

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 1980

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND



Parliamentary Debates

[HANSARD]

Legislative Assembly

THIRD SESSION OF THE FORTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

Appointed to meet

AT BRISBANE ON THE NINETEENTH DAY OF AUGUST, IN THE TWENTY-NINTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II, IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1980

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 1980

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

Pursuant to the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor, dated 24 July 1980, appointing Parliament to meet this day for the dispatch of business, the House met at 11 a.m. in the temporary Legislative Assembly Chamber in the Parliamentary Annexe.

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

The Clerk read the proclamation.

COMMISSION TO OPEN PARLIAMENT

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a commission appointing me and Mr W. D. Hewitt, Chairman of Committees, or either of us, Commissioners to open this session of Parliament.

I now call on the Clerk to read the commission.

The Clerk read the commission.

Mr SPEAKER, as the Senior Commissioner, said: Honourable members, we have it in command from His Excellency the Governor of Queensland to communicate to you that Parliament has been summoned to meet this day to consider legislation, the granting of Supply to Her Majesty and such other matters as may be brought before you; that the customary Speech will not be delivered at

the Opening of this the Third Session of the Forty-second Parliament of Queensland and that, nevertheless, it is His Excellency's desire that you proceed forthwith to the consideration of the aforementioned business.

DEATHS OF SIR ALAN MANSFIELD AND SIR MOSTYN HANGER

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.6 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 Alan Mansfield, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.St.J., LL.B.Syd., LL.D.(Hon.) Qld., formerly Governor of the State of Queensland and its dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

"2. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Honourable Sir Mostyn Hanger, K.B.E., B.A., LL.M., formerly Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Queensland and one time Administrator of the State of Queensland and its dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia.

"3. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the widow and family of each of the deceased gentlemen the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

Honourable members have been saddened by the recent passing of two very eminent public figures who served the State faithfully and well.

Sir Alan Mansfield was a distinguished citizen and scholar who endeared himself to the people throughout his term of office as Governor from 1966 to 1972. During his six-year term, Sir Alan won the affection, respect and confidence of people in all walks of life. He devoted virtually a lifetime of service to the community and the State.

Our Sovereign the Queen personally honoured Sir Alan through bestowing two knight-hoods on him—that of Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George in 1958, and Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order in 1970. He was also a Knight of the Order of St John of Jerusalem.

In his speech upon assuming the office of Governor in March 1966, Sir Alan said his aim as Governor would be to bring the Queen closer to the people. He succeeded admirably with that intention.

Queensland-born, Sir Alan was the second Queensland to be appointed Governor. The first was Sir John Lavarack, whose term ran from 1946 to 1957. Born in 1902 at Indooroopilly, Brisbane, Alan Mansfield was the son of Edward Mansfield, himself a Judge of District Courts (Queensland) who served as Chairman of the Land Appeal Court and, from time to time, upon the Supreme Court.

In 1924 Sir Alan, then in his early twenties, graduated from Sydney University with the degree of Bachelor of Laws. In that year he was called to both the New South Wales Bar and the Queensland Bar, reading within the chambers of Mr P. L. Hart. More than 30 years of active court work followed. He lectured in bankruptcy at the Queensland University Law School and in the Faculty of Commerce. He was also lecturer at the Brisbane State Commercial High School.

He was regarded as a leader among younger counsel and as a man of culture. As he matured, his judgments in court were considered vigilant and shrewd, and invariably tinged with mercy. He was elevated to the Supreme Court of Queensland in 1940 and was appointed to the office of Chief Justice in 1956.

From 1956 to 1965 he was Warden of the University of Queensland and became its Chancellor in 1966. He held this important post for 10 years. During this time the university enjoyed one of its most progressive periods.

As a member of tribunals of inquiry and courts of appeal, whether within the State, the nation or on the international stage, Sir Alan displayed his wisdom and legal scholarship.

He was commissioned as an Honorary Colonel of the 2/14 Queensland Mounted Infantry and as an Honorary Air Commodore of 23rd Squadron of the Citizen Air Force.

But many Queenslanders will have fondest recollections of Sir Alan as a man who loved nothing better than to escape to a secluded seaside spot and indulge in his hobby of boating and fishing.

He was a dutiful husband, and father to a son and daughter. To his family, we express our heartfelt condolences. Sir Alan has left a highly individual and indelible mark in so many areas.

He will be recorded in Queensland's history as one of the State's most eminent citizens and one who subscribed to the tenet: service above self. His career, with its countless achievements of excellence, remains his most faithful memorial.

The late Chief Justice Sir Mostyn Hanger died after a long illness. This great man had a long and distinguished career in both the legal profession and the service of this State.

Sir Mostyn was held in the highest regard by those who knew him personally and by those who associated with him professionally. All of them were aware of his being a truly honourable gentleman.

Born in 1908, he was educated at Gympie State High School and the University of Queensland. He graduated from that university in 1929 with the degree of Bachelor of Arts and was admitted to the Queensland Bar in 1930.

In 1932 he commenced private practice and after many years of distinguished service he was appointed a King's Counsel in 1950.

Sir Mostyn was elevated to the Supreme Court of Queensland in 1953 and was appointed to the office of Chief Justice in 1971, in which office he served until his retirement in 1977. He earned the respect and high regard of the entire legal profession. Judicial roles filled by him included the demanding position of President of the Industrial Court from 1961 to 1971.

Queensland owes a great debt to this man who gave so much of his life for the benefit of the community. For these services, Her Majesty graciously conferred a knighthood upon him—that of a Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

Sir Mostyn also served Queensland in the capacity of Administrator between the retirement of former Governor, the late Sir Alan Mansfield, and the appointment of the late Sir Colin Hannah in 1972. He served again in this capacity in 1977 between Sir Colin's retirement and the appointment of the present Governor, Sir James Ramsay.

Sir Mostyn is survived by his wife, three sons and a daughter. His links with the legal fraternity still continue, however, as one of his sons, John, is a Judge of District Courts in Townsville, and another son, Ian, is a barrister in Brisbane.

I am sure all members feel a great loss with the passing of Sir Mostyn, who was one of Queensland's great men.

On behalf of the Government and, I am sure, all honourable members of this House, I wish to extend our condolences to the family of the late Sir Mostyn Hanger, K.B.E.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.13 a.m.): I wish to second the motion of the Premier in expressing the condolence of the Parliament on the passing of two of Queensland's most distinguished sons—Sir Alan Mansfield, K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.St.J. and Sir Mostyn Hanger, K.B.E.

Both men made an enormous contribution to Queensland and they have left indelible marks not only on the legal history of this State, but also in the fields of administration, education and community development.

Sir Alan Mansfield came from a remarkable family with a history steeped in service to the law profession. He was the third judge in the family—succeeding his father, Edward Mansfield, who was a Judge of the Queensland District Court, chairman of the Land Appeal Court and an Acting Supreme Court Judge; and his great-grandfather, Sir James Mansfield, who was twice Solicitor-General in England and Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

Sir Alan's own career in the law was outstanding. He was called to the New South Wales Bar and the Queensland Bar in 1924. He was a highly successful and respected barrister and it was only a matter of time before he was elevated to the Bench.

On 17 May 1941, he was sworn in as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Queensland and later he became the Acting President of the State Industrial Court. He was the Senior Puisne Judge in 1947 and Chief Justice of Queensland between 1955 and 1966.

After more than a quarter of a decade on the Bench, he became Governor of Queensland from 1966 in an extended term till 1972. At the same time he was also Chancellor of the University of Queensland from 1966 to 1967.

As Governor, Sir Alan earned the deep affection of many Queenslanders. Together with Lady Mansfield he toured the State widely, meeting Queenslanders in all walks of life. He was truly a Governor for all the people.

Sir Alan Mansfield was a man of exceptional ability. He was a keen sportsman in his youth. Nobody who knew him back in his rowing days at Sydney University was surprised when he was appointed Governor in 1966, for he rowed in a boat that has since become legendary for the good fortunes it brought to her crew. It was the famous Interfaculty Eight of 1923. The stroke in that boat was a young man named Curlewis who later become Judge Adrian Curlewis; No. 7 become Judge Holt of the New South Wales District Court; No. 5 became Mr Justice Heron of the New South Wales Supreme Court; No. 4 became Judge Berne

of the New South Wales District Court; the bow went on to become Mr Justice Hunter—Chief Justice of Tonga—and No. 6 in the boat was a young law student of great repute, Alan Mansfield. For sheer weight of talent there has never been a crew quite like it.

Sir Alan Mansfield always put his State first. In 1957 when the then Governor, Sir John Lavarack was ill, Sir Alan was Administrator of the State. Members will recall that that was a turbulent period in Queensland's political history with the then Gair Government on the brink of collapse. Mr Justice Mansfield, as he then was, delayed a pending operation to stay on duty during that period of constitutional crisis. Such was the man's devotion to duty that in 1958 he was honoured with a knighthood in the State's New Year honours list—the first for more than 25 years.

Sir Alan Mansfield loved Queensland's outdoors and its natural environment. He was a keen fisherman and was often seen in his baggy shorts fishing for whiting on Moreton Island. He regularly holidayed on Fraser Island. Sir Alan Mansfield thrust himself into community life. His part-time and honorary jobs were enough to absorb the energies of an ordinary man. Sir Alan Mansfield was more than just a Governor of Queensland. He was a part of our State and a part of the Queensland community. He was a family man and a devoted husband. To his widow and children I express our deepest sympathy.

Sir Mostyn Hanger was a respected and dedicated servant of the State. A man with an exceptional ability at law, acute and quick in apprehension, and thorough in preparation, he had a great capacity for independent critical thought. Mostyn Hanger was admitted to the bar on 25 November 1930. He built up a reputation as an able advocate in the commercial and property side of the law. In 1941 he received his masters degree in law and took silk in 1950.

His service to the law spanned more than 47 years and culminated in his elevation to the high office of Chief Justice on 12 May 1971. Such an appointment speaks for itself as to his qualities of learning and integrity. A distinguished figure in his homburg hat, Sir Mostyn was always willing to seek advice and in turn be generous of his time and knowledge—particularly to young lawyers and law students.

Above all, Sir Mostyn Hanger was a devoted family man. With three sons and a daughter he cultivated in them a great appreciation of the importance of the family unit and together they shared his love for music and the arts. He was a dedicated scholar of German. An indication of the wide-ranging interests of the man was his deep love for his orchids. He was an avid orchid hobbyist and was patron of the Brisbane Orchid Society. He balanced his recreational time in his nursery with other activities. A keen golfer, he attained an enviable level of skill and indeed continued to play until his recent illness.

Sir Mostyn Hanger was an outstanding Queenslander with a lasting record of service to this State. To his widow and family I extend our deepest sympathy. I support the motion moved by the Premier.

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.19 a.m.): I would like to join the Opposition with this motion and support the comments made by the Premier and the Deputy Premier in relation to these two most distinguished Queenslanders. It is rather odd that a motion of condolence should be moved for both of them at the same time because I do not suppose there would be two more distinguished legal personalities in this State whose careers were so much in parallel in many respects.

I personally remember Sir Alan Mansfield more than I do Sir Mostyn Hanger because I met Sir Alan in the North over a great many years prior to my entry into this Parliament. He often reminisced with me about his early career as a barrister when he used to practise in the circuit courts round Queensland.

Sir Mostyn Hanger's career followed much the same course. The work these two young barristers did suited them very well for the roles that they eventually played: Sir Alan Mansfield as Governor of the State and Sir Mostyn Hanger as Administrator of the State for a period. They distinguished themselves firstly as barristers and then as judges and Chief Justices. Sir Alan Mansfield also distinguished himself as Governor. Sir Mostyn Hanger, as Administrator, was not required to travel anywhere near as much as was Sir Alan Mansfield. He merely administered the office of Governor during change-over periods. I think that the earlier training of both men held them in good stead for the very high offices that they both filled with great distinction.

Sir Alan Mansfield, at quite a young age, became Australia's representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission in 1946. That commission wrote a new page in world legal history. This very distinguished Queenslander was part of that commission and served on it with great distinction. He was acclaimed throughout the world for the legal knowledge and ability that he displayed on that commission.

I suppose that in years to come both men will be remembered best for their legal work. Unfortunately, Governors and Administrators come and go. Both men will be remembered for the work that they did on the Bench in Queensland in their earlier years. Both were appointed to the Bench at a very young age and, as I say, they served on it with great distinction for a long period. We in the Parliament of Queensland are equally as proud of them as are any other people in the State and we certainly support the motion of condolence.

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove—Minister for Survey and Valuation) (11.23 a.m.): I wish to associate myself with the

remarks of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. Like all who practised before them, I had the greatest respect for both Sir Alan Mansfield and Sir Mostyn Hanger. Sir Mostyn had not long retired as Chief Justice. His acute mind made a great contribution to the administration of justice in this State. His forte, I think, was in the hearing of cases before the Full Court, where he would quickly master the facts and seize upon a vital passage the signifiante, or full significance, of which may have been overlooked by counsel. In nisi prius cases, too, he had great gifts. I will remember him most, I think, presiding over the famous gold bars case: *Fazal Deen v. Thomas Brown & Co.*

Sir Alan Mansfield enjoyed a position which is almost unique in the legal profession. His courtesy and conduct on the Bench and his legal scholarship were an example to everybody. I remember his patience on the Bench when he was teaching me to pronounce "Mudgeeraba", which I had mispronounced three times in as many minutes. He had a distinguished ancestor in Lord Mansfield. Lord Mansfield had such a reputation for fairness that, when his house was burnt down, the arsonist who did it especially asked to be tried by Lord Mansfield. Sir Alan Mansfield's reputation was no less. His character can be summed up by saying that a whole generation modelled themselves on his behaviour. I associate myself with the motion.

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

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WHITSUNDAY

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, member for the electoral district of Whitsunday—

"Mineral House,
"41 George Street,
"Brisbane, 4000.
"24th June, 1980.

"Dear Mr Speaker,

"I hereby tender my resignation as the Member for the Electoral District of Whitsunday, such resignation to take effect at midnight on Thursday, 17th July, 1980.

"Yours sincerely,

"R. E. Camm,
"Minister for Mines, Energy
and Police."

SEAT DECLARED VACANT

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

"That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Whitsunday hath become and is now vacant by reason of the resignation of the said Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm."

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.25 a.m.): The Opposition takes the unusual step today of enlarging the debate on this normally formal motion as the means of registering its disgust and disapproval of the “jobs for the boys” adventures of the National and Liberal Parties.

We ask the majority of members in this Parliament—in particular the Liberals who pretend such high principles on these matters—to join with us in this defence of what should be the minimum standards of Government behaviour.

I believe there is no more degrading advertisement to not just a Government, but a Parliamentary system as a whole, than the sight of a generously superannuated political favourite being hustled sideways into an extravagantly rewarded Government job at an age when most Queenslanders are either required to be retired or are on the edge of retirement.

Last year it was the National Party's former police and tourism Minister (Max Hodges) who, at 63, retired with almost \$270,000 in superannuation into the Government chairmanship of the Port of Brisbane Authority on \$300 to \$400 a week. Last month the political beneficiary was the National Party's former mines Minister and Deputy Leader (Ron Camm). He retired on 17 July on what will, in finality, approximate a record \$320,000 in superannuation. He was then recalled by his Cabinet colleagues only five days later, on his 66th birthday, to fill the \$800 a week Government job as Chairman of the Queensland Sugar Board.

Shortly before Mr Camm's retirement, and also since Parliament last met, the National Party's unknown one-termer for Wynnum (Mr Bill Lamond) was prised from the jaws of yet another election defeat and installed, without applications being called, in the chairmanship of the Government's new Small Business Development Corporation.

Both Mr Camm and, before him, Mr Hodges, in their final days as parliamentarians and Cabinet Ministers, were conditioned for the political retirement pastures through first class round-the-world holidays. In the case of Mr Hodges the target was Amsterdam and “other centres”—we can only guess what that means. For Mr Camm it was “round the world” in the most expensive sense of the term. Neither, I might add, submitted a report to the Parliament on his journey, despite the commitment that was made to this Parliament last year when another Minister of the Crown was unceremoniously recalled from overseas. At that stage the Parliament was promised that it would be informed and given a report about the overseas tours of Ministers. Incidentally, we are still waiting for that Minister's report.

I might add that since the 1977 elections Mr Camm had enjoyed at least four, and possibly five or more, overseas excursions at the Queensland public expense. It is no

wonder that cynics in Queensland declare that winning the Premier's selection for Cabinet is like learning the combination to the Bank of Brisbane.

Because of the manner in which it was proclaimed via Cabinet, there is no way in this Parliament that we can upset the appointment of Mr Camm. The decision was made by Cabinet and was promulgated by Cabinet through the Executive Council. Parliament is not given the opportunity to withdraw the appointment. However, today we might be able to remedy that deficiency.

Mr Hinze: What happened to Forgan Smith?

Mr CASEY: He left this Parliament at the age of 55, 10 or 11 years before the normal age of retirement. That was also at a time of no superannuation scheme for members of Parliament. There was no parliamentary pension of any kind. There can be no comparison between the two cases. If the honourable Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—he is now the chief sheriff of this State—would like to check on this particular matter he would soon learn that when Mr Forgan Smith left this Parliament he did not immediately take the job of Chairman of the Sugar Board. Following a distinguished career elsewhere, he then took that position.

I hope that today we might be able to correct the deficiency resulting from the efforts of our Cabinet gang of 18 in this matter. We must defend the dignity of our parliamentary system against these Cabinet detractors through a protest in the strongest form against this individual appointment and the practice of Government jobs for the boys by the Liberal and National Parties.

I challenge the Liberal Party to stand with Labor in support of parliamentary standards—which it professes to uphold—although I am aware that its leader and, no doubt, other Ministers were partners in the Camm conspiracy. I see the Minister for Industrial Relations chafing at the bit over there. I suggest that he, as Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, would have been fully in support of this appointment, along with his leader.

The Camm conspiracy was known in many circles as far back as early January this year, when even the cane stalks were shouting to one another that, when the Sugar Board was restructured and Eric White was appointed as Deputy Chairman, the appointment was made only until the further appointment of Mr Camm at a later stage during the year when he was ready to retire from the Parliament. That was known not only in the electorate of Whitsunday but also in various sugar circles within the State. The conspiracy was begun many months ago.

No political party in my memory has been allowed more uncritically by sections of the media to dishonour its own proclaimed principles than the Liberal Party in Queensland.

Some Liberals have been endeavouring to shout from the rooftops about this issue. We will see how strong they are on their principles today. No political party has been allowed so unquestioned to propound a multiplicity of policies, few of which it is prepared to enact when the occasion arises and its members are given the opportunity on the floor of this Parliament. I give them here today in this Parliament the opportunity to display a strength of conviction and a spirit of principle that have so sadly deserted them in the past.

What, I ask, in these troubling times of record post-war unemployment must our jobless youngsters think as they see the superannuated Government grandpas of this Parliament pensioned off by their mates into \$800-a-week plush, cushy jobs? What must they think, these Queensland youngsters, as they see yet another National Party 66-year-old (the former Minister for Police and member for Mirani) approaching retirement, which he hopes will land him in London as the next Agent-General? What, I ask, must anyone unemployed think as he sees young Vic being shuffled up into old Ronnie's job behind the Premier as the receiver of the next Government goodies to be handed out?

There is, I believe, in Queensland a disillusionment—a disenchantment—towards not only the style of government but also the standards of government in this State. We see an alarming coincidence between donations to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and Government contracts and appointments made by Cabinet. Jobs worth three or four times the average earnings (padded, I add, with healthy expense accounts) are filled secretly by political favourites through Cabinet appointments without applications being invited or qualifications for the jobs being disclosed. I have no doubt that, in such cases, the possession of a National Party membership card is more influential than a university degree.

Today through my motion we have the opportunity to strike a blow for the conscience of Parliament and to show our displeasure at practices of the Government that, no matter how they are justified, are really indefensible. The facts of the Camm affair are that this former National Party Minister methodically maximised his parliamentary superannuation, skilfully selecting his retirement date between 1 July, when new adjustments apply, and his 66th birthday on 22 July when reduction factors would have begun. Only five days after this careful financial transaction at an age already one year above the maximum Public Service retiring limit, six years over the voluntary limit and 11 years over the Government's voluntary police limit—a portfolio he was administering at the time of his retirement—he is miraculously recalled by his grateful old buddies over there on \$40,000 a year until he turns 70.

His claims in the "Telegraph" on the 14th of this month that he stepped down to make way for a younger man are nonsense. Mr Camm stepped down, to the day, when it suited him best financially, knowing there was a new pot of Government gold waiting at the start of his retirement rainbow. To crown parliamentary injury with indecency, on 18 July in "The Courier-Mail" newspaper, former Minister Camm told Queenslanders that if he didn't get a well-paid retirement job he could make more selling his Cabinet and departmental secrets to mining companies.

This sent a shock wave round the whole of Queensland, and Queenslanders might well question whether this is, in fact, the unprincipled guide-line of the jobs for the boys philosophy that has taken over the National and Liberal Parties in this State. Is the new retirement cry of Ministers to be, "I've got my super, but if you don't fatten me further, then I'll sell you all out with some of my secrets."? It is an attitude, I believe, that no Government should cultivate and no Parliament can afford.

I move the following amendment—

"That the following words be added:—

'and that the Parliament of Queensland desires that so much of the proclamation of 22 July 1980 under the Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915 as published in the Government Gazette of 26 July 1980 as refers to the said Ronald Ernest Camm be rescinded and that the Executive Council is hereby instructed by the Parliament that applications be called for the position of Chairman of the Sugar Board from persons who have the necessary qualifications and who have not reached the compulsory retiring age of 65 years in accordance with the Public Service Acts.'

I draw the attention of the House to the statement in that amendment that Parliament does have the responsibility and does have the authority—we will see in a few moments, Mr. Speaker, whether it also has the desire—to override the actions of the Cabinet gang of 18, through the Executive Council, in making unprincipled appointments without calling applications to enable people in Queensland who may be far better qualified to serve their State well to put themselves forward. Honourable members have just spoken of two distinguished Queenslanders who have passed on who served their State well. There are many others in the community who could do equally well and who have knowledge of the sugar industry necessary to enable them to take the onerous responsibilities of the position of Chairman of the Sugar Board, rather than the position being given to an aging and retired parliamentarian.

I invite all members who care, even if only a little, for the prestige of Parliament to join me in this protest.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.36 a.m.): In seconding the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr SULLIVAN: I rise to a point of order. I wish to second the motion moved by the Premier.

Mr Casey: It does not require seconding.

Mr D'ARCY: It is the amendment that I am seconding.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We now have an amendment before the House. I must give the call to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to second the amendment.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to Standing Order 52, which says—

“A Motion may be made, without Notice, by leave of a majority of the House, to be decided without Debate.”

The Premier sought leave to move a motion without notice, and leave was granted by the House. Therefore, I ask you for a ruling that the motion should go forward without debate.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Dr EDWARDS: Mr Speaker, I ask for your ruling on my point of order before the Leader of the Opposition is given the call.

Mr CASEY: My point of order is an addendum to the Deputy Premier's point of order.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am desirous of hearing the comments of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CASEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention—I do not really need to draw your attention to it because you know it so well, but the Deputy Premier certainly does not—to Standing Order 88, which says—

“A Question having been proposed, may be amended by omitting certain words only, by omitting certain words in order to insert or add other words, or by inserting or adding words.”

Quite clearly, it is a corollary of the motion moved by the Premier.

Mr D'ARCY: In seconding the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition—

Dr EDWARDS: I again rise to a point of order. I raised with you a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and asked if you would give a ruling on it. The matter mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition is, of course, not relevant. I ask you again to give a ruling on this point under Standing Order 52, which says quite clearly that a motion may be made, without notice, by leave of a majority

of the House, and that it may be decided without debate. I reiterate that the Premier sought leave of the House to move a motion without notice, and that leave was granted. Therefore, I put to you that the motion relating to the resignation of Mr Camm should not be debated.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is a very technical debate.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I shall listen to the honourable member's point of order later on. I wish to confer with the Clerk to get a clear interpretation of the meaning of the Standing Order, because it has been debated and it will continue to be debated. I wish to have this matter cleared up once and for all.

Mr Speaker conferred with the Clerk.

Order! There has been some difference of opinion in relation to this matter, so in the circumstances I feel I cannot sustain the point of order taken by the Deputy Premier.

Mr D'ARCY: As I was saying, I rise to second the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Queenslanders generally were shocked by Mr Camm's appointment as Chairman of the Sugar Board within weeks of his retirement from this Parliament.

Senior citizens who retire after a lifetime of work are forbidden to work if they are to receive the age pension, which is a mere pittance granted to them by the Federal Government. Queenslanders, who never see a return from the great mineral wealth of this State, are cynical about the appointment of the man who, as Minister for Mines, administered that mineral wealth. From the parliamentary superannuation fund he received the sum of \$300,000 and, at 66 years of age, is now given a \$400-a-week job.

As my leader pointed out, young Queenslanders who have no job and face little prospect of obtaining one must wonder in amazement at the crudity of this Government's appointment of a retired Minister who received \$300,000 to a job paying \$400 a week. Surely Mr Camm should have been retired in the normal manner.

One is not concerned about the National Party policy. Over the years we have seen the National Party make no apology for its belief in political patronage. In fact, over the years we have seen plenty of evidence of its policy of political patronage.

However, the mystery lies within the Liberal Party, which itself is a mystery. The Liberal Party's policy is vacillating to such an extent that Queenslanders everywhere, in addition to saying that the Liberal Party's leader is weak, are saying that the party itself is weak. That is the comment that we hear all the time. And no wonder!

On this subject, Dr Edwards must surely show where he stands. The party of which he is leader is a mystery. It is too weak to make a decision. When Dr Edwards took

over as parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party he said he was going to change the Liberal Ministers in Cabinet. He is an embarrassment to his party and to Queenslanders. Most of all, he is an embarrassment to the Press. I do not know how the Press puts up with him. He said he was going to make changes in Cabinet and he leaked to the Press what those changes were to be. They appeared on the front page of the newspapers. Then the Press was forced to withdraw the announced changes.

Only last week "The Courier-Mail" carried the headline, "Libs to axe 'jobs for boys'". The paper said that Mr Camm was one on a list of eight whose appointments were to be reviewed by the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party was reported as saying that it will examine every statutory body and remove and terminate patronage appointments. The list included Bill Lamond, Frank Moore, Ron Camm, Sir Wallace Rae, Mr Keith Williams, Mr Max Hodges, Mr Carl Robertson and Mr John Wyatt.

Later on the article deals with the appointment to the position of Chairman of the T.A.B. Will it be the Premier's National Party appointment or Dr Edwards's Liberal member? In the same article Dr Edwards says that there will be no more jobs for the boys. The editor of "The Courier-Mail" must have been terribly embarrassed the following day because he had to come out and say that the Liberal Party's assurance that it would make no political appointment to State Government bodies was welcome but a little late.

At the end of an article by Mr Casey in the same newspaper, Dr Edwards is quoted as saying that he would have nothing to do with any Opposition moves. He will have his opportunity to explain to this Parliament what is the Liberal Party policy.

The following day, Dr Edwards came out with the statement, "I backed Camm for top job." The public must surely be tremendously worried about the policy of the Liberal Party. Do they follow Dr Edwards or the Liberal Party? If not, whom do they follow? Dr Edwards should give an explanation to this House, because the eight Liberal Cabinet Ministers signed the proclamation concerning Mr Camm's job.

Just look at Liberal Party appointments. Dr Edwards was Minister for Health for some time. It was common knowledge among members of the Press and members of the public that one of the things he said he would end was the making of political appointments to hospital boards. He said that everywhere. What happened? To my knowledge, he did not change one. Every hospital board in this State is full of Liberal Party members. Every other board in this State is full of Liberal Party members.

Mr LICKISS: I rise to a point of order. I take it that we are debating the motion to declare vacant the seat of Mackay?

Mr Casey: No, the amendment.

Mr Jones: You have not even got the seat right; it is Whitsunday.

Mr LICKISS: Mr Speaker, I had not finished what I was saying. The motion before the House concerns the vacancy in the seat of Mackay, and an amendment has been moved.

Mr Jones: Whitsunday. Get it right.

Mr LICKISS: Whitsunday. An amendment has been moved to that motion. I ask you, Mr Speaker, if the debate is going beyond the motion and the amendment currently under review in this House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The debate before the House at the moment is based on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr D'ARCY: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

I have referred to hospitals boards and fire brigade boards. Let me now refer to a former Liberal Attorney-General, Dr Peter Delamothé, who became Agent-General in London. He was a member of the Liberal Party and a member of the Government. Dr Edwards is on very weak ground in saying what he will do about jobs for the boys.

I believe that Dr Edwards's staff appointees in recent times have been Liberal Party members and Liberal executive members. Mr Justice Connolly was the member for Kurilpa in this Parliament and Mr Justice Wanstall was the Liberal member for Toowong. Yet the Liberals talk about jobs for the boys!

Surely one of the biggest jokes must concern Sir William Knox. One wonders how he gets into the Press. It was only a few months ago that Dr Edwards was fighting with him over the leadership. It was suggested that Sir William Knox might be appointed to Tokyo. He issued a Press statement in which he said he did not want to go to Tokyo but would take the job in London. The Press headline reads, "Sir William for London." The reason he did not want to go to Tokyo was that he had young daughters at school and they probably would have had great difficulty learning at a Japanese school. He would have had no problems at all in London.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I can take it. The honourable member for Woodridge is supposed to be debating a serious point. I say to the honourable member, through you Mr Speaker, that I have not been offered any jobs and I have not asked for any. I am doing a job for both the Government and the people of Queensland and I am very proud to be doing it.

Mr D'ARCY: Perhaps he would like the leadership of the Liberal Party back.

The people of Queensland believed that. They believe a lot of what they read in the Press. That was in the Press and it was debated for several days. When we talk about jobs for the boys and look at the Liberal Party's track record, it is seen to be very poor. Where does the Deputy Premier stand? With all his vacillations, no-one in Queensland knows.

This is a serious matter and one about which Queenslanders must be terribly concerned. We are not seeing a return from our natural wealth. The Queensland public cannot be fooled all the time. I believe the Government has goaded them into such a state of despair that they will react violently against it in the forthcoming elections. This applies particularly to our senior citizens. In recent weeks I have attended meetings of 200, 300 and 500 senior citizens. I attended one recently in Toowoomba with Bob Hawke, and the question that was repeatedly asked was, "Why do parliamentarians take big lump sums and then take jobs when we cannot do so?" The Government cannot fool the people of Queensland all the time.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy) (11.51 a.m.): The motion moved by the Premier reads—

"That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Whitsunday hath become and is now vacant by reason of the resignation of the said Hon. Ronald Ernest Camm."

The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment to that motion. It has not been circulated, but I understand that after mentioning jobs for the boys it goes on to attack the appointment of the Honourable Ron Camm as chairman of the Sugar Board. The amendment was seconded by the honourable member for Woodridge.

In the 1950s the then Premier of Queensland, the late William Forgan Smith, was appointed chairman of the Sugar Board and chairman of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board—

Mr Casey: 1940.

Mr SULLIVAN: Whenever it was, apparently the Government of the day felt that he would be of value to the sugar industry, and I believe the industry accepted that.

Mr Casey: Deputy chairman of the Sugar Board.

Mr SULLIVAN: Just let me make my speech.

As the then Minister for Primary Industries and Minister responsible for recommending an appointment to the chairmanship of the Sugar Board, a vacancy brought about by the deteriorating health of the present incumbent

of that position, Mr Lloyd Harris—who has done a magnificent job—I considered the people who were available. Nobody can convince me that giving the job to Ronald Ernest Camm would qualify as an example of what the Leader of the Opposition refers to as "Jobs for the boys." Mr Camm could have remained in his position of deputy leader of the National Party and Minister for Mines, Energy and Police for the next three or four elections if he chose so to do. He was next in line to become Premier of this State.

I believed, as did so many other people in the sugar industry, that because of his responsible attitude to the sugar industry, which he served as an outstanding farmer, as a mill administrator and as a representative of the industry at sugar conferences at executive level, and having the wide knowledge that he has, Mr Camm was the most appropriate man to fill the position to be vacated by Mr Lloyd Harris.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the appointment of my former private secretary, Mr Eric White, as deputy chairman of the board. It is true that on the recommendation of the chairman of the Sugar Board Mr White was appointed to that position, but I did not believe that after occupying the position of deputy for a period of only a few months he was sufficiently experienced to take over as chairman. So I looked at other people and came up with Mr Camm. When I asked him whether he was prepared to take on the job when he resigned from Parliament, he gave the matter long consideration and then accepted. It should be borne in mind that he could have remained here for the next three, six or nine years on a Minister's salary, and perhaps on the Premier's salary. But he has given the job away and taken his superannuation. If he had stayed his superannuation would have grown, as it grows each year, and he would have paid tax on only 5 per cent of it. But he has taken the superannuation to which he was entitled and invested a large proportion of it in the electricity loans for which he was responsible for so many years. Opposition members have come here today and condemned Ron Camm. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that he will not be impressing many people around Mackay.

I shall not deal with all the other appointments that the member for Woodridge mentioned. I just wish to put the record straight. I, as Minister for Primary Industries, was responsible for recommending to Cabinet an appointment to the Sugar Board. My recommendation was for the appointment of Mr Camm, and I make no apologies for doing that. I believe that he is the best man in Australia for the job, and many people in the sugar industry think the same.

I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 54

Ahern	Knox
Akers	Kyburz
Armstrong	Lane
Austin	Lee
Bertoni	Lester
Bird	Lickiss
Bishop	Lockwood
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Booth	Miller
Bourke	Moore
Campbell	Newbery
Edwards	Porter
Elliott	Powell
Frawley	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Scassola
Glasson	Scott-Young
Goleby	Simpson
Greenwood	Stephan
Gunn	Sullivan
Gygar	Tenni
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tomkins
Hewitt, W. D.	Warner
Hinze	Wharton
Hooper, M. D.	White, P. N. D.
Innes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Neal
Kaus	Turner
Kippin	

NOES, 21

Blake	Prest
Burns	Scott
Casey	Underwood
D'Arcy	Vaughan
Fouras	Warburton
Gibbs, R. J.	Wilson
Hansen	Wright
Hooper, K. J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Davis
Kruger	Shaw
Mackenzie	
Milliner	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be added (Mr Casey's amendment) be so added—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 21

Blake	Prest
Burns	Scott
Casey	Underwood
D'Arcy	Vaughan
Fouras	Warburton
Gibbs, R. J.	Wilson
Hansen	Wright
Hooper, K. J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Davis
Kruger	Shaw
Mackenzie	
Milliner	

NOES, 54

Ahern	Knox
Akers	Kyburz
Armstrong	Lane
Austin	Lee
Bertoni	Lester
Bird	Lickiss
Bishop	Lockwood
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Booth	Miller
Bourke	Moore
Campbell	Newbery
Edwards	Porter
Elliott	Powell
Frawley	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Scassola
Glasson	Scott-Young
Goleby	Simpson
Greenwood	Stephan
Gunn	Sullivan
Gygar	Tenni
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tomkins
Hewitt, W. D.	Warner
Hinze	Wharton
Hooper, M. D.	White, P. N. D.
Innes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Neal
Kaus	Turner
Kippin	

Resolved in the negative.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BULIMBA

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr **SPEAKER**: Honourable members, I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from Mr John William Houston, member for the electoral district of Bulimba—

“Electoral Office,
“Brisbane Cricket Ground Complex,
“Stanley Street,
“Woolloongabba, Qld, 4102
“24th July, 1980.

“The Speaker,
“Queensland Parliament,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane, Qld, 4000.

“Dear Mr Speaker,

“I hereby tender my resignation as the Member for the Electoral District of Bulimba in Queensland Parliament.

“I wish this resignation to take affect from midnight the 25th July, 1980.

“I naturally also resign any positions that I hold through my membership in the Queensland Parliament.

“Yours sincerely,

“J. W. Houston MLA”

SEAT DECLARED VACANT

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

“That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Bulimba hath become and is now vacant by reason of the resignation of the said John William Houston, Esquire.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

CHANGES IN MINISTRY

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.17 p.m.): I desire to inform the House that on 17 July 1980, His Excellency the Administrator of the Government—

(a) accepted the resignation tendered by the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, as a Member of the Executive Council of Queensland, effective from midnight on 17 July 1980;

(b) accepted the resignation tendered by the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, as Minister for Mines, Energy and Police of Queensland, effective from midnight on 17 July 1980.

I also desire to inform the House that on 29 July 1980, His Excellency the Governor—

(a) accepted the resignations tendered by the Honourable Victor Bruce Sullivan, as Minister for Primary Industries of Queensland, and the Honourable Russell James Hinze, as Minister for Local Government and Main Roads of Queensland, effective on and after 29 July 1980;

(b) appointed Michael John Ahern, Esquire, B.Agr.Sc., to be a Member of the Executive Council of Queensland;

(c) appointed the Honourable Victor Bruce Sullivan, to be Minister for Mines and Energy of Queensland; the Honourable Russell James Hinze to be Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police of Queensland; and the Honourable Michael John Ahern, B.Agr.Sc., to be Minister for Primary Industries of Queensland.

I lay upon the table of the House copies of the Queensland Government Gazettes of 19 July and 29 July containing the relevant notifications.

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

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR WELFARE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.18 p.m.): I also desire to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896-1975, authorised and empowered the Honourable Llewellyn Roy Edwards, M.B., B.S., MLA, Deputy Premier and Treasurer, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Welfare by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 19 August 1980, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Samuel Sydney Doumany, B.Sc.Agr., M.A.I.A.S., MLA.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette of 16 August notifying this arrangement.

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

CENTRAL QUEENSLAND COALFIELDS TAXATION DISPUTE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.19 p.m.): I desire to advise the House that earlier today, I once again made personal representations to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister in relation to the disastrous strike by coal miners in Central Queensland.

On behalf of the Government and the people of Queensland, I advised the Prime Minister that the coalfields dispute had to be ended immediately. I advised Mr Fraser that my Government could not accept the Commonwealth's proposal for what amounts to a new tax on the Central Queensland workers involved in the dispute and that I regarded the proposals as a tax that is surely unique in that it would be a tax on an agreement between employers and employees.

I advised the Prime Minister that there was every indication that the miners would remain on strike—with tragic results for this State and the nation—indeinitely. I again proposed to the Prime Minister that he should order a moratorium on the housing tax proposals pending a genuine, far-reaching inquiry into the entire question of housing subsidy taxation throughout Australia.

For the benefit of honourable members, I can report that the Prime Minister assured me that he would give my proposals urgent consideration.

RELEASE OF MRS I. M. LAMB ON PAROLE

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Health) (12.20 p.m.): I wish to draw the attention of members to the circumstances surrounding the recent release on parole of Irene Mavis Lamb.

It is not normally my policy to discuss individual cases relating to those people who, at one time or another, are admitted to any psychiatric institution. However, I believe it is necessary in this case to clear up a few points.

Mrs Lamb was admitted to Osler House, Security Patients Hospital, Wolston Park Hospital, Wacol, on 8 March 1977. She had been charged with the commission of the offences that on or about 20 February 1977, at Wolvi near Gympie, she had murdered Thomas William Lamb, Laurelle Gail Lamb, Lynette Gail Oakley and Brenda Lee Lamb.

Her admission to Wolston Park Hospital was in accordance with section 34 of the Mental Health Act 1974. Mrs Lamb was subjected to intensive investigation and active treatment. She was fully investigated, not only from a psychiatric and psychological point of view but also from a physical point of view. Mrs Lamb was also examined by an independent psychiatrist on the request of the Public Defender.

In accordance with the Mental Health Act, reports were made by the Director of Psychiatric Services and the Attorney-General and, in June 1977, an Order in Council was issued, deferring, for six months, further consideration of the matter.

In November 1977, further reports were made to the Governor in Council and, in accordance with section 34 (10) of the Mental Health Act, the Governor in Council

ordered that proceedings be continued against Mrs Lamb and she was subsequently tried in the Supreme Court at Brisbane.

On 29 May 1978, the jury found that Mrs Lamb was not guilty on the grounds of unsoundness of mind, and the Supreme Court judge ordered that she be kept in strict custody at the Women's Prison, Brisbane, until Her Majesty's pleasure be known.

Mrs. Lamb continued to be under the care of psychiatrists while in the Brisbane Prison, and regular reports on her condition were made in accordance with the Mental Health Act.

Mrs Lamb's progress was such that a further independent psychiatrist examined Mrs Lamb and, as a result of that examination, the advice from the treating psychiatrist and the advice of the Comptroller-General of Prisons, both the Minister for Health and the Minister for Welfare made recommendations to the Governor in Council that Mrs Lamb be released on parole subject to certain conditions.

Mrs Lamb's condition was one which, although uncommon, is a classic psychiatric disorder susceptible to treatment, and is one of those conditions where what might be termed radical cure is possible. The facts in this case have followed the classic clinical picture and advice to the Governor in Council indicates that Mrs Lamb has recovered.

Mrs Lamb, however, will remain under psychiatric care and reports will be submitted to the Governor in Council during the period of her parole.

SURVEYING PROFESSION

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove—Minister for Survey and Valuation) (12.23 p.m.): As members of the House know, some officers of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and senior members of the surveying profession have recently been vilified in an anonymous article in the magazine "Metes and Bounds" and in a series of anonymous letters. I do not propose to comment further on that rubbish. Writs have been issued and the Supreme Court will deal with them in due course.

What I wish to do this morning is reassure the House that the reforms and enormous changes that have occurred in the practice of surveying during the last eight years have been changes for the better. If the current campaign of denigration continues, as it may well do in an election year, there are a few facts which honourable members should have available to them if they are asked about these matters.

The first is that the Queensland Government was one of the first Governments in Australia to recognise that modern surveying technology could not be catered for by an Act and Regulations based on 19th Century

thinking. The Land Surveyors Act of 1908 and its regulations were in need of review. In 1971, the Government set up a committee of inquiry under the chairmanship of a member of the Public Service Board, Mr Pat Bredhauer, to recommend reform. The resulting report was considered by all relevant State Government departments. Their comments were completed by January 1976. The Surveyors Act 1977 resulted from this work. Ultimately the new Surveyors Regulations were prepared.

Throughout this process of reform the Government has had the complete support of the surveying profession. That profession has for over 100 years been represented by the Institution of Surveyors. About 90 per cent of all registered and licensed surveyors belong to that institution. The institution includes within its ranks both employers and employees, private sector, Commonwealth and State Government and local authority surveyors. Its views are recognised as the authoritative voice of the profession. In addition, the Association of Consulting Surveyors supported the reforms. That body is the private enterprise sector of the profession. All its members are obliged to belong to the institution.

The reforms in Queensland have been of great interest to other parts of Australia. South Australia moved along the same path independently but New South Wales and Victoria have made changes in the same direction as Queensland. Only a fortnight ago our department was visited by the Western Australian Surveyor-General and the Western Australian Minister. The pioneering work of our Surveyor-General, Mr J. M. Serisier, has been recognised throughout Australia. This year he was elected Federal president of the Institution of Surveyors.

It is said that action causes reaction. In 1973 a group of 20 or so surveyors, who found themselves out of step with the rest of the profession, formed a group which they called the Society of Registered Surveyors. To members of the public their title seems respectable enough. What honourable members should remember is that they are a tiny dissident body whose membership is by invitation only and whose views have become increasingly hostile to any form of change. They have become almost obsessional in their attacks on the department, its officers and the institution. The latest edition of their journal "Metes and Bounds" is the last straw as far as I am concerned. I know that at least one of their members has resigned as a result of it. From now on I propose to regard SORS as a disreputable organisation.

However, in the difficult situation which these anonymous letters have created, it is good to know that the department has the support of the responsible profession. I will table, if I may, two letters, one from the Association of Consulting Surveyors and one

from the Queensland division of the institution. The letter from the institution is quite short.

It reads—

“Dear Mr Greenwood,

“This Division represents some 90% of all registered and licensed surveyors resident in Queensland. Membership is voluntary and the Divisional Committee is elected annually by ballot of all members. The current Committee is representative of all significant sectors of the profession.

“On behalf of Members of the current Divisional Committee I wish to record our disgust at the anonymous campaign being conducted against yourself, senior officers of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and other distinguished members of this profession.

“In our view the allegations which have been made have no substance, and because of the manner of their airing are not worthy of dignifying with a public response.

“Whilst the Institution is and wishes to remain non-political, I am empowered by my Committee to inform you that they have utmost confidence in

The Surveyors Act and Regulations

Your Administration of this Act

The Surveyors Board,

The Department of Mapping and Surveying and its senior officers.

“As President, I share these views and add the comment that I believe the current organisation of surveying in Queensland is second to none in Australia, and carries public benefits which are the envy of all other States.

“Yours sincerely,

“G. R. Ledlie,

President.”

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the letters referred to.

MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT CAMPAIGN AGAINST UNREGISTERED VEHICLES

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police) (12.29 p.m.): I read with grave concern a week-end Press report headed, “Russ cools it on rego blitz.” As honourable members would be aware, the report claims that the State Government will do nothing to rid the road of unregistered vehicles until after the State election. This report is completely without foundation. I state that there has been no direction to me to slow down a campaign by the Main Roads Department against unregistered vehicles. There has been no approach to me from the unnamed “men at the top” quoted in the report.

The facts are that late last month I announced that the Main Roads Department was to begin a Statewide check on unregistered vehicles. Cabinet recently approved the secondment of eight additional police officers to the Main Roads Department registration branch to boost its strength to 14 officers. The 14 officers this week will complete a familiarisation course in Brisbane and some will then be transferred to provincial areas. During the course the officers have participated in enforcement and detection drives in Brisbane and surrounding areas including the Gold Coast.

There are presently 3 300 reports of unregistered vehicles being investigated. During 1979, 22 283 reports of possible breaches of the regulations were received. Of these, about 60 per cent were received from the then Main Roads Department police attachment of six officers. During 1979, 6 444 summons were issued, and during the last financial year a total of \$464,525 was returned to the department from fines and fees.

Currently, 300 cases are processed through the Brisbane Magistrates Court every second week. On the Gold Coast, 26 people appeared charged with a total of 30 offences before the Southport Magistrates Court on 15 August. A further 30 charges will be heard in that court on Friday, 29 August.

The State Government views the matter of unregistered vehicles as serious from both the personal and public points of view. We are seeking to protect people from the very considerable personal and financial risks of driving in an unregistered vehicle which could be involved in an accident and also to recover for our road building funds substantial outstanding fees. Both aims are for the benefit of the vast majority of honest and responsible vehicle owners.

Unregistered vehicles involved in an accident are not covered by compulsory third party insurance. The owner of such a vehicle could be liable for a huge amount of damages, which could prove financially disastrous. The Main Roads Department believes that a potential 83 000 vehicles—or more than 6 per cent of the State total of some 1.6 million—currently are unregistered and could be using the State’s roads. This could represent a loss of income of up to \$5m annually to the department—not the \$8m quoted in the Press article.

Cabinet simply has authorised a much-needed and long-overdue increase in the patrolling force of the Main Roads Department registration section following a huge increase in the number of unregistered vehicles using the State’s roads.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Thirty-third Report of the Public Accountants Registration Board of Queensland.

Interim Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Efficiency and Administration of Hospitals.

Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Queensland Museum for the year ended 31 December 1979.

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 1971–1979.

Prince Charles Hospital Development Centre Trust Act 1980.

Hospitals Act Amendment Act 1980.

Health Act Amendment Act 1980.

Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act Amendment Act 1980.

Nursing Act 1976–1979.

Nursing Studies Act 1976–1978.

Forestry Act 1959–1979.

Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts Amendment Act 1980.

Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915.

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.

Public Service Act 1922–1978.

Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977–1978.

Explosives Act 1952–1978.

Mines Regulation Act 1964–1979.

Electricity Act 1976–1980.

Forestry Act 1959–1979.

Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act 1944–1978.

Barrier Fences Act 1954–1978.

River Improvement Trust Act 1940–1977.

Irrigation Act 1922–1979.

Water Act 1926–1979.

Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act 1958–1979.

Metropolitan Transit Authority Act 1976–1979 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923–1979.

Industrial Development Act 1963–1979.

State Housing Act 1945–1979.

Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976. Collections Act 1966–1977.

Co-operative and Other Societies Act 1967–1978.

Supreme Court Act 1921–1979.

Harbours Act 1955–1980.

Land Act 1961–1978.

Forestry Act 1959–1979 and the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975–1976.

Queensland Film Industry Development Act 1977–1979.

Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959–1980.

Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959–1980 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923–1979.

City of Brisbane Market Act 1960–1978 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923–1979.

Dairy Produce Act 1978–1979.

Milk Supply Act 1977–1978.

Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923–1979.

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926–1979.

Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act 1962–1972.

Soil Conservation Act 1965–1980 and the Co-ordination of Rural Advances and Agricultural Bank Act 1938–1980.

Sugar Experiment Stations Act 1900–1976.

Regulations under—

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971–1979.

Public Service Act 1922–1978.

Prisons Act 1958–1974.

Explosives Act 1952–1978.

Health Act 1937–1979.

Health Act 1937–1980.

Hospitals Act 1936–1980.

Nursing Studies Act 1976–1978.

Medical Act 1939–1980.

State Transport Regulations, 1961.

Traffic Regulations, 1962.

Architects Act 1962–1971.

Bail Act 1980.

Crown Proceedings Act 1980.

Elections Act 1915–1976.

Queensland Marine Act 1958–1979.

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966–1978.

Agricultural Standards Act 1952–1972.

Dairy Produce Act 1978–1979.

Fruit Marketing Organisation Act 1923–1980.

Hen Quotas Act 1973–1978.

Meat Industry Act 1965–1977.

Milk Supply Act 1977–1978.

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926–1979.

Stock Act 1915–1979.

Wheat Pool Act 1920–1979.

By-laws under—

Nursing Act 1976-1979.

By-law No. 1 of the Loder Creek Drainage Board in accordance with the provisions of section 36 (1) of Part III of the Schedule to the Water Act 1926-1979.

By-law No. 2 of the Silkwood Drainage Board in accordance with the provisions of section 36 (1) of Part III of the Schedule to the Water Act 1926-1979.

Resolutions of the 9th Meeting of the Australian Fisheries Council.

Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account as at 29 February 1980 of The Union-Fidelity Trustee Company of Australia Limited.

RINGING OF BELLS FOR DIVISIONS AND QUORUMS

SESSIONAL ORDER

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

“That during 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: Provided that, for consequent divisions or after the first division in Committee on the clauses of a Bill, the Chair may order the bells to be rung for two minutes only.”

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SESSIONAL ORDER

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.”

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (12.47 p.m.), by leave: Earlier this morning, in a ministerial statement, the Premier referred to the disastrous situation that has arisen in Central Queensland over the issue of taxation on subsidised housing

and mentioned that he was speaking for and on behalf of the people of Queensland. As a positive measure in the House this morning, I should like to give the Opposition's support to the proposal that the subsidised housing tax on Queensland miners be scrubbed. The Opposition is very concerned that, if the situation is not resolved successfully, great hardship will be created for many other workers in many different fields within the State.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is supposed to be making a personal explanation, not an explanation collectively for the Opposition.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CASEY: I would add that most of these things are tied up with industrial agreements.

Mr GYGAR: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to Standing Order 110, which states—

“By the indulgence of the House a Member may explain matters of a personal nature, although there is no Question before the House;”

I submit that the matter that the honourable gentleman seeks to raise is not of a personal nature and that therefore he should not proceed with this matter as if it were a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I take the honourable member's point of order. I inform the Leader of the Opposition that his explanation must be of a personal nature or he cannot proceed.

Mr CASEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I accept your ruling.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

CENTRAL QUEENSLAND COALFIELDS TAXATION DISPUTE

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave of the House to move—

“That so much of Standing Orders as is necessary be suspended to allow debate to ensue on a motion by me—

‘That this Parliament condemns the Federal Government for its betrayal of the Central Queensland miners over the subsidised housing taxation dispute and the consequential losses to the Queensland economy that their actions have caused.

Furthermore, it calls on the Federal Government to immediately cease any further action on this issue and any consequential action of a similar nature on persons engaged in other industries in remote areas.’”

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 21

Blake
Burns
Casey
D'Arcy
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Hansen
Hooper, K. J.
Jones
Kruger
Mackenroth
Milliner
Prest

Scott
Underwood
Vaughan
Warburton
Wilson
Wright

Tellers:

Davis
Shaw

NOES, 53

Ahern
Akers
Armstrong
Bertoni
Bird
Bishop
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Bourke
Edwards
Elliott
Frawley
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Greenwood
Gunn
Gygar
Hewitt, N. T. E.
Hewitt, W. D.
Hinze
Hooper, M. D.
Innes
Katter
Kaus
Kippin
Knox
Kyburz

Lane
Lee
Lester
Lickiss
Lockwood
McKechnie
Miller
Moore
Newbery
Porter
Powell
Row
Scassola
Scott-Young
Simpson
Stephan
Sullivan
Tenni
Tomkins
Warner
Wharton
White, P. N. D.
White, T. A.

Tellers:

Neal
Turner

Resolved in the negative.

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

SITTING DAYS

SESSIONAL ORDER

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.”

Motion agreed to.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

SESSIONAL ORDER

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, on each sitting Wednesday a period shall be

allotted until 1 o'clock p.m. for discussion of matters of public interest on which any member may address the House for ten minutes. If the discussion is still proceeding at 1 o'clock p.m., it shall be terminated by Mr Speaker.”

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PIN-BALL MACHINES

Mr CASEY: Unfortunately it appears that Ministers have not been told that question-time is still on. Perhaps the Premier might arrive on the scene, but meanwhile I will ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer a question because he appears to show some interest in this matter. I draw his attention to yesterday's report in the “Telegraph” newspaper headlined “Hooked up on pin-ball—they stole to pay”, which outlines the tragic case of five Brisbane children who stole \$12,000 in three weeks to feed their gambling habits on pin-ball machines.

I ask: How does the Deputy Premier and Treasurer reconcile the inconsistency of his attitude of condonement of this unregulated form of imported gambling for schoolchildren in dingy fun parlors, with most of the profits going to foreign gambling interests, with his blind rejection of the right of adult Queenslanders to even decide if they want Australian-made poker machines in their club premises under strict Government guide-lines and the further supervision of respectable club managements, with most of the profits being used locally to provide more jobs for our young unemployed and better sporting facilities which will keep them out of fun parlors and prevent them stealing?

Dr EDWARDS: The only positive contribution the Leader of the Opposition has made as far as policy is concerned is in his claim that the introduction of poker machines into Queensland would solve the unemployment problem. On the one hand the Leader of the Opposition talks about the benefit to the family yet on the other he talks about the implementation of a policy which would, in the words of Mr Dunstan, the former Labor Premier of South Australia, do more to cause the disintegration of the family than anything else. So the Leader of the Opposition is totally inconsistent in his views. When he is consistent in his attitude towards these matters, then and only then will he be in a position to ask such questions.

As to the pin-ball machine situation—the Government is aware of some of the problems associated with pin-ball machines and has introduced some legislation and regulations to control them as best we can at this stage. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Government will continue to survey this problem, and if it continues then further regulations will be introduced.

CENTRAL QUEENSLAND COALFIELDS
TAXATION DISPUTE

Mr CASEY: As the Premier has still not arrived, I direct a further question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. I refer to the continuing mining tax dispute, the inability of the Queensland Government to influence its Liberal-National counterpart in Canberra which it has applauded so often and its tragic indifference towards the tremendous economic loss the dispute is causing Australia, Queensland and our international export trade.

I ask: What assurances does the Queensland Government have that the Canberra tax attack now being mounted against miners in Central Queensland will not be extended to public servants, police, nurses, teachers, railwaymen and thousands of others, including station hands, permanent farm hands and share-farmers who rightfully receive housing assistance in country areas as the barest compensation for the comforts they unselfishly forgo to fill basic employment needs in this State?

Dr EDWARDS: Not only has the Leader of the Opposition not understood, but obviously he has not even read or listened to what this Government has been doing over the last seven weeks. The Government of Queensland, through the Premier, myself and various Ministers, has made its position perfectly clear. We believe quite categorically that the Federal Government has not handled this position in the best way possible at all. In fact, we have been quite outspoken in our condemnation of this particular attitude of the Federal Government.

The Queensland Government's position is perfectly clear. We believe quite clearly that there should be a basis on which the taxation can be assessed. But we also believe very clearly that people who live in such areas should have zone allowances and locality allowances discounted so that they are not discriminated against in the taxation field. If the members of the Labor Opposition had assisted us, perhaps we might have been able to let the people of Queensland know that Labor members at least have some sensible thoughts in their heads. They have shown no sense whatsoever in the past.

The Premier and I have been in touch daily with the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer. We have been in touch with union officers. In fact, we have discussed continuously with union members and leaders the problem as we see it and also the way in which we can assist. We make no apology for saying that we are ashamed of the way in which this matter has been handled. The Federal Government must be condemned and we face up to the responsibility of condemning it. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we do not shed that responsibility.

HEALTH SERVICES EXPENDITURE

Mr WRIGHT: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware that, according to the Commonwealth Grants Commission report on social services spending for 1978-79, the Queensland Government is spending around 27 per cent less than the average of the other five States on health services? As this means that under existing arrangements Queensland is not getting a fair share of Commonwealth health expenditure, what steps has he taken to have his Liberal colleagues in Canberra provide Queensland with a more equitable share of this expenditure and also to increase the State's spending in this area to meet the health needs of Queensland?

Dr EDWARDS: I am not aware of the specific arrangement to which the honourable member referred, but I will certainly have it examined.

Mr D'Arcy interjected.

Dr EDWARDS: The honourable member for Woodridge can laugh as much as he likes.

I do not have those figures in my possession at this time. I am sure the member for Rockhampton will understand that. I will give him a detailed statement on that aspect tomorrow.

I would like to comment on the aspect of health spending in Queensland, to which the honourable member refers. It is indeed a fact that this State's expenditure on health has been less than that in other States of Australia. There are a number of reasons for this. We do not have a system under which consultants are paid on a fee-for-service basis, which increases enormously the cost of hospitalisation. We do not have the expensive hospitalisation programs of other States. Over a long period we have become efficient in the operation of hospitals, through a central accounting bureau and centralisation of hospital-supply purchases.

Mr Fouras: Absolute nonsense.

Dr EDWARDS: The member for South Brisbane would not know too much about hospitals. I do not think it is even worth while listening to his interjection.

As to the community health program facet of health expenditure—Queensland has matched the programs in this field but has not expended the additional costs incurred in most other States. However, I will give the honourable member further details as soon as I can have an answer prepared for him.

APPOINTMENT OF MR R. E. CAMM AS
CHAIRMAN OF THE SUGAR BOARD

Mr D'ARCY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: As the general public is having a great deal of difficulty following the policy of the Liberal Party on "jobs for the

boys", could he inform the House how many Liberal Ministers signed the proclamation for Mr Camm's appointment to the Sugar Board?

Dr EDWARDS: I make it perfectly clear that when a decision is made by Cabinet the Ministers attending the Cabinet meeting sign that document.

LEAKING OF BUDGET DETAILS

Mr LANE: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the police investigation that has been instigated by the Federal Government into the leaking of details of the 1980 Federal Budget papers and I ask: Is he satisfied that security arrangements with regard to the Queensland Budget documents are adequate enough to maintain the traditional confidentiality of such papers?

Dr EDWARDS: I should like to say how regrettable this incident is. I think that every thinking Australian would agree with me, including members of the Opposition—although at times one wonders whether they think at all. What has happened on the Federal scene has created a very deplorable and irresponsible situation for the Government and, indeed, the Public Service. It is a very regrettable state of affairs.

The Queensland Public Service has a long and fine record of loyalty to Governments. I place on record my deep appreciation for their confidentiality and loyalty. We have not had any difficulties such as those being experienced on the Federal scene. The Public Service in this State has a tradition equal to that of any similar service anywhere else in the world. Our public servants act with integrity, honesty, loyalty and neutrality. I believe that that situation will continue and I look forward to continuing confidentiality in regard to not only Budget documents but also all other documents that come into the hands of public servants in this State in whom I have the greatest confidence.

PROTECTION OF PREMIER'S PROPERTY UNDER PROVISIONS OF MINING ACT

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Mines and Energy, I refer to the draft proclamation that I tabled in this Parliament last session which, if allowed to proceed, would have exempted the Bjelke-Petersen land in the Kingaroy area from the application of the Mining Act. As this Parliament was never advised by the then Minister for Mines, Energy and Police (Mr Camm) as to which officer in the Mines Department received and subsequently processed the request for such a proclamation, or that that proclamation be drafted, and who issued the instruction to the Mines Department officer, will he clear the air and eliminate the secrecy surrounding the events leading up to the tabling of the draft

proclamation and provide answers to the unanswered questions to which I have referred?

Mr SULLIVAN: The honourable member amazes me. I sat here alongside the then Minister for Mines and Energy when these questions were asked and answered. It is not my intention to rake over the coals again. The answer to the question is "No".

"BUY QUEENSLAND MADE" CAMPAIGN

Mr FRAWLEY: I ask the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services: In view of claims by some members of the Opposition that the suit worn by him in his television advertisement for the "Buy Queensland Made" campaign was actually made in Hong Kong, with a Freedman label sewn on the inside of the coat, can he inform the House whether those claims are correct?

Mr K. J. Hooper: I was there when he had it made.

Mr LEE: Like the member for Archerfield, I visited Hong Kong, and I had a suit made there by the gentleman he recommended. It lasted about three months, and I immediately realised there was no truer saying than "We make it great in the Sunshine State"—referring, of course, to Queensland. There is no better place to have a suit made than Freedmans in the Valley, Brisbane, Queensland. That is where my suits are made.

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

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.

SUPPLY

VOTE OF CREDIT—\$1,405,000,000

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 1981—

"From the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland (exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account), the further sum of \$650,000,000;

"From the Trust and Special Funds, the further sum of \$675,000,000; and

"From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account, the further sum of \$80,000,000."

COMMITTEE

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

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (3.20 p.m.): I move—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1980-81, a further sum not exceeding \$1,405 million towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State."

In the last Appropriation Act, passed by the House in December of last year, Supply for 1980-81 to the extent of \$770m was granted—\$350m for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$370m for the Trust and Special Funds and \$50m for the Loan Fund.

The purpose of the Bill now before the Committee is to provide a further sum of \$1,405m, of which \$650m is required for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$675m for the Trust and Special Funds and \$80m for the Loan Fund.

The total supply which will now be available for 1980-81, pending the approval of the Budget for that year, is \$2,175m—\$1,000m for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$1,045m for the Trust and Special Funds and \$130m for the Loan Fund. In total, this represents an increase of \$290m on the 1979-80 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.

As you are aware, Mr Hewitt, it has been traditional for the Treasurer of the day, in presenting this Bill, to take the opportunity to comment on the financial or economic position of the State or other important matters of interest to the community.

We have recently entered a new decade. The commencement of the new decade marks the start of an exciting new era in which our development prospects will intensify from now on. This new era holds much promise for us. We have the potential to be one of the most important energy exporters in the world. However, we will certainly not achieve this position if we cannot establish a genuine and lasting reputation as a reliable supplier.

The health of our basic economy is fundamental to our successful progress through the years ahead. So are our attitudes to work. Many in the community want to be paid more to work less and have greater leisure. There is no doubt that, over the years, our standard of living will be able

to increase to higher and higher levels. However, if we demand those higher standards before they have been really earned, then all we will do is endanger our future rather than enrich it. These are important issues and I will touch on all of them.

We have a strong and diverse economic base from which to launch forward into the eighties. Our primary industries of wool, beef, sugar and grains are doing well. The gross value of rural production in Queensland for the financial year just closed has been estimated at \$2.466 billion. This represents an increase of approximately 11.7 per cent over the result for 1978-79. The beef industry faces a favourable outlook in the short term. The outlook for wool remains bright, especially with the minimum floor price increase. Sugar growers and millers can look forward to a much brighter season in 1980.

Our manufacturing industry sector has grown quickly in recent years and is now as large as our old-established primary industry sector. The estimated value added in Queensland manufacturing production in 1979-80 is \$2.6 billion. Conditions are generally good in a wide range of activities—mineral-processing, foundries, steel fabrication and general engineering.

Confidence has been particularly strong in the building industry. High levels of activity have been reported on the Gold and Sunshine Coasts, and in the Gladstone and Cairns areas. During 1979-80, dwelling commencements were consistently high at levels approaching those of the boom in 1973-74.

For the first 11 months of 1979-80, new motor vehicle registrations in Queensland increased by 5.27 per cent compared with an Australia-wide decline of 2.02 per cent.

Retail sales in Queensland for the March 1980 quarter were 14.3 per cent higher than for the corresponding quarter of the previous year. The figure for Australia was 12.5 per cent. Our basic economy therefore is very sound. To be able to maintain this performance through our development policies is a real achievement indeed. It has been done despite the inability of the Commonwealth to correct the fundamentals of the economy.

Inflation and unemployment have proven to be particularly intractable. The Consumer Price Index rose by 10.2 per cent in 1979-80. Unemployment remains unacceptably high and, unfortunately, there is a high level of youth unemployment. As a State Government we have, unfortunately, very little direct control over the general course of the economy. While we do agree that the continued control of inflation must be a policy of paramount importance, we do disagree with the Commonwealth that there must be a relentlessly rigid adherence to restricted State loan works programs. We believe that special injections of capital in loan works programs is the most suitable way of providing stimuli to the economy

that will result in job creation. A major element of the Government's economic policy in recent years has therefore been the diversion of as much funds as possible into special employment intensive capital projects. In 1979-80 it was possible to provide in the Budget \$98.3m for this purpose. Since 1976-77 some \$275.1m 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 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.

Although there are still difficulties, our economy is nevertheless basically sound. The prospects of our existing industries are good. Our economic base is now spread between primary industries and various secondary industries. Generally it can be said that we are no longer a one crop economy depending on the exigencies of the weather or whatever.

Our wide range of important industries now means that even if there are set-backs in one or two from time to time Queensland can be carried forward by the others and still maintain a strong rate of growth. As far ahead as I can see Queensland's economy, and thus the improvement in our living standards, will be ahead of the rest of Australia. When the Australian economy as a whole moves off again then we will move faster and further. If it continues to mark time then we will mark time faster, and if it recedes a little Queensland will be last to move down and will not move down so far. Our international creditability is excellent. International financial houses want to do business with us, and are cutting their rates to outbid each other for this business. Not only are the prospects of our existing industries good, those of our future industries are very exciting indeed—better than at any time in our history.

As oil, our major source of energy, has become increasingly expensive and scarce, there has been a move towards oil fuel alternatives, and this must accelerate. In this Queensland can achieve a position of advantage. Firstly, there will be a continuing switch to the use of coal for heating and steam raising around the world, and our vast steaming coal reserves will be at a premium.

Australia's total technically and economically recoverable reserves of coal are about 32.8 billion tonnes. Queensland has a large share of these reserves. There are about 19 important deposits of non-coking coal in Queensland. The world coal study has

estimated that Australia might be exporting up to 75 million tonnes of steaming coal by the year 2000. The figure could be even higher. Granted that Australian steaming coal reserves are split between Queensland and New South Wales, Queensland will obviously be in a position to provide a significant part of the new trade. The higher level of exports would consist almost entirely of new demand. Even at the level of 75 million tonnes the task is very significant. It will involve new mines, new towns, new railways and new ports.

There are also important additional effects apart from the direct effect of an increase in the demand for steaming coals. The current and prospective energy scene has had far-reaching effects on the existing and expected costs of electrical generation in many overseas countries dependent on imports for their sources of energy and which are already tied to oil as a fuel in electrical generation. In very quick time countries such as Australia have been recognised as having optimal potential to sustain in the long term relatively low energy charges for energy-intensive industrial processes.

The aluminium industry has now become an exciting new growth element in our development. In the short space of about 18 months there have been definite decisions to build two smelters involving a total of seven pot lines in Queensland. This will create a new demand for electricity totalling 1 320 MW. In addition, considerable interest has been shown in the establishment of further new aluminium smelters in Queensland in the mid to late 1980s.

This State has vast reserves of oil-shale up the eastern coast and also inland. Optimum development of the Rundle deposit, for example, will involve mining 300 to 500 million tonnes of shale per annum. Production of heavy crude oil could be up to 200 000 barrels a day. A project such as this could supply the base for well over a third of Australia's oil requirements if it is proved to be totally feasible in the scaled-up actual operating situation. The real significance, however, is that if the Rundle experiment proves technically feasible, it is but one of many such very large shale deposits in Queensland. Our potential as a supplier of crude oil in this form is therefore tremendous.

Apart from those projects, we are likely to see a caustic soda-chloride chemical complex, a coke-making plant and perhaps an oil-from-coal plant. The investment in all these projects would amount to about \$12 billion. Total investment in large development projects Australia-wide has been estimated at over \$50 billion in the '80s.

Careful management will be required to ensure that we have available the skilled labour and resources to do the job. Care will also be needed to ensure that the economy does not become over-heated at critical times.

Provided that aspect can be kept under control, the future holds great promise for substantially increased living standards for all Queenslanders. However, the realisation of these higher standards depends to a very large extent on our being able to continue to be a reliable supplier to the rest of the world.

The current dispute on the Central Queensland coalfields is a typical example of where a more prosperous future for all Queenslanders can be seriously threatened. This dispute has been entrenched for far too long now. The cost so far has been enormous. The State itself will have forfeited of the order of \$34m by the end of the week and will continue to lose royalties, pay-roll tax and rail return at the rate of \$4.3m per week.

Employees lost wages must be close to about \$10m now and the loss in coal sales would be well over \$100m. The Commonwealth has lost tremendous sums in tax and levies. Perhaps most important is the loss of our international reputation as a reliable supplier under firm contracts. There will also be other costs for other members of the community who are related to the industry.

This Government has just about run out of patience on the issue. It cannot remain unresolved much longer in view of the damage that is being caused to our otherwise very favourable future prospects. The parties must resolve this dispute shortly.

The future of Queensland is bright. This Bill and the Budget to come will continue to provide a basis for continuing development and progress in this State.

I commend the motion to honourable members.

Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

Resolution reported, received, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

COMMITTEE

VOICE OF CREDIT—\$1,405,000,000

Mr Gunn (Somerset) 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 1980-81, a further sum not exceeding \$650,000,000 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 1980-81, a further sum not exceeding \$650,000,000 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 1980-81, a further sum not exceeding \$80,000,000 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)

FIRST READING

A Bill, founded on the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced and read a first time.

SECOND READING

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

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

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (3.40 p.m.): I elected to speak in the second reading of this Bill because I believe that we need to canvass, as the Treasurer has done, many aspects of the financial administration of this State in the last financial year. In introducing the Bill before the Assembly the Treasurer has now presented somewhat of a glowing picture of Queensland's financial administration. I also note that he again made a plea, if I might use the word “plea”, for greater Commonwealth assistance.

Members will recall that in the Treasurer's introduction of the second Appropriation Bill for 1979-80 in December last year he made some rather critical observations about Queensland's being greatly disadvantaged in comparison with other States in the tax-sharing arrangements with the Commonwealth Government. He went on to elaborate on the reasons for that undesirable position. He cited the financial assistance grant formula and pointed out that the distribution to Queensland had been significantly eroded under that formula because of population under-estimation—an under-estimation that he stated was almost 4 per cent between the years 1970 and 1977. He went on to put this in hard cash terms—I use his own calculations again—when he told this Assembly that it meant a loss to Queensland of almost \$40m, not in the seven-year period but in the previous two financial years alone.

He summed up his feelings about the Commonwealth's attitude to this State by saying that it was a matter of continuing regret. I say to the Treasurer that that would have to be an understatement—possibly the understatement of the year—because in February of this year his own department, the Queensland Treasury, prepared a 143-page submission which went to the Commonwealth Grants Commission advocating a review of State relationships. In the last few days I took the time to read that thoroughly. Those members who have considered it would appreciate

that it is a detailed, in-depth, well-prepared and certainly well-considered document. The truth of the submission, however, is that it is not so much an outline of the different methodology of establishing these grants as an attack on the very foundations of the existing Commonwealth-State financial relationships. It did not say as much; but, reading between the lines, that is certainly what it was, for it challenged the Federal Government's interpretation, firstly, of the States (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act of 1976 and left no doubt that Queensland was receiving a raw deal, backing up the statement that the Treasurer made in December last year—a raw deal, irrespective of the party political persuasion of the Government in power.

The attitude adopted by the Treasury officials who drafted the submission was somewhat different, however, from the expression of concern made in this Assembly when the Treasurer said that it was a matter of continuing regret. In sharp contrast, it was critical of even the time given to this and other States to prepare that submission; it was critical of the methodology adopted by the Fraser Government in conducting the review of State relativities; it was critical of the very terms of reference for such a review; and it made it patently clear that Queensland's broad and specific disabilities in terms of population dispersal, social position, environmental and climatic conditions and revenue capacity were not given due consideration and proper weight by the commission.

One of the more startling statistical revelations made in the submission was that Queensland has the lowest household income per head of mean population of all the States. This again is in great contrast to a statement made only a few moments ago about improved living standards in this State. It also pointed out that Queensland has the lowest level of savings per capita. The submission went on to reveal in relation to companies that, although Queensland has approximately 15.5 per cent of the total population of this nation, it generates a substantially lower percentage of manufactured value added—in fact, only 10.4 per cent. Even if we consider the tremendous mining development taking place in this State and if we add mining value added—and this is taken into account—then Queensland's total value added was lower than the population of 12.9 per cent. If we compare this with other States—and after all, that is what political parties and Governments tend to do: make comparisons of their progress and their abilities and their capacities in line with other States—we see that, even if we add the mining and manufacturing industries together, Queensland's total per capita value added in comparison with New South Wales was only 81.9 per cent. In terms of Victoria it was 71.8 per cent; in terms of Western Australia, it was 80.1 per cent. Even in relation to Tasmania, such a small State, it was 89.1 per

cent. The only State that had a lower figure—and then only slightly lower—was South Australia.

While these comparisons should be recognised by the Commonwealth Government in distributing revenue—and that is no doubt the reason why Treasury officials went to such great pains in presenting these facts—and while it ought to be impressed upon the Commonwealth Government that these factors have to be taken into consideration, they also raise and stress some serious questions about the claims that have been made by members of this Government as to how well off Queenslanders are under this present State administration.

One often hears Government members in this Chamber present a picture that Queenslanders are almost on a financial Easy Street; yet facts provided by their own Government show that Queenslanders have the lowest household income in the nation. With all the puffing and blowing about development under this Government, it might come as a shock to members of this Assembly and to supporters of the Government to hear that, on a per capita value-added basis, Queensland's mining and manufacturing industries rate even lower than those of the smallest State in the Commonwealth.

Dr Edwards: It is a very interesting fact, also, that Queensland has the highest number of pensioners.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes, I accept that. I also realise that there are problems because of the State's social make-up and its 2 per cent of Aborigines. However, the facts should not be cast aside and it should be acknowledged that Queensland has that difficulty, particularly in view of the laudatory comments that are constantly made about how wonderful life is in Queensland.

I am not knocking Queensland; it is a great State, and I will continually stress that. But the fact is that for almost a decade, and especially for the last five years under the Fraser Commonwealth Government, Queensland has been sold out financially by Canberra. One would have thought that because of the depth of this submission—and it was an excellent one—and because of the party-political persuasion of the Government in charge of this State, because of the co-ordination one often hears about in the politicking and campaigning, the Federal Government, when it amended the States (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act last year, would have given special consideration to Queensland in particular. But that has not happened. Instead of introducing an amendment taking into account the ideas put forward by this Treasury group and the submission that detailed the disadvantages of Queensland, instead of giving any cognisance to it, Mr Howard made only one real promise, which was that the State's tax-sharing entitlement for 1980-81 would be at least as much in real terms as for 1979-80. In his usual generous way, which I think has been typified by the offers

he has made to the Central Queensland miners, Mr Howard made it clear that that promise—let us call it a guarantee—could be given for only one year. It is rather strange, Mr Speaker, that it happens to be for 1980, a year in which an election is to be held.

All the signs are there. Despite the pleas of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, despite the pleas of the Premier, despite the pleas of their counterparts in Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, in the future—not just now, not just in the last agreement, not just in the amendments that were made in April this year, not just at the Premier's Conference held in June this year, but in the future—there will be less and less money coming from the Commonwealth unless something drastic happens, such as a change of Government. All the signs are there that the future financial lot of the States is a dismal one, and that means that all the disadvantages for Queensland can only increase.

I cast my mind back to 1975-76, when Mr Fraser took over in Canberra, and the debate that ensued throughout the Commonwealth in Public Service areas and in the Assemblies about Fraser's new Federalism. Honourable members will recall that it was hailed by the Government of this State when it was first mooted. It was hailed by the Premier; it was hailed by those on the Government side who had some sort of economic expertise, with one exception. The Treasurer of the day, Sir Gordon Chalk, was the only one who voiced reservations of any type. The Premier gave his personal endorsement of what the Fraser Government was doing, in spite of the warnings of Sir Gordon Chalk and in spite of the warnings of some senior Treasury officials and some senior members of the Opposition. Regardless of the treatment that has been meted out to the States, especially since 1975, regardless of the losses to Queensland amounting to tens of millions of dollars—the Treasurer said \$40m in just two years; so one can imagine what it has been over the 10-year period—and regardless of all the comments that have been made, there is still an acceptance by the Government of Queensland of this deal.

Dr Edwards: What could you do about it?

Mr WRIGHT: I want to talk about that, and that is the principal reason why I wished to speak on the second reading of this Bill.

I accept the Treasurer's point that an effort has been made by Treasury officials, and one cannot cast any blame there. I know that, in his capacity as Treasurer, the honourable gentleman has endeavoured to present a special case for Queensland. Although the Treasurer said that it was a matter for continuing regret, I think that was the only point on which he was correct. It certainly is continuing, and if something is not done in a political sense—unless Labor is returned to office in Canberra—it will continue at least to the stage where we see either a

drastic reduction in the quality and quantity of services rendered by the State or the introduction of dual taxation throughout the nation.

It will be the people of Queensland and others like the people of Western Australia—let us keep in mind that Sir Charles Court has already said that he intends to do something about it—who will suffer. Unless something is done to force the Commonwealth Government to provide the revenue to fill this vacuum, the State of Queensland faces a dismal future. The local authorities in this State will learn what it is like to suffer at the hands of this Government. There are more and more grounds for believing that that will be the result.

Politically, I do not often agree with the Mayor of Rockhampton, Alderman Rex Pilbeam. I certainly agree with some of his schemes for improving the city of Rockhampton. In yesterday's "Morning Bulletin", published in Rockhampton, Rex Pilbeam was reported as making certain comments concerning the latest local authority grants. I notice that his comments appeared in this morning's "Courier-Mail". I suggest that his comments will be echoed by every shire councillor, town councillor and city council leader and alderman throughout Queensland if the Fraser Government continues to treat the States as colonials in financial terms and if the local authorities are treated any longer with utter contempt.

Mr Pilbeam is not one to mince words. I know that at times he has made certain rough comments. On this occasion he has been reported as saying that the local authority allocations are "bonuses for bums". He pointed out that the grants are disgraceful, unrealistically low and unjust. He described them as nothing more than a hand-out. He summed them up as being totally irresponsible. I might point out that his words on this occasion stand in sharp contrast to the praise and adulation that he heaped on this Government, particularly the Premier, the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources, at the official opening last Saturday of the new traffic bridge. On that occasion he told the people of Rockhampton what a wonderful job the Queensland Government has been doing for the city of Rockhampton.

It should be noted that Rex Pilbeam is a member of the Liberal Party and one who served in this Chamber as a Liberal parliamentarian. I stress that because he expressed the opinion that Rockhampton's allocation is based on political motives. That is what he said; that comment is not mine.

Dr Edwards: You wouldn't agree with him, I hope?

Mr WRIGHT: I intend to establish a case and I hope that the Treasurer will try to answer it. It would seem that on this whole issue there is some smoke; and where there is smoke, there is fire.

Of a total of \$50.7 million provided by the Commonwealth for distribution by the State of Queensland to the local authorities, Rockhampton received \$785,000, or a mere 12 per cent more than it received in 1979. Admittedly, to someone who does not have that amount of money, that is a generous sum. However, let me make some comparisons.

The city of Ipswich received \$942,000, Toowoomba received \$874,000, Mt Isa received \$837,000 and Townsville received a massive \$1,440,000. It might be only a coincidence, but those cities are of political importance to the Government with an election brewing.

Dr Edwards: Did you hear what the Ipswich City Council said about it?

Mr WRIGHT: No, I didn't.

Dr Edwards: I will tell you later.

Mr WRIGHT: I would like to hear it.

Perhaps it is only a coincidence, but the two State seats in the city of Rockhampton are held by Labor members and even the Government is saying that it has no hope of winning those seats. Time and time again Ministers have risen in this Chamber and denied that any departmental allocations have been based on the political affiliation of the members representing the electorates in which the particular cities and towns are located. The member for Archerfield and other members of the Opposition have raised this matter on many occasions. It is patently obvious that Rex Pilbeam believes our allegations to be true. He does not accept ministerial comments to the effect that no type of political motive is involved.

Mr Pilbeam's belief seems to be confirmed by a comparison between the allocation given to other local authorities and that given to Gladstone, which also is held by a Labor member (Mr Prest). Gladstone received \$388,000, whereas the nearby Banana Shire, which just happens to lie in an electorate held by a National Party member, and a very small shire at that, received \$673,000. Furthermore, Miriam Vale, which also just happens to lie in a National-Party-held electorate, received \$486,000. Mt Morgan, which happens to be in a Labor electorate, received a paltry \$255,000. So, to answer the Treasurer's question, I do find myself in agreement with Mr Pilbeam on these issues.

Also, I have to raise the matter of where the blame lies. Mr Pilbeam says that the blame should be laid not at the feet of the Federal Government but at the feet of his own Liberal Leader and Treasurer, Dr Edwards. He says this because the Local Government Grants Commission distributes the allocations and it is the Grants Commission that is under the direct control of the Queensland Treasurer. So, heated up about this whole issue, he says that he will have to consider his future membership of the

Liberal Party. What an indictment not only of the general disbursements but also of the reasons why the disbursements were made!

Dr Edwards: Do you support the idea that political involvement should be part of the decision-making?

Mr WRIGHT: No. I do not think it should play any part at all. The decision should be based on needs and priorities. I am surprised that so much evidence is coming forward that decisions in this State are based on what seem to be political motives.

It is not an indictment from ALP or independent critics in a local government area but one from the Treasurer's own Liberal ranks. I suggest that it is a warning to every other local authority in this State about the way this Government is now administering Queensland and what they may expect in the future. Queensland is being administered with policies and financial allocations that are not based on the interests and needs of people but are made for straight political gain.

It is bad enough when special priority has been given to Government-held electorates. It is bad enough when Ministers can say publicly that they have a pre-school in every town in their electorates. This was said publicly the other day. It is bad enough when we see works programs in which the bulk of the money goes to Government areas for schools, pre-schools, bridges and roads; but now it seems it is happening also in the local government grants area.

Mr Pilbeam says that it is disgraceful. I agree. It is completely irresponsible and unjust. It is not unjust to the members of the ALP who represent those areas, because they can always say, "It is not our fault." But it is unjust to the people of Queensland who live in those areas.

It can only get worse, not because an election is brewing but because the State's revenue will be cut back continually by the Commonwealth Government. As priorities get tighter, the blatant political motives must become more obvious. I say to the people of Queensland that if the Liberals ever get control of the coalition it will be the end for any area outside the metropolitan region.

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: It is happening now. It will be Brisbane first, Brisbane second and Brisbane last. Every National Party member and supporter ought to keep that in mind. Irrespective of the claims made by the Treasurer as to how well off Queensland is under Liberal and National leadership, the fact is—and his own departmental submissions substantiate this—that under the Liberal-National Country Party coalition in Canberra Queenslanders are being disadvantaged. Under a National-Liberal Party State Government, so far as the local authorities are concerned, Queenslanders are being disadvantaged.

Whether we like it or not, under this Government we are tied to Fraser's new Federalism scheme. It is a scheme which Canberra has used as an excuse to force this and every other State to carry a disproportionate share of the burden of fiscal restraint.

The figures speak for themselves. Since 1975, when Fraser took power, total Government outlays have increased by 45 per cent; yet, in the same period, the financial assistance given to the States has risen by only 32 per cent. Year by year, the States have been forced to obtain an ever-increasing percentage of their capital funds in the form of semi-government authority borrowings rather than through the Federal Budget. This has meant borrowing at more than twice the usual interest rate. One estimate given to me last week is that this has added approximately \$250m to the interest bill owed by the States in the last four years. I would like it discounted. I would like to hear the Treasurer's side of it.

It is clear that, as they are forced to borrow under this new form of semi-government authority borrowing rather than obtain money through the Budget, they are forced to pay hard money. They are forced to service hard money loans. The quickest way to bring a business to its knees is to force it to service hard money loans. It seems that is what the Fraser Government is doing to the State of Queensland and, in turn, to the local authorities.

Dr Edwards interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I shall deal later with borrowings overseas.

Every now and again there is some political grandstanding by Ministers. Especially have we seen this from the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police when he has been complaining about the poor deal he is getting from the Federal Government. But, like the Treasurer, it seems that other Ministers are prepared to cop it, and it will not be too long before they have to cop stage 2 of the Federalism proposal and impose State income tax. The Treasurer shakes his head, but I say to him that he will not have much choice in the matter because he has to find the money from somewhere. As I said before, Western Australia has already indicated that it is prepared to do so, and if Mr Fraser and Mr Howard have their way Queensland will eventually follow suit; it will have no choice.

Queensland is under attack financially by the Commonwealth, just as is every other State. It seems to me that this Government has no defence; it is being attacked from every side. Not only is it being forced to accept the pre-1979 financial arrangements under the personal income tax scheme, but there is also a tightening-up of the matching arrangements for programs. The Commonwealth Government is forcing the States to commit more and more of their untied funds in order to qualify for the maximum amount

of Federal allocations. One can give many examples, such as the dental schemes. Prior to 1976 such schemes were totally Commonwealth funded, but now funds are provided on a 50/50 basis.

In the area of health planning agencies, finance was previously provided on the basis of \$2 for \$1, but they are now provided on a \$1 for \$1 basis. In the area of home-care services, funds were previously provided on a basis of two for one, but this has now been altered to a one for one basis. In the funding of senior citizen centres, funds were previously provided on a two for one basis, but again this has been altered to one for one.

In the area of transport planning and research, two-thirds of total spending was provided by the Commonwealth, but this has been altered to a half. In the housing area, prior to 1978-79 there were no matching arrangements, but in 1978-79 a base amount was provided with the rest again provided on a one for one basis.

The effect of these changes has been such that they tied up around \$170m of State funds in 1978-79. So it is no wonder that this Government is looking to other areas for financial return—for revenue. It is no wonder that State indirect taxes have skyrocketed. I did not have the time to go through all the departments, so I picked just one—the Fisheries Department. I thought it would be an interesting one because of the promises that have been made to help the fishing industry, which is a primary industry, and encourage people—

Dr Edwards: You wouldn't call it typical, would you?

Mr WRIGHT: I think it is typical. I was hoping the Minister for Justice would be here so we could also look at the increased cost of lodging legal documents and so on in the courts. The same thing has happened in this area, too. The cost of a master fisherman's licence has increased by 33-1/3 per cent since last year. The cost of registering a commercial fishing vessel up to 10 m in length has increased by 50 per cent; up to 15 m in length, 60 per cent; up to 20 m, 140 per cent; and 20 m in length, 100 per cent. The cost of a licence to conduct oystering operations has increased by 25 per cent. One could go on and on. Members will see that trend in every area, and those are just a few figures I was able to obtain very quickly from the Parliamentary Library. But one finds that indirect taxes are increasing, and this increase seems to be the only way this Government is able to fill the vacuum left by the change in Commonwealth financial arrangements.

It is also no wonder that local authorities are in such a desperate plight. I was speaking to a local authority leader at an airport in North Queensland the other day and he told me that he is being forced to borrow, even small amounts of up to \$20,000, at

12.6 per cent and the repayment period is only 10 years. This same situation is confronting many local authorities. In the final analysis it is the people who pay, and it is the people who suffer.

It is sometimes amazing what political leaders will say in an endeavour to present to the public, especially at election-time, that things are going well, that they have been successful in their efforts. I was very interested in the Premier's comments when he came back from the Premiers' Conference in June. "The Courier-Mail" ran a headline, "Joh comes home happy." I suggest to this Assembly that the Premier is either very easily pleased or he is playing the political cover-up. One has only to look at the allocations to see why. Whilst Queensland may have come off best of all the States—in fact, I believe it received half of what was requested—its allocation was \$1,255m, made up of \$1,081m in tax-sharing grants (up 13.6 per cent), \$173m in loan programs (up 5 per cent), \$360m in borrowing authorisations by larger local and semi-government authorities (up 12.9 per cent), \$95m in estimated borrowing authorisations (up 5.5 per cent), special loans of \$17m for infrastructure loans, which we all realise allow money to be borrowed overseas—this one was specifically for the coal export facility at Hay Point—\$100 m in infrastructure loan authorisation for the powerhouse and another \$20m infrastructure loan for the Brisbane railway electrification, and also loans for minor electrification projects.

It all sounds wonderful but, in terms of what was requested, it was another defeat not only for this Premier but for all the Premiers. It was an important defeat by the Federal Government, because it was a defeat mainly in the tax-sharing arrangement. It was a defeat under the Federalism deal that Fraser has proposed. He has held the Premiers to the relativities laid down by the States (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act of 1976. Regardless of the promises made in 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979 that he would constantly review the percentage, it is still 39.87 per cent of net personal income tax collections in the preceding year. As I said before, the guarantee is for only one year.

Dr Edwards: It is under review at the moment.

Mr WRIGHT: It is under review, but he said that the guarantee is for only 1981, and that is all we can expect.

Dr Edwards: Until an agreement is made.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes, but we must remember the experiences that this State has already had with the Commonwealth. The Treasurer has said that Queensland has lost \$40m in two years and that it has been disadvantaged for 10 years. Regardless of what political party has been in office in

Canberra, the States have been disadvantaged by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth seems to be determined to have this clamp-down on loan funds for the States in every area, and this is the fifth consecutive year that there has been a clamp-down. There has been no major increase in Commonwealth-backed loans for works and development projects. Allowing for inflation, this in an effective cut-back of 10.5 per cent for 1980-81. Since 1975-76, loans to the States from the Federal Treasury have been effectively reduced by almost 40 per cent. So we cannot simply say, "It is a matter of continuing concern." It amazes me that the Premier returned from Canberra and said that he had won. The people of Queensland certainly have not won.

It must be clear to honourable members that Fraser's new Federalism is not the partnership approach that he talked about in 1975 and 1976. It is certainly not the deal that this Government thought it would be. It is clear also that, if the last five years are any indication, the future for the States in terms of Commonwealth/State financial relationships will be an ever-worsening one. It will be completely one-sided, with the Commonwealth calling the tune.

Mr Blake: That is what new Federalism is all about.

Mr WRIGHT: That is what it is; it is a brand new type of centralism. The Commonwealth will call the tune. It will determine how the money will be spent. It will determine the priorities. It is the responsibility of this Government to stop playing the role of the ostrich. It ought to recognise the situation for what it is and totally review not just the approach that is made by the Grants Commission but also the approach to financial administrative policies.

There are alternatives, and they have been expressed in some part by Mr Howard. He says, "You have always got the personal tax levy." I heard Eric Robinson say recently, "There are always indirect taxes." There is also the alternative of cutting down on the services that are rendered and extending the time in which projects are completed. I reiterate: the real answer is to defeat the Fraser Government. But, again, there is a financial answer, and that is to adopt different revenue-raising policies.

I am interested also in the fact that the Labor Party in Canberra has rethought its approach to the States. I was critical of the Whitlam Government, in part, for some of the things that it did, and I make no apology for saying that. I believe that its communications were lacking. It wanted to try to resolve the problems facing Australia in a few years instead of over a period, which the people of Australia would have given it. The Federal Opposition has made it very clear that in power it will remove

the threat of State personal income tax by repealing stage 2 of the financial agreement. It has also committed itself to provide 2 per cent of the net personal income tax collections to local authorities, and that ought to be shouted from every mountain top and published in every newspaper in order to inform local authorities that there is a better deal, there is an alternative.

One can imagine what this would mean to local government funding. The Opposition's shadow Treasurer, Ralph Willis, has already advocated that the guarantee for one year that Howard is talking about would be increased. But we need to cast aside the knowledge that there is an election pending and accept the fact that, irrespective of the outcome of that election, this Government has responsibilities, and that it must revamp its style of administration. There is a growing tax revolt in Australia; there is a growing tax revolt in Queensland, and one that is ever increasing. There must be another way. We all appreciate that State Governments have limited avenues for raising revenue for capital works and recurrent expenditure. They can take it from people through personal income tax, if they accept stage 2 of that program, or they can raise it by indirect taxation. They can receive it in the form of tied or untied grants from the Commonwealth, or they can borrow it, regardless of the source, but we all know that eventually the money has to be repaid. Finally, and the one I suggest, is that they can earn it.

Surely this is the real solution to the dilemma that is facing the States and local authorities, and will face them even more in the future. Queensland has already proved that State enterprise can work. It proved that with the SGIO. I maintain that that principle needs to be extended, that initiatives need to be taken by this Government and that a lead ought to be given personally by the Treasurer and by the Treasury.

We all appreciate that Queensland is a great State with unlimited potential, but it is apparent that that potential is not being tapped for the benefit of Queenslanders. The fact that we have the lowest household income of any State is an indication of this. It is certainly true that some mining companies are reaping huge financial benefits, but it is also true that that benefit is not being passed on. For all the wealth, for all the millions of dollars in natural resources that leave this State, and for all the massive primary industry wealth that we have, personal incomes remain low.

I was very pleased to receive a copy of a recent survey carried out by members of this Parliament. Maybe those who read "Hansard" appreciate that in recess members of Parliament do not just sit around, play bowls or go fishing. An eight-member committee consisting of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bill D'Arcy), the member for Lytton (Mr Tom Burns), the member for Nudgee (Mr Ken Vaughan), the member

for Everton (Mr Glen Milliner), the member for Chatsworth (Mr Terry Mackenroth), the member for Archerfield (Mr Kev Hooper), the member for South Brisbane (Mr Jim Fouras), and the member for Murrumba (Mr Joe Kruger) carried out a thorough and in-depth survey.

Mr Porter interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: The report is factual and is backed up by statistical information. The report makes some startling revelations. Comparisons have been made between 1980 and previous years. One of those comparisons dealt with food prices, and 14 basic items were used. Their price in 1975 was \$8.01. The price for the same 14 items in 1980 is \$19.72. As members will realise, that is an increase of well over 100 per cent. Other results dealt with 38 items of groceries. In 1975 their cost was \$27.73, but in 1980 their cost is \$48.95, an increase of 76 per cent.

That committee also looked at incomes, because they are so important—one's capacity to buy. In 1975 the average minimum award rate was \$6,133. In 1979 it was \$8,748. The average weekly earnings for the same period were respectively \$9,136 and \$12,896. One must consider that the CPI had risen by 10.1 per cent last year, food costs had risen by 18.5 per cent and the average minimum award wage had decreased in actual disposable income and buying power by \$20 to \$36 a week, or \$1,059 a year.

In regard to average weekly earnings, the fall in disposable incomes for the same period was \$22 to \$60 a week, admittedly a great variation, but the actual fall per annum was \$1,175.

Mr Warburton: This Government has the power to reduce tax.

Mr WRIGHT: It certainly has such a power.

The main problem is that because of the lower incomes being received and the higher cost factors being faced, the lower and middle income families are being hurt. I now deal with the percentage increases of costs last year. Food increases were 18.5 per cent; health and personal care, 17.1 per cent; transportation costs rose by 11.2 per cent; recreation costs, 10.5 per cent; housing, 6.7 per cent; and clothing, 6.4 per cent. The only action that this Government took to control prices in this period was to introduce a minimum price scheme for bread—not a maximum, not some protection for consumers, but a minimum price scheme.

That committee also made some very interesting comparisons, again in the Brisbane metropolitan area, not just in one year, as that can create some difficulties, but in a number of areas in the 10-year period from 1970 to 1980. The average price of a three-bedroom home in 1970 was between \$11,000 and

\$15,000. In 1980 it was \$26,000 to \$35,000. The cost of a standard Holden Kingswood 6-cylinder sedan in 1970 was \$2,488, while in 1980 it is \$7,068. A 15 cubic foot refrigerator in 1970 cost \$400, while in 1980 the cost is \$680. The quarterly electricity bill of 2 000 units for domestic purposes such as hot water was \$31.30 in 1970 but a massive \$70.60 in 1980. Standard doctors' and medical costs in 1970 were \$2.80 a consultation, while today they are \$9. The cost of a home visit was \$4.20 in 1970, while today it is \$13.80.

The interesting comparison for us all is with petrol. Per litre in 1970 super grade cost 9.5c. In 1980 it varies between 29.9c and 34.9c. In other words, it has risen from 42c per gallon to \$1.35 to \$1.57, which people are paying without appreciating the fact because of the change from Imperial to metric measurements. For those who partake of the amber ale, a 7 oz. glass of beer in 1970 was 15c, whereas today it is 45c. A bottle was 40c in 1970 and today it is 93c. A packet of cigarettes was 40c in 1970 and today varies between 80c and 95c.

There are other statistics, not just those based on surveys carried out by members of the Opposition. I have seen similar surveys in "The Australian", "The Courier-Mail" and many other reports. There has been a definite erosion of family living standards; yet the Treasurer today spoke about improved living standards. I would suggest that if we start looking at the erosion of disposable income, the family is facing difficulties from the large increase in costs in every area of expenditure. And it will worsen as State indirect taxes increase. It will worsen as Commonwealth financial assistance decreases, as I believe will happen. It will worsen as the financial burden on local authorities becomes heavier. As all realise, their interest and redemption payments today are exorbitant. It will also worsen as personal income tax increases.

The answer is to offset the tax burden. As I have said before, the way to do it is to earn the necessary revenue to fill the gap. I have thought carefully about a number of areas that the State Government could enter. The first surely would be the tourist industry. Previous Ministers for Tourism have said in this House that it is the second major income earner for Queensland and has tremendous untapped potential. The Government should enter that field and assist local authorities to do likewise. Their task and objective should be to promote local tourist resources. The Government should establish State-financed motels and tourist resorts and finance such things as country camping reserves.

Dr Edwards: Would you say that again?

Mr WRIGHT: If the Treasurer knew anything about national fitness, he would understand what I am talking about.

Mr W. D. Hewitt: He said "State-financed motels".

Mr WRIGHT: Yes, I believe we ought to have State-financed motels and tourist resorts.

Mr Davis: Like New Zealand.

Mr WRIGHT: I was just going to say that: like New Zealand. I would have thought that the Treasurer would have understood that, instead of being like New Zealand, which spent money, opened up a new area, pioneered a resort and then sold it off to private enterprise, the Government ought to maintain an equity in it. The State railway system could be used in a far better way to promote the tourist industry. We could even have a State tourist bus system. Resort areas could be opened, just as has happened in other countries. Again I cite New Zealand. New Zealand gave a lead in the South Pacific in this way. There is no reason why Queensland cannot follow suit, but let us keep the properties for ourselves. The tourist industry is one of tremendous potential. It is untapped. It is a great revenue earner for this State, but it could be maximised to the fullest if the State owned part of the developments taking place.

The second area with great potential, naturally, is the development of the State's mineral resources. It is time that this State Government rethought its attitude to a partnership approach with private enterprise. I acknowledge that it is a sheer impossibility for the State Government to have the necessary funds to develop the great resources, in coal-mining areas and others, by itself. I accept that, but there is no reason why there cannot be a partnership. I might say that it pleased me to hear the Treasurer say when he came back from overseas that the deal Queensland is getting is not satisfactory.

I suggest to the Treasurer that, instead of increasing royalties and freight rates, the Government should have part of the action. That suggestion was made when Moura was opened up. Thiess made overtures to the State Government to come into partnership, but those overtures were not accepted and the company had to work with the Japanese. There is a need for a partnership approach with private enterprise to develop the State's resources. Profits are being made, and I suggest that the economy of Queensland would be in a serious state without those profits. However, the profits that could be made in a partnership development would be ten or a hundred times greater than those received from royalties and freight rates. There would also be the added advantage that the Government would control the exploitation of the State's resources. It would give Queensland State participation.

I suggest to this Assembly that there is a growing nationalism in Australia and in Queensland. It was begun by Whitlam in 1972, when he made people realise that culturally Australians had something to be proud about, that they did have a tradition.

It has grown, and even the Fraser Government has realised the importance of Australians wanting to be part of Australia.

Something similar could certainly happen in the development area, too, and I put forward the view that Queensland needs to launch its own public development investment fund, a special fund to which Queenslanders could subscribe. As Queenslanders, we all accept that we have confidence in our State. Queenslanders everywhere are proud of Queensland. They do not mind being called banana benders or being ridiculed in that way, because they are proud of Queensland. I am sure that they would be prepared to invest in the development of the State.

If a public investment development fund could be set up, just think, Mr Speaker, of the access to financial resources that would be available to the Government. It could approach private enterprise and say, "We have the money. It is the people's money. We want to work with you to make Queensland an even greater State." It would also guarantee ownership of the State's natural resources, at least in part, and it would keep the resources and the wealth of the State in the hands of the people of Queensland, and in the hands of the Government on behalf of the people of Queensland.

I should like to see the profits of the SGIO, instead of being used to help private enterprise develop huge shopping centres—and we know that the SGIO has financed the establishment of shopping centres all over the State—being used to build shopping centres on its own behalf and allow the property to remain the property of Queensland. What is done now? Cheap money is made available to private enterprise and the State receives some return by way of interest. There is no reason why this State could not launch out into major commercial and retail development projects, improving the commercial and retail centres throughout the State. As the earnings increased, the people of Queensland would benefit, and services to the people would also improve and increase. In turn, there would be a chance of the tax burden being lessened, and, finally, it would remove the State's dependency on the Federal Treasury. The Treasurer would not have to go cap in hand, time after time, to the Federal Government.

I appreciate, too, that the attitude of the Federal Government is, "The better off you are, the less you will get." If the State Government starts trying to give incentives to local industry, as it did by reducing pay-roll tax, the Federal Government reduces the amount of money that the State Government receives. That has happened, as the Treasurer said earlier, in other areas. However, I suggest that a different approach is needed and that a partnership approach is desirable, a partnership consisting of the Government, the people and the private sector. That is the only way in which the financial dilemma that the State is beginning

to face, and will face in the future, can be resolved. It is the only way in which the uncontrolled exploitation of the State's natural resources can be curtailed.

I concede that it is not an immediate panacea. It would be a long-term solution to the State's problems. However, it would meet the growing desires of the people of this State to curb the ever-increasing demands on them to fill the Treasury coffers. The position is going to get worse. Australia is already the highest-taxed nation in the western world, and the position must worsen.

In conclusion, I say that the responsibility lies with the Treasurer. He asked earlier, "What do you do about the Commonwealth's attitude?" One can plead; one can go cap in hand; one can badger; one can threaten; but finally one must use one's own initiative. The Treasurer must try to create independence, an ability to carry out development in the Government's own right. That would mean, of course, that the Treasurer and the Government would have to cast off their inhibitions in regard to State enterprise. They would have to rethink their definition of what some people call socialism. However, it is time that this State, the Treasurer, officers of the Treasury and those who make the decisions for Queensland acknowledge the disadvantages that the State faces now, and also acknowledge the disadvantages of State enterprise while appreciating the many advantages and benefits that are to be derived from it.

I suggest that the time is fast falling away and that, if the Federal Government is not defeated this year, Queensland will suffer even worse. It will not be a matter of the loss of \$40m because of the financial arrangements; in two years we will be talking about hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars. The only thing to do is to cast aside one's basic political motivations and say, "O.K., I have a task to do and that task is for Queensland."

Mr W. D. HEWITT (Greenslopes) (4.26 p.m.): It would be reasonable to assume that, if by some quirk of fate there were a change of Government in this State at the end of this year, the honourable member for Rockhampton would be the incoming Treasurer. It is therefore useful that today he has given us a very thoughtful exposition on his attitudes and on the policies that he would bring forward. He would assume, quite correctly, that the Treasurer and I would join issue with him on some of his propositions. I propose to do that. However, first I want to say that not since the time of Eric Lloyd and Pat Hanlon have I seen a member of the Opposition approach himself so meaningfully and responsibly to a debate on an Appropriation Bill. I compliment the honourable member for Rockhampton for the work that he has brought to bear today. He has done an enormous amount of work and has given us the benefit of his thinking on a range of subjects.

Before I join issue with him, I tell him that I agree with his earlier proposition concerning taxation disbursements from the Commonwealth. I do believe that Queensland has been disadvantaged and remains so. All of us recall the problem we had in counting our population. The Commonwealth had to concede in retrospect that the assessment of Queensland's population was incorrect and that the formula was affected. For too long the consequence was that the reimbursements were not of the proper order. That is one of the things that have been corrected.

My very good friend Kevin Cairns, a most learned gentleman, has long argued about the extent to which Queensland and Western Australia have been disadvantaged. There is no denying that these two great States are the great repositories of natural resources and that they will make the major contribution to a burgeoning Australian economy in the 1980s. As a consequence of that contribution, there should be a more meaningful Commonwealth flow-back to them.

If those propositions are correct, it is all the more remarkable that Queensland has been able to maintain the lowest level of State taxation of all the States in the Commonwealth. A little later I shall deal with a table that I have at my disposal to demonstrate that contention quite clearly.

The honourable member for Rockhampton made a side-swipe at my party, putting forward the remarkable contention that when we gain the ascendancy in the coalition the people will somehow or other be disadvantaged. The fact of the matter is that in the 23 years that this Government has been in office—23 highly successful years—there have been nothing but Liberal Treasurers. Those Liberal Treasurers have participated in the negotiations on all of the great contracts that have led to the development of this State and our highly successful decentralised programs. The fact remains that Queensland is the most decentralised State in the whole of the Commonwealth. If that is a compliment to the coalition as a whole—I take it as such—it is a compliment also to an unbroken line of Liberal Treasurers.

The honourable member for Rockhampton worries too much. He tries to sustain an abysmally poor attack on my party. The fact of the matter is that the distribution of funds that we have seen over the past 23 years will certainly be sustained in any Government led by my party.

The honourable member also made reference to a growing taxation revolt in this country. Undoubtedly he is correct. What he did not make reference to, however, is the remarkable paradox that can be identified in this country today. Every person is asking for a lower rate of tax; every person is saying, "We want to control our own income and we want to determine how we will spend our money. Lower our taxation." But almost every last person has his own pet project and says that the Government should spend more

money in this area. It is a remarkable paradox, one that the Australian community sooner or later must apply itself to and come up with a solution.

Quite simply, there is nothing that Governments cannot do. If the Australian community wants to settle for a level of taxation comparable with that in Sweden, where the people pay something like 80 per cent of their wages by way of tax, the Australian community only has to say so. Governments will extract the money and Governments will look after people from the cradle to the grave or, as I have often heard it described, from the womb to the tomb. The people only have to opt for it. I do not believe that they want to opt for it, and sooner or later they will have to face the hard option. They cannot demand more and more Government expenditure and, at the same time, cry for lower tax.

There are interesting projections which suggest that, by about the year 2010, a critical judgment will have to be made. In referring to this, I emphasise and support the very clear observations that Mr Justice Kirby made recently when he invoked young people to become more involved in political affairs and to consider their own future a little bit more. He put it hard on the young academics. He said, "They owe something to Australia for what Australia has done for them." It was a good proposition, and I agree with it.

I talk about the year 2010 as the critical point. There are some cynics who say that about that time I will be offered a ministry and I will be available. But, about that time, the projections suggest that with the contributing factors of a lower birth rate, earlier retirement and longer life expectancy, those people then in the work-force will not be able to sustain the heavy demands made on them; they will collapse under the burden.

Those of us in this Chamber will be past caring. If we are still in the world of the living, we will be the recipients of all the welfare programs. But young men, of whom my son is typical as he is rising 19, will, in the year 2010, be at the height of their professional careers. They are the young people who, right now, should be considering the hard options or the easy options. The honourable member for Rockhampton is right. There is talk about tax revolt, but people are not thinking it through. It is about time they were encouraged to do so.

The honourable gentleman, in the latter part of his speech, cited a great number of figures. He identified the prices of certain commodities a few years ago and contrasted them with the prices today. No-one quite understood what he was trying to prove. He certainly lost me.

Mr K. J. Hooper: That wouldn't be hard.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: The honourable member who has to go for some driving lessons soon said that I would be easy to lose. I

have never made any pretence of being an intellectual giant in this place and the chances are that I would be lost pretty easily. But, if I am lost pretty easily, the honourable member for Rockhampton lost himself earlier because he gave those figures without relating them to wage structures or other movements. By a strange coincidence, the first example that he gave was the cost of housing. He spoke about the cost of housing in Queensland now and compared it with the cost three years ago. The fact of the matter is that houses are cheaper in Brisbane than they are in any other capital city. The average cost of a house in Brisbane is \$32,800, in Melbourne it is \$40,900 and in Sydney it is an astronomical \$58,500. So the honourable gentleman, to my thinking at least, did not prove much.

Mr Vaughan: He was talking about the difference in prices between 1970 and 1979.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: I am telling the honourable member that to talk about a movement in prices without relating it to wage structures and other contributing factors proves absolutely nothing. I am very grateful to the honourable member for helping me to prove that his colleague proved nothing.

I have already referred to the fact that in the event of a change of Government the honourable member would be the Treasurer. It is therefore not untimely to talk about the party that he supports, the policies it projects and precisely what that party would do if it were in control of the Treasury benches in the latter part of 1980.

We must, first of all, look at the party itself, which approaches the electorate with the wonderful slogan, "Labor—ready to govern". Now, Mr Speaker, you might notice that with great difficulty they restrain the grins. It is hard, but this is a sombre occasion—"Labor—ready to govern"! That would have to be the sick joke of the decade.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: The fact of the matter is that they cannot even govern themselves. Seldom has a party on the eve of an election been so hopelessly torn asunder; the so-called old guard and new guard or, as the Leader of the Opposition, in the most unfunny attempt to be funny, talks about, "The old guard, the new guard, the rear guard and the mudguard." We are all expected to greet that with guffaws of laughter. It is so pathetic it is puerile. But the fact is that the dissensions are so real that not in a fit is that party remotely ready to govern. The fact of the matter is that the concession to that statement is made by the president of the Labor Party himself, who was quoted in the Sunday Monitor section of the "Sunday Sun" as saying, "I would be dishonest with you if I said I think we are going to win this next State election." You don't want much

better verification than that, Mr Speaker. We are enormously grateful to Dr Murphy, and we wish him well in his presidency.

We know, without highlighting the fact, the state of the Labor Party at the moment, but what is more important is the policies that the Labor Party is tied to in the event of becoming the Government, and we should not forget the fact that every member of the parliamentary Labor Party is bound by a pledge to support conference decisions in the Parliament. So the record of proceedings of the Rockhampton conference of 1979 is in fact the parliamentary program for the next three years if Labor comes to office.

Therefore, it is timely to look at these policies and to ask ourselves precisely what they would do for Queensland and where they would lead us. There is no doubt in my mind that that document is a blueprint for disaster. In looking at these policies we must not be seduced by the fairy-floss, froth-and-bubble presentation by the Leader of the Opposition when he goes on television at his urbane, avuncular, lugubrious and ubiquitous best, but rather must we look at that document itself and analyse it in great detail. The fact is that at a time when the people are calling for less control, fewer State authorities and reduced Government control that document calls for the very opposite: massive Government intrusion, massive Government expenditure and massive public authority establishments, so that private enterprise would be under the same squeeze that it faced in South Australia.

Let us analyse that document. The first thing to talk about is the number of authorities, tribunals, boards, commissions and all those other things to which a Labor Government would have recourse. We should recall again that members from this side of the Chamber are now committed to what we call sunset legislation. Sunset legislation would look at all these statutory authorities, committees and nondescript boards, call them all to account, and if they could not justify their continued existence they would be phased out—no ifs, no buts, no maybes. That sort of legislation has worked with very telling effect in some 27 of the United States; it could work with great effect in Queensland. We are committed to it. We are committed to the concept of reducing Government, of getting out of people's lives, of letting them do their own thing and of trying to create a genuine free enterprise society.

The Labor Party policy documents tells us that the Labor Party would create one administrative tribunal, one set of advisers, one agency, five authorities, one board, one bureau, one centre, nine commissions, 15 committees, one co-operative, four councils, two counselling services, another court, two departments, one division, two inquiries, one institute, a new set of loan funds, three offices, one portfolio, a region, a scheme,

a secretariat, a statutory board, a new system, two tribunals, a trust and two units. They are all spelt out in close and concise detail, and I would be happy to elaborate upon them to those who might be too embarrassed to ask publicly what they might be.

That is not the end of it; that is only the start of it. Some committees, inquiries and boards could be justified. We must not be myopic in these matters, and I certainly do not intend to be that. I select three of the policy statements in that document to which I direct the closest attention of any concerned Queenslander who genuinely worries about the future of this State. The first that I select is headed "Statutory Bodies". The document reads—

"That committees be formed to examine the social and economic advantages of forming statutory bodies—separate from the State public service—to become involved in mining and secondary manufacturing industries in Queensland."

It is not a committee to inquire as to any disadvantages of statutory authorities. It is assumed that they are only advantageous and that it is only a question of considering where and how they would be set up. I have already referred to the fact that we have a proliferation of statutory authorities, which we must bring to account, and it is anathema to us to suggest that more should be created.

In talking about statutory authorities, nobody to this point in time has predicated the situation facing our entrenched Public Service. We have a Public Service in this State that is loyal, dedicated and hard-working and gives complete loyalty to the Government of the day. Young people join the Public Service in the expectation that they will develop a long, successful and happy career with the Public Service. The Public Service Board and the Public Service authorities in this State should be under no doubt at all that a proliferation of statutory authorities would erode their base, security, and employment possibilities. I would hope that the great number of public servants who approach elections dispassionately would look at this provision, ask their own questions and satisfy themselves on what impact that policy declaration would have upon their future.

The second matter that I touch upon is under the heading of "Public Sector", and reads—

"An ALP Government in Queensland will take all steps necessary to protect and expand the public sector in this State, recognising that a thriving public sector, including State-owned enterprises, is a practical and responsible method of ensuring that the resources of Queensland are enjoyed equally by all Queenslanders."

Dr Edwards: Like the State butcher shops they used to have.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: The Treasurer anticipates me very well. The former Labor Prime

Minister, when he wanted to speak in derisory terms about his political opponents, would use the turn of phrase, "They are like the Bourbons: they learned nothing and they forgot nothing." The label could be applied equally these days to the State branch of the Australian Labor Party. To talk about State-owned enterprises is to push aside the failure, the disgraces, the scandals and the blots on our history of attempts to set up State-owned enterprises in this State. The Labor Party has learnt nothing.

It is consistent with the argument on our side of politics that there must be an evacuation from public participation; that Governments should do those things for which they are elected, and they should do them well, and that they should let the private sector, with total encouragement, get on with doing the things that it can do best of all.

When one talks of the expansion of the public sector it brings to mind a policy matter on the agenda for the Victorian conference of the Australian Labor Party in which it aspired to 60 per cent of the population being employed by the State. That is a very noble aim. At least the Victorian ALP is honest about these things. But that would be as destructive to its State as the implementation of such a policy would be to ours. It is frightening.

The third and last point that I touch upon is under the heading "Industrial Democracy". Every employer, every businessman, every entrepreneur, every man who pays lip-service to private enterprise and the Australian ethic of having his own go and getting rewarded for it should ponder these words very carefully and make his judgment upon them—

"An ALP Government will introduce legislation designed to develop the capacity of unions and their members to carry out intervention in all aspects of managerial prerogatives."

Any person who is involved in his own company, who enjoys a good relationship with his workers, but nevertheless believes that it is his show because he has worked hard to put it together, should consider the implication of those words very carefully. It is quite frightening; it is terrifying.

Mr Wright: You are talking about Victoria.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: I am quoting from the proceedings of the Australian Labor Party Conference held in Rockhampton in 1979.

Mr Wright: You weren't when you were talking about 60 per cent.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: Because the honourable member is only half tuned in, that was about three paragraphs ago. I will try to help him catch up by using simple language.

Mr Wright: Do you believe that a private enterprise that goes bust for some reason should have the right to go back to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, re-register and have another go?

Mr W. D. HEWITT: I believe that there are great shortcomings in the administration of corporate affairs.

Mr Wright: Answer the question.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: I am answering the question. Isn't it amazing in this world that people ask a question and when they do not receive the answer in precisely the way they want it they say that the question is being dodged? I am not dodging the question at all. The honourable gentleman asked me a question and I said that in my opinion the administration of corporate affairs has some loopholes. I do not believe that people who take others down willy-nilly should be able to get registration very quickly.

Mr Wright: Do you believe that a company that fails in its first enterprise should be allowed to have another go? If you do, that should be the same for State enterprises in Queensland.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: With all the Christian charity at my disposal, and I am well endowed with that, if there were in the history of this State only one example of a State enterprise going bust, then we might consider the argument of the honourable gentleman on its merits and say, "Yes, let us give it a go." But the fact remains that, in regard to State enterprises, the economic road of Queensland's history is covered with disaster. The honourable gentleman cannot escape the history of his own party.

Mr Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Cairns under Standing Order 123A.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: There is an old axiom in politics: when they are throwing it at you, you know you are in front.

As I say, the intrusion of unions and their membership into managerial initiatives at all levels should terrify and frighten any businessman and any entrepreneur in this State who genuinely wants to get on with the business of running his show without facing the possibility of union and Government intervention.

By inference, it is suggested that the State is not moving well, that the development is slow and great things have to be done. During the Korean conflict when thousands of people crossed the border from north to south, the phrase was coined: "They voted with their feet." These days thousands and thousands of Victorians are voting with their feet by moving into Queensland. That is their vote of confidence. They are taking up residence here; they are staying and they are loving it. The fact remains that over the last 10 years the population growth in Queensland has been of the order of 2.2 per cent. The all-State average is 1.61 per cent. However, looking in more relative terms than just the last 10 years, Queensland is gaining 1 000 migrants from interstate every month. Victoria lost 13 600 people to

other States last year, while Queensland's population rose by 31 000, 18 000 by natural increase and 13 000 interstate migrants. So the first proposition is that this is one of the growth States of the Commonwealth. This is one of the great States that the people are expressing their confidence in with their feet. People do not like to move house and home unless they are convinced that they are moving to a good establishment.

My second proposition with regard to the State of Queensland relates to internal taxation, to which I made passing reference at the start of this speech. These figures are the more remarkable in the light of the arguments presented by the honourable member for Rockhampton, who spoke about the extent to which we are disadvantaged by the Commonwealth. The corollary of that would be that we should be more dependent upon internal taxation than any of the other States. What are the facts in the taxation fields of the State? Gift, probate and succession duties and property taxes yield \$105.79 per head of population in Australia. The average in Queensland is \$85.34. From liquor taxes and taxes on gambling, the Australian average is \$33.99. The Queensland average is \$16.55. Taxes on ownership and operation of motor vehicles is \$55.83 as a national average, whereas in Queensland it is \$46.87. Incidental taxes such as pay-roll tax, fire brigade levies, stamp duties, business franchise and things such as that yield \$420.54 over all of Australia, whereas the Queensland average is \$333.32. Not only are we substantially below the Australian average in every quarter, but we are also below every other State. The only exception is the Northern Territory, and Territorians cannot be compared because they do not pay taxes in some of the fields that I have referred to. Therefore, a clear case is shown that our internal taxation is the lowest of any State of Australia and that Australians by voting with their feet are saying that this is one of the great States and they want to live in it.

Development of this State is not without its problems. We are told that in the next 10 years Rundle could well come on stream. We could have three aluminium smelters, which is remarkable. Great developmental projects that are taking place will make Queensland the California of the '80s. I refer to the problems that these things create.

When addressing a distinguished group recently the Under Treasurer (Mr Hielscher) referred to the possibility of labour shortages, particularly with craftsmen. There is a strange paradox when we are agonising constantly about unemployment and yet at the same time predicating the stage where we could be short of labour and short of tradesmen.

There is a response that should be made. Last year the Government set up a manpower planning authority, which met with my total support. I believe in manpower planning. I do not believe in manpower direction. I would

not think anyone here would. However, manpower planning is good sense. Doing projections five and 10 years ahead and being able to demonstrate in what professional fields there will be specific demands makes very good sense. The manpower planning authority should be applying itself to the comments that the Under Treasurer has been gracious enough and sensible enough to make. We should be doing long-term studies already on what artisans are going to be needed, where they are going to be needed and when they are going to be needed. Instead of waiting for those great constructions to commence and then wringing our hands, running around the world looking for tradesmen, we should be finding them now. If need be, we should be telling our TAFE colleges and our employers that apprentices should be trained in specific disciplines. If the State responds to challenges of that type, its problems are dissipated and it is ready to respond as soon as the soil is turned.

The last observation I make relates to the essence of the debate today. Honourable members are debating an Appropriation Bill, and we are giving to the Government, for the services of Her Majesty, in excess of \$1,000 million. It is a Supply Bill. The Government's life depends upon Supply. If Supply were not granted, the Government would have to go to the country forthwith. Therefore it is an important debate.

No-one suggests for a moment that Supply will be refused, but I do not believe that it is sufficient for a Parliament merely to say, "We give you \$1,000 million. There it is." Parliamentary supervision must be a little more involved than that. We quite desperately need the opportunity to adopt an overseeing role in public expenditure. We must know precisely where the Votes go; we must know precisely that they are being spent to the best effect. There must be seen to be parliamentary participation. The long-ignored cry for a public accounts committee should no longer be ignored. There is a great need for a public accounts committee here, and it is apt to refer to that when the House is debating an Appropriation Bill. Every other Parliament now gives its back-bench members an opportunity to scrutinise and supervise public expenditures. Back-bench members of this Assembly should be given a similar opportunity.

If there is one great problem that almost every Parliament in the world wrestles with it is the problem of overseeing and administering public expenditures. Public expenditures are now so enormous that they present a real problem for Parliament to satisfy itself how the moneys are being spent and whether they are being spent in the proper way. I do not pretend for a moment that a public accounts committee would solve all our problems in this Chamber or make members as well briefed as they should be, but it would take us a long way along the road. I hope that at this time next year, when an Appropriation Bill is again before the House,

we will be able to hail the fact that a public accounts committee exists and that there is a sense of participation from members on all sides of the Parliament. When that day comes, we will be able to say that a significant victory has been won for the back-bench members of this Assembly.

Mr P. N. D. WHITE (Southport) (4.58 p.m.): I welcome the opportunity to enter the debate and speak for a few moments about policies relating to Government land sales in this State. It might seem to some honourable members that that subject is not directly related to the Appropriation Bill, but the fact is that Government land sales have a significant financial impact on the revenue accruing to the State.

In recent weeks I have been very concerned about the level of prices that has been achieved at public auctions of Crown land in the Southport electorate. In my opinion, there are two reasons why prices have been so high. I speak about \$20,000 or so for an ordinary residential block, which is out of proportion with the usual sale prices achieved in the area. Firstly, there is a shortage of land in what is a very significant growth area. There is a shortage of developed land; there is a shortage of residential blocks. It has been estimated that on the Gold Coast at present there is a shortage of about a thousand blocks, and these are needed to provide some equality between supply and demand for residential land on the Gold Coast. The second reason why a price significantly higher than that for ordinary residential blocks has been obtained is that favourable terms are given to purchasers of Crown land at auction. In brief, these terms are 10 per cent down and 8 per cent on the remainder over 10 years.

What is happening is that these blocks are seen as a good investment, which indeed they are. If inflation is running at between 10 and 12 per cent a year and a person can invest his money, or part of his money, in a capital-growth investment on which he is paying only 8 per cent a year, it does not take a genius to work out that he must be considerably in front.

What is happening, however, is that investors are buying this land and sitting on it. People who need it so that they can build houses on it are unable to acquire it. More importantly, the first-home buyers are being excluded from an opportunity to purchase this land. I have seen them go to auction after auction, bidding on every single block of land that is put up for auction. When the price gets beyond the level that they can afford they shake their head and put their cheque-books away. They go away in despair and wonder whether they will ever have the financial capacity to purchase a block on which to build a home.

I suggest that the Government change its land policy. In certain areas, such as Southport, the Government should release more Crown land in the pressure areas where

land is required. The land should be auctioned. I believe a good case exists for auctioning it in a raw state. That would save the Government the expense of developing it. It is not right that private enterprise should be excluded from some areas. The land could be auctioned and private-enterprise developers could be allowed to develop it and put it on the market. What is more, the developers who purchase it should be obliged to put it on the market within a certain period. There is no point in auctioning land so that someone can buy it and sit on it waiting for his capital gain.

A second solution that I would put forward is that the Government reserve for first-home buyers a certain percentage of land put up for auction. This system works very well in the Australian Capital Territory and probably in other places. I do not say the Government should give it away; an upset price should be put on the land. In certain growth areas where price pressures are exerted, it is difficult for people to buy blocks of land on which to build a house. The reservation of a percentage of that land for first-home buyers would give young people an opportunity to purchase a block and to build the home of their choice. It would also avoid locking up a lot of this land for speculative purposes, as is happening at present.

What I am suggesting is that the Government look at its policy of opening up land and selling it. I am not suggesting that the solutions I have put forward would work in every area of Queensland. Obviously, in certain areas it would be impossible to find developers and markets. In growth areas such as my own, however, land could be made available at a reasonable price to those who need it.

In conclusion, and putting aside for one moment the Government's land policy, I endorse the comments made by the honourable member for Greenslopes concerning a public accounts committee. I have spoken on this matter on earlier occasions, as have the member for Greenslopes and other members. I fully endorse his call for a public accounts committee in this State. The sooner such a committee is set up, the better off the State and the Government will be.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (5.4 p.m.): I enter this debate to raise a number of issues that deserve airing in this Parliament. First of all, it is pertinent that I comment on some of the remarks made by the honourable member for Greenslopes during his speech—if indeed it could be described as a speech of any substance and standing. He made the comment, "If by some remote chance the Labor Party were to become the Government after the next State election," and so on. Although that may be a remote chance, Opposition members know, as do members of the National Party, that there is no chance of the Liberal Party becoming the senior partner in the coalition after the next

State election. I was disappointed to hear the honourable member for Greenslopes, in a manner that really does not benefit him, indulge in a nasty attack on the Labor Party.

One would have to say that the honourable member for Greenslopes is fast earning himself the reputation of being nothing short of a political humbug in this Parliament.

The honourable member for Greenslopes spoke about the Treasury. It is fitting to say that, with the present state of mind of the Premier, it is highly likely that, following the elections, Dr Edwards, who will probably have problems in retaining his leadership of the Liberal Party, will not be Treasurer. That will be one of the plum jobs that will go to a National Party Minister.

The honourable member for Greenslopes tried to paint a rosy picture of what the Liberal Party would do as the senior partner in the coalition. All Liberal members of this Parliament have been found sadly wanting in this particular area. They have talked about the need to establish a public accounts committee. This is something that the Labor Party has been calling for in this State for years. The ALP has been very vocal on this matter. The offer has been made repeatedly in this Parliament to Liberal Party members that, if they are honest in their desire to have a public accounts committee established, they only have to make the move within this Parliament and the members of the ALP, because they realise the importance of such a committee and the need for it, will support that move on the floor of this Chamber. On every occasion the Liberals, adopting their typical attitude, have backed off.

The same can be said about a fair and equitable redistribution in Queensland. On every occasion that the ALP has made the offer to the Liberals, their demonstrable lack of guts has come to the forefront and they have backed off. They are not fair dinkum about the issues that they raise in this Parliament.

The honourable member for Greenslopes spoke about the Australian Labor Party wishing to introduce committees, etc., which would increase the red tape that the people in this State would have to cut through. He spoke about the democratic processes of the Parliament and the democratic rights of the people. But when one of the most damaging Bills was introduced into this Parliament—the Essential Services Bill, which was a vicious attack on the rights of every worker in this State—the Liberal Party supported it. It was the honourable member for Sherwood who moved one of the most savage amendments. He proposed that the 48-hour term contained in the Bill be reduced to 24 hours. That is a typical example of the democracy that the Liberal Party speaks about.

Let me go one step further. The honourable member for Greenslopes spoke about worker participation. What he said is not shared by the thinking people in the community. I wish to refer to a report entitled "Employee Participation, Ways and Means," which has come from the National Employee Participation Steering Committee. And who is the chairman of that committee? None other than the Honourable Kevin Newman, MP, who is a Liberal Federal member and Minister. Another member of the committee is Mr W. K. Allen, who is Assistant Secretary of the Department of Productivity. I could go through and rattle the names off. They are certainly not people who would be supporters of the Australian Labor Party or strong sympathisers with the Australian trade union movement.

The report on the objectives of this committee reads—

"Develop and recommend policies appropriate to Government, employers and trade unions, designed to develop a greater understanding of the concepts of employee participation and to encourage their implementation.

"Identify and develop measures for stimulating action in both the public and private sectors. In order to fulfil this objective, the Committee has an important role in identifying, assessing and diffusing newly emerging ideas and practices and in creating within organisations a willingness to change.

"Identify and develop guidelines for appropriate training, research and dissemination of specific ideas, information and programs."

And so it goes on.

But then, if we turn to the conclusions of the report, we find—

"Employee participation should be seen as a gradual, evolutionary process. Established procedures, roles, habits and attitudes do not change overnight."

Nowhere in any section of the policy or platform of the Australian Labor Party do we say for one moment that we as a Government would move in and, by the stroke of a pen, legislate to introduce employee participation overnight, because we realise, and indeed the trade union movement realises, the need for a gradual easing in of that process.

The report also states that—

"The development of employee participation is best regarded as a dynamic process."

That is what the people who compiled this report said and, as I said before, they are involved in the industrial sphere and know what they are talking about, which is probably considerably more than could be said for the honourable member for Greenslopes. I recommend that honourable members read that very good report.

If the Liberal Party wants to talk about the role of trade unions within the community and the democratic rights of people in the community, then once again we have only to look at its role in the current dispute on the Blackwater coalfields. Whilst there have been some mealy-mouthed statements made publicly by members of the Liberal Party about their attitudes towards the dispute, the fact is that it is Liberal Party policy that created the present industrial trauma up there. It was the Federal Liberal Party that caused it and, whether members oppose like it or not, they are tied to their coat-tails and cannot detach themselves regardless of how much they would like to do so.

I now want to mention some housing problems which exist in this State at present and refer to a company known as Peter Kurts which, in my opinion, can only be described as a financial jackal. The company is on the verge of creating a monopolistic situation and is preying on those who wish to realise the great Australia dream of owning their own home. When one looks at the conglomeration of companies created by Peter Kurts one has to be immediately suspicious of their activities within the community. There are firms such as Peter Kurts Pty Ltd, Peters Realty, Queen Street Realty Pty Ltd and Vacluse Investments.

The one in which I am specifically interested is Peters Realty, because it operates in Ipswich and, specifically, in my own electorate of Wolston. But the problems I intend to outline today emanate mainly from Toowoomba. It is significant, and needs to be said, that this information was taken to the Liberal member for Toowoomba North (Dr Lockwood) who advised his constituents that he could not assist them, that he could not help them because he would not rise in this place and expose the financial shonkies pulled by this firm. These activities involve not only Peter Kurts but the Permanent Finance Corporation Ltd and a firm of solicitors in Toowoomba named Clewett, Corser & Drummond of 92 Russell Street. They are the only solicitors I intend to name here today, but I am extremely suspicious of the activities of a whole group of people within the legal profession who are currently doing legal work for Peters Realty. I will explain my reasons for that later on.

But let me get to the crux of this problem. It also involves a gentleman named Laurie Flanigan from Toowoomba, who is employed by Peters Realty. He has been the arch architect of the practice of selling people homes on the payment of a deposit of around \$1,400 or \$1,500. The system worked like this: after Mr Flanigan or Peter Kurts inserted advertisements in newspapers for these cheap homes, people went around to them with a deposit. They were required to put a \$100 holding deposit on a home. Then they were brought down to PFC in Brisbane. They thought that they were coming down to Brisbane to see PFC.

I put it to this Parliament that this is one instance of a highly irregular financial exchange taking place. None of these people have ever been required to go to PFC for an interview to discuss their personal financial situation to see whether or not they were capable of meeting the repayments which this particular company requires. The people were driven to Brisbane. Laurie Flanigan went to PFC and carried out the financial dealings on their behalf. He took the \$1,500 deposit. Then he drove the people back to Toowoomba.

Some time afterwards the people received their contract through the mail. They were advised that their finance had been approved. I have here with me today the bills of mortgage belonging to some of these people. I do not intend to table them because I wish to return them to the people concerned, but they are available for perusal by any honourable member. The bills of mortgage very clearly set out the financial terms involved.

The first refers to a Douglas James Bennett and Barbara Bennett, his wife, as joint tenants. The loan is for \$23,180. They took out a loan with PFC on the understanding, and to their best knowledge and advice from their solicitor, that it would be a 20-year loan for the purchase of a home. These people signed the papers, although I must admit that in some cases they should have read the contracts a little more thoroughly. Lo and behold, when these people received their contract they found that it was for only a five-year period. This working man has to pay \$389 a month for five years on a loan of \$23,180.

The next bill of mortgage refers to Ian McLaren Ferguson and Patricia Clare Power. They were lent \$24,285. Again, it was a five-year term. They were given to believe all along that they were signing up for a loan to be repaid over 20 years. Their repayments are \$330 a month.

Another bill of mortgage refers to Peter John Booth and Vera Ann Booth, his wife. The loan is for \$24,295, with monthly repayments of \$303, again over a five-year period. The same terms apply to each of these contracts. The repayments range from \$250 to \$330 a month.

The best example that I can give is to refer to the bill of mortgage of Kenneth William Lark and Colleen Kay Lark, who have a large family. They were told by Mr Flanigan and also by PFC that they would not have any particular problems getting finance through PFC because Mrs Lark's family allowance cheque each month would be enough to cover the repayments. I do not know what this woman is supposed to do. I do not know whether she is supposed to keep on having babies every 12 months over the next five years in order to partly finance the repayments. This is a shocking indictment of the financial dealings of Peter Kurts, PFC and the solicitors involved. As I have said,

these people were under the impression that they were signing up on a 20-year basis. Now they find that they have only a five-year contract.

I have a computer read-out sheet here showing the finance involved in this shonky type of racket. It involves an initial borrowing of \$24,598, with repayments of \$330 a month over five years. After paying that amount of money for five years, these people will still owe PFC the sum of \$22,819. So, over five years, they will have paid a little over \$2,000 off their loan. The rest of the repayments will have been for interest.

When the end of the five-year contract is reached there is absolutely no guarantee that the loan will be refinanced so that the people can remain in that house. That leaves it open for Peter Kurts, after this five-year initial period has run out, to evict those people from their homes and to put them on the market and sell them. Such allegations have already been made in this Parliament. Certainly there is no guarantee that PFC will refinance those loans for a further period of five, 10 or 15 years.

I have with me today some letters from people who are involved in this sordid deal. One of the letters is from Permanent Finance Corporation and advises a couple that the pay-out on their account is \$24,734. It goes on to state that of the \$330 monthly repayment for June, \$315.47 represented interest. That simply means that for every month over the five-year period they are virtually paying off only \$14.53 of the amount they have borrowed. I am glad to see the Minister for Justice here today because I will make some pertinent comments to him shortly. I believe it is high time that the Government started to make some moves in this area.

The Minister for Justice should investigate the activities of some real estate companies. I am not one who wishes to slate the entire real estate industry. But it is the same as the car industry: it only takes a couple of crooks in the barrel to make the whole thing stink.

Peters Realty has been operating in my electorate for quite some time and I have had numerous complaints about them. I see the Treasurer shaking his head. Perhaps that is a sign that he agrees with me because right through Ipswich and Toowoomba complaints are received about the business activities of that company.

Dr Edwards: The man the ALP has endorsed to oppose me in my electorate is their solicitor.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am not aware of that. If he is, I certainly make no apology for him.

The Government should act in a number of areas to rectify this situation. For the life of me I cannot see why it is not possible for the Government to introduce legislation to make finance companies that enter into the financing of homes charge a maximum interest rate equal to that charged by building

societies. If the Government wants to speak of a free-enterprise system, that certainly would be a free-enterprise system because it would open the field for borrowing money for housing. The Government needs to consider legislation to ensure that finance companies that engage in home financing charge interest rates equivalent to those of building societies.

The Minister for Justice should seriously consider an investigation of these companies, particularly the ones that I have mentioned, because allegations and charges have previously been levelled at them in this place. Because of this Government's legislation, their dealings cannot be considered as illegal. Certainly morally and ethically they can only be described as thieves and crooks. One of the reasons that strong Government action has not been taken in these cases is that the Liberal Party obviously gleams much of its funding for election campaigns from people in the industry.

I will now read some of the letters I have received from people up there. The first is from Mr Ian McLaren Ferguson and Miss Patricia Clare Power. It says—

"On inquiries to advertisement in the local newspaper for older style home for a deposit of \$1,000, I was immediately shown new home for \$1,500 deposit, which at the time seemed a great deal. When I explained that only \$1,100 was available he said—"

and "he", I might point out, was again Flanigan—

"... that I could pay of the balance while waiting for loan to be approved, which I did. I was told that repayments were \$77 a week and was led to believe for a 20 year period. Loan was approved in seven days which I thought was unusually quick, but who would argue with that."

Indeed, who would argue with it when trying to purchase a first home?

"Not having any previous experience in purchasing a house, the mountain of papers to be signed seemed a mere formality and the quicker it was done, the quicker we moved in. Nothing of the deal involved was explained to us. Contract and other documents were quickly read through to us in the usual confusing manner. 'Solicitors' fees were to be added onto the repayments, which made it easier still. Life insurance and house insurance was essential, payable by us. Six months later life insurance was to be transferred over to 'Permanent Finance Co' still payable by us. Which was done."

They did that. The letter continues—

"We realise now of the deal involved and 'usury' tactic of Permanent Finance Co and 'Peters Realty' and due to other commitments and improvements done to the house, makes it almost impossible to save enough for refinance by another co."

That is one letter. Another letter I have here is from D. L. Wilkinson. The real estate agent he bought the house off was Laurie Flanigan—again the name Flanigan—of Peters Realty. It reads—

"He explained to us that we could buy the house and that Peter Kurts would finance us. He said we would be paying the house off for a total of 20 years and would never pay over 14% interest and the payments would be \$64.25 a week for the whole 20 years. Our payments have not been \$64.25 a week. They have been \$69 a week, or \$279 a month.

"We then went to the solicitors—"

again Clewett, Corser and Drummond—

"... which they sent us to. They told us we would only have to sign a contract for five yrs and if we were suitable payers they would then sign us up for the remaining 15 yrs. He said the reason for this is that Peter Kurts has had a lot of trouble with people who won't pay their monthly payments. They also said we wouldn't pay over 14% interest and \$64.25 for 20 years."

Again, total misrepresentation by the representative of Peter Kurts, total misrepresentation by Peter Kurts themselves and very shoddy dealings and representation by the firm of solicitors I have mentioned, Clewett, Corser and Drummond. Perhaps at a later date in this Parliament I will name other solicitors who are involved in the same business.

I will now read the final letter, which comes from a Mr. Davison.

Dr Lockwood interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am glad to see the member for Toowoomba North in the House listening to my speech. As I said before, these people actually approached him in Toowoomba about this problem and he dismissed them. He was not sufficiently interested to take the matter up on their behalf. Nearly every one of the instances I have here concerns someone who lives in the electorate of Toowoomba North. The same circumstances will be seen out at Redbank Plains, very close to my electorate, throughout Ipswich and throughout Brisbane. People have been trapped by the same type of arrangement.

Dr LOCKWOOD: The honourable member is referring extensively to documents. I move—

"That the documents be tabled."

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will make them available for his perusal. I do not want to table them, because as I said before—

Dr LOCKWOOD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have moved that the documents be tabled.

Mr Porter: Caught again.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am not caught. I will table the documents.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The final letter I read to the House comes from Mr R. W. Davison and says—

“Our dealings with Peter’s Realty, Ruthven Street, Toowoomba, has been as follows:—

I first approached the agency after seeing an advertisement in the local paper saying obtain your own home on a low deposit of \$1,500 which was the only way for myself and family at that time & they seemed a reputable Company.

Upon this we were shown different homes (mainly old needing repair & paint work) by the agent whom we had the only dealings with, Mr. Laurie Flannigan.”

Again, our friend Flannigan’s name is mentioned. The letter continues—

“Most of these old homes were at 16% & \$1,000.00 deposit. Then we were shown the new similar homes they were building with ‘Edward Street Properties’, Brisbane—”

again, another subsidiary company of Peters Realty—

“ . . . at 14% interest reducing on \$1,500.00 deposit, plus legals over 5 years, which we bought, as at the time they looked a good bargain (compared to the old homes) . . .

During the signing up of the contract we were told for the first 5 years we would be with their finance company ‘Permanent Finance Co., 30 Herschel St., Brisbane’ & the repayments to be \$54.00 weekly. Not until we had moved in & paid legals were we informed by mail that owing to the Calendar weeks it would now be \$74.00 weekly which was far to high for us.”

So in one jump they went from \$54 a week repayments to \$74 a week after they had signed the contract. Incidentally, the solicitors left a blank in that particular section of the contract that they were signing. The letter continues—

“(When signing the contract, 2 copies in all, the place showing amount weekly to pay was a blank space.) (Our solicitors never pointed out the calendar setup or the high-interest rate section.) Also we had an earlier letter from them with \$54.00 weekly typed on it.”

Again, a charge against the solicitors. The letter continues—

“My wife who works part-time occasionally, was told by Mr. Flannigan to help us to obtain the home he would have to put down her income at \$500.00.”

This was a woman who was not working, but the shonky agent from Peters Realty wanted

to put in a recommendation that they be financed because she was earning \$500 a year. The letter continues—

“Whether this was quartely or what—we don’t know & didn’t understand or realize what he was actually doing. My wife protested to him not to put such a high amount down as it was far below this figure.

“After a 7 day acceptance wait (not much time to rethink the purchase over) I was driven to Brisbane personally by Mr. Flannigan to collect the deposit I had there in Brisbane. I asked to go along with him during the transaction of paying the deposit in but he refused saying he’d handle it all—as though doing me a favour. I also remember Mr. Flannigan telling me that after 2 years with this 14% reducing, that we would be paying more off the house & that come the 5 years up a large amount would be paid off clear, off the house.”

We know, of course, that that is complete hoo-ha. The letter continues—

“Only recently I found out the following:—

“Two weeks ago I saw the Loans accountant at ‘Permanent Finance Company’ & asked for a pay-out figure on the house to date after 22 months. I was told a figure of \$23,232.00. Apparently in all this time from the value of house less deposit being \$23,490, is only \$258.00. Not even one monthly repayment which is \$293.00. I asked then for a figure after 5 years which I was told was impossible for him to do then & there & was denied me.

“I then went to the Solicitor who did the legals for me & was told it was a ‘Balloon contract’. After 5 years all I would have paid off is a very small margin of principal off my loan being around \$1,300.00. If I was refinanced by the same firm (probably at a higher interest rate again) I would be nearly 85 years old & my beneficiaries, children, would be nearly 64 years old. And if I was a bad credit risk I would have to find finance elsewhere”

They are letters that come basically from people in the electorate of Toowoomba North who approached Dr Lockwood with this problem, but he rejected them out of hand and was not prepared to bring the matters before the notice of this Parliament. Again I make the accusation that this is a typical example of the little concern that the Liberal Party shows for the people of Queensland, and I challenge the Liberal Party Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and the Treasurer to introduce legislation to protect people in situations such as these.

Dr LOCKWOOD: I rise to a point of order. Again the honourable member has referred to certain documents. I ask that they be tabled.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kaus): Order! They have already been tabled.

Mr POWELL (Isis) (5.35 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak in support of

the Appropriation Bill. In the past the Queensland Government has shown very good stewardship. As a result, the State has progressed quickly and in a manner that would satisfy most people.

The Bill simply asks Parliament to approve the expenditure of certain sums of money from certain funds. I suppose that each member has the opportunity to suggest to the Government the way in which the money should be spent. It is important that in debating this fiscal legislation each member present to the Government projects that should be looked at very closely in his electorate. Unlike a previous speaker, I have enough work in my electorate without having to annoy other members or to attempt to do work for them. My electorate is a fairly large one and it requires a good deal of time spent in it.

Mr McKechnie: Would you say that members who go into other members' electorates are probably neglecting their own electorates?

Mr POWELL: That is most definitely correct.

Over the past 5½ years it has been my policy to bring to the attention of this Parliament the problems that confront the people in the Isis electorate. The greatest problem confronting them at the moment is the drought. Unlike other people, I do not blame the Government for the drought. I guess a lot of other members would like to blame the Government for it; but of course, they cannot do that.

Mr Shaw: You take credit for the rain.

Mr POWELL: I have never taken any credit for the rain. In fact, if it were to rain in my area I would be very happy indeed. Rain would help solve the problem that confronts us. The problem is that we just have not had any rain. The Isis area is suffering from its fourth year of below-average annual rainfall. Over the past 84 years the average annual rainfall in the Isis area was 1 090 mm. In contrast, the average annual rainfall registered in the Isis area over the last three years was only 682 mm. That indicates a 68 per cent annual average rainfall. Most people would understand that that has a very serious economic impact on the district.

The Isis mill area has proved that it is capable of producing in excess of 1 000 000 t of cane in a season. In the last three years, the mill's production has been seriously depleted because of drought.

The thing that the cane growers of the Isis area just cannot stomach is the existence of a dam nearly full of water only a short distance away. The Fred Haigh Dam was finished approximately six years ago. It is presently reticulating water to a significant number of growers in the Bundaberg district and in the Millaquin, Qunaba and Fairymead mill areas. Water is also reticulated to a few growers in the Bingera mill area. As yet, the growers in the Isis area are not receiving

one drop of water from the dam. If the scheme had proceeded at the rate at which we were told 10 years ago it would proceed, water would now be reticulated to the farms in the Isis area.

The blame must be sheeted home to the Federal Government because that Government promised to fund the scheme. It was originally to cost \$47m but it might finish up costing about \$147m or even more. In 1974 the Federal Government decided not to fund the scheme any further, and the rot set in. It must be said, with the greatest of charity, that most of us believed, with a change of Government in Canberra, that funds would flow to this very valuable project.

The plain economic fact is that if the Isis area had been able to produce sugar to its total peak in each of the past three years, the Federal Government would have gained handsomely through tax provisions. We know that the Federal Government is the income tax collector in this nation. But, through the ineptitude of the Federal Government and its slowness in delivering the goods, the scheme has been proceeding in a very slow fashion. It is quite clear that the State Government has done everything possible. No fair person would blame the State Government for the present situation. But, even with the greatest of charity, the people find it very difficult to support the Federal Government's attitude.

The Federal Government made an election promise three years ago that it would spend \$200m on water resource programs in the following five years. However, three years later, it has spent only \$45m of that \$200m. It was to spend an average of \$40m a year, so it is currently about \$80m behind.

Perhaps tonight Mr Howard will tell us that \$80m will be provided for water resource programs in Australia to fulfil the Government's promises. I have serious doubts about whether that will occur. According to the information that has been leaked, the Government will announce a \$38m surplus. I will be the first to congratulate that Government if it can present a more or less balanced Budget because it is in the interests of the nation that that occur. However, I can see no reason why it cannot provide at least \$10m of that surplus for the Isis section of the Bundaberg-Isis Irrigation Scheme and end up with a \$28m surplus.

Mr Yewdale interjected.

Mr POWELL: It could be said for any other part of Australia, as the honourable member for Rockhampton North said. But it is important to remember that, unlike our area, not every other part of Australia has been guaranteed funds for irrigation.

Apart from the economic impact of the drought in the Isis area and the lack of action by the Federal Government to get the scheme moving at a sensible rate, Childers has a serious town water supply shortage. Its scheme is 40 years old and it depends

on bores. That is not unusual in many towns in Queensland. The unusual aspect is that although the Childers area is very close to the Bundaberg subartesian basin it cannot find adequate water close by for its town water supply. The Isis Shire Council, after years of investigation, has come up with a town water supply scheme which would satisfy the needs of Childers and Woodgate for probably the next 40 years. The drawback is the cost, which is conservatively estimated at \$2.7m. Frankly, I do not believe that the people of Childers and Woodgate should be lumbered with a cost of \$343 per annum for a domestic water supply. That is exactly the cost that will be thrust upon them—\$343 just for water.

Over and above that, of course, they have to pay general rates, cleansing rates, and so on. It has been put to the Government that a grant of \$917,000 would bring the water cost per consumer down to \$200 per year which is, in my view, still extremely expensive. However, when people have no water an expensive scheme may be the only way out.

In this debate on the Appropriation Bill the Parliament should be brought up to date with the current situation. In the opinion of many people in the district the Bundaberg irrigation scheme ought to be advanced quickly so that water may be reticulated from the Fred Haigh Dam to the Isis area, and in particular to the Childers district, so that both schemes may operate concurrently. It makes not one bit of economic sense, to my mind, for a local authority to have to spend almost \$3,000,000 on a town water supply scheme when the district as a whole is facing a drought and when that entire drought-stricken district could be relieved by accelerating work on the Bundaberg-Isis irrigation scheme.

I bring this matter to the notice of the Treasurer because I believe that the Government must treat it as a special case. I know of no other part of Queensland that is in a similar situation. In most places a creek or river can be dammed to supply the water that is required, but in the Isis area there are only a couple of dry gullies. This area has the potential to produce a lot more than it is producing. It makes no sense at all for a local authority to spend \$3,000,000 on a town scheme when the rest of the district will remain drought stricken. I am very pleased that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police has convened a meeting of interested persons and took a submission to Cabinet. He will be taking a further submission to Cabinet which, I hope, will satisfy the needs of the district. The State Budget is a fairly tight document, but it will have to take into account this very serious problem that is facing us.

A further point that should be made is that the cane growers of the district are willing to look seriously at the idea of local involvement. To my knowledge this has not yet been done in Queensland. The directors of

the Isis mill are prepared to put the proposition to the mill shareholders that they contribute towards the acceleration of the scheme. It must be emphasised that we are not trying to advance the Isis area at the expense of another part of the scheme. I emphasise that the priorities were set 10 years ago, but it must be remembered that had the Federal Government played its part as promised in 1969 the scheme would be finished and I would not have to fight for water for Childers, Woodgate or the Isis district as a whole. I acknowledge that it was a Government different from the present one, or even the one that we had from 1972 to 1975. The people of the Isis electorate think constantly of the promise by this Government and the Federal Government to enter into the Burdekin scheme.

It may be remembered that when that legislation went through this Parliament I did not vote against it. In fact, I said then, and I repeat it now, that water conservation projects in this State, and in fact in this country, ought to be supported because this country is comparatively parched and needs water conservation projects. However, it must be emphasised that the Bundaberg/Isis irrigation scheme satisfies the needs of existing growers and, in fact, of existing assigned land as at 1970. It does not include the expansion of 1974, nor does it include the present expansion. Those new lands are outside the scope of the irrigation project. Again it must be emphasised that the Isis scheme is designed for existing growers who are currently attempting to produce sugar-cane on their land. It is not for new growers. It does not satisfy the needs of any new projects.

On the other hand, the Burdekin scheme will satisfy the needs of new growers and new land. Personally, I believe it is important for the Government to get its priorities straight and ensure that it provides enough finance for the Bundaberg/Isis irrigation scheme in order to satisfy the needs of the existing growers. Their position should be made economically viable and secure so that drought does not cause serious economic harm to the district as a whole.

I suggest that in the next week or so Cabinet look very seriously at the proposition, which I have put to it through the Minister for Local Government, that the priorities of the Bundaberg/Isis irrigation scheme be changed so that the present areas on the north side of the Burnett River receive the allocation that would normally go to them; but also that there should be a concurrent development on the south side of the Burnett River and in the Isis area in order to satisfy the needs of those very badly drought-stricken areas. It is quite clear that if the Federal Treasury is to collect the total amount of income that it believes it needs, this scheme must be developed as quickly as possible. The State Government should look seriously at providing a special allocation of \$10m for the

Isis scheme this year so that it can be advanced in order to satisfy the needs of the people in these areas.

Another subject on which I wish to comment is the Local Government Grants Commission. I do not have the allocation figures for all the local authorities in Queensland. In fact, I have the figures for only the local authorities in the Wide Bay area. I am pleased that the local authorities in my electorate have received an increased allocation. I might say that the increase was justly deserved because, in my view, some of these local authorities have been treated very badly in the past.

It is pleasing to note that the Bundaberg City Council is to receive an allocation of \$404,000, but when that is compared with the allocation received by the Mt Isa City Council, which has a smaller population, and the Mackay City Council, which has a similar-sized area, I am rather disappointed that the figure is so low. I am very pleased when I see that the Hervey Bay Town Council is to receive a 50 per cent increase, taking its allocation to \$201,000. However, I have a great deal of difficulty in accepting the fact that the Gympie City Council is to receive \$236,000, which is \$35,000 more than that received by the Hervey Bay Town Council, yet the city of Gympie is smaller in area and has a smaller population than Hervey Bay. I cannot understand why on earth the Gympie City Council should receive a greater sum than the Hervey Bay Town Council.

I now look at a further anomaly. The Widgee Shire Council is to receive an allocation of \$354,000. Admittedly, that is an increase of only 35 per cent on its last allocation, but in my view it is far too much. I compare that with Hervey Bay, Woon-garra and Isis and, when one thinks of anomalies, it pales into insignificance for it is quite clear that Widgee, with a population similar to that of Hervey Bay and Gympie—but larger in area—should receive 50 per cent more than Hervey Bay. I do not believe that that is fair.

In Queensland, local government is receiving from the Grants Commission 2 per cent of the Federal income tax collection. I certainly applaud that idea. It is a very good idea indeed, but the formula and the way in which that formula has been advanced are what I complain about. It is worrying that some of the coastal local authorities in my electorate, while apparently receiving a far better deal than last year, in my view still do not receive a fair deal. For example, Isis receives \$154,000. After what I have said about its water problems here this evening, surely it needs a whole lot more than \$154,000.

I am told that water problems and water-supply problems are not considered by the Local Government Grants Commission. I believe they should be. I believe it is right and proper that the Local Government Grants Commission should look at the rate

structures of local authorities. I am told that one reason Hervey Bay receives such a small amount is that its rates are so low. The rates paid by people in the Hervey Bay Town Council area are among the lowest in Queensland. That area certainly has the lowest rate in the dollar. Surely that has been brought about by good housekeeping on the part of the local authority. I do not see why a local authority which practices good housekeeping and keeps its rates low should have the imposition placed on it of receiving a smaller amount from the Local Government Grants Commission. Although the amounts received by local authorities this year from the Grants Commission are far better than last year—there is no question about that—they ought to be better, especially for the local authorities in my electorate that I have mentioned.

Before I conclude, I mention a problem at the Urangan Boat Harbour. I asked the Minister a question about that today. I understand that the contract figure for dredging was \$350,000. That may be confirmed or denied by the Minister tomorrow. I was also informed through the local media that the contractor contracted to spend a certain amount of money rather than to do a set amount of work. Surely there is something wrong with that. Surely the body that called tenders should have decided how much work had to be done. Surely it is not correct that a contractor, once he has spent the amount of money that he stated he could do the job for, can then turn to the Government and say that he cannot continue because he has run out of money. If that is the case then there is something seriously wrong with the way in which tenders were called. Perhaps tomorrow the Minister will state that that is not the way it happened. However, according to the local media it is. The officers of the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism should look very seriously at the way in which they call tenders. If a contractor has contracted to do work for \$350,000 and is unable to do it for that figure, he should be made to complete the work for which he has contracted.

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (7.15 p.m.): On 12 March this year I spoke in the debate on Matters of Public Interest about a mutual home loan scheme which is operating in Queensland. At that time I referred to the scheme as legal robbery. I also called on the Justice Minister to take action to protect Queenslanders who were being ripped off by these companies. I specifically spoke on that occasion about two people I was representing.

At this date, the number of people who have asked me to assist them has grown to 84, with new people contacting me almost every day. Their investment in the funds at this stage totals almost \$300,000. Most of these people have, in the past, contacted either the Justice Minister or the Corporate

Affairs Office, but in true Queensland Government style the Justice Minister sticks his head in the sand and hopes that they will go away. I would like to inform the Justice Minister that as long as I can continue to talk I will fight to see that these people get justice.

I can remember when I first became a member of Parliament asking the Health Minister to investigate a problem in my electorate. It took 16 months and a change of Health Ministers to get action. Perhaps that is what is needed now—a change of Ministers. If Dr Edwards had not been so weak when elected Leader of the Liberal Party, and had gone ahead with the change of Ministers, perhaps we would have a Minister who would be prepared to take strong action.

I would like to briefly outline the events since 12 March.

Dr Edwards: You won't be here after the next election, anyway.

Mr MACKENROTH: I certainly will, but there is not much chance of the Treasurer's being the Leader of the Liberal Party after the next election, because he won't be here.

On 1 April the ABC program "Nation-wide" ran a segment on this subject. In that segment George Smith interviewed Mr Barry Alfred Brown, Chairman of Directors of Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited and Intercapital Finance Corporation Limited. During the course of that interview Mr Brown promised that for any member who wished to leave the company he would sell the shares and they would receive his money by 30 June 1980. I will table a transcript of that interview.

Following that interview I arranged for 21 members to advise Mr Brown that they wished to have their shares sold. On 12 June I received a phone call from Mr Brown stating that he wished to speak to me about the sale of members' shares. I agreed to speak to him and arranged a meeting in my office for Friday, 13 June 1980.

At that meeting Mr Brown was accompanied by Mr Ross Barnett, the new company secretary, and Mr Maher Suliman, the national marketing manager for Executive Counsellors Pty Ltd, the new superannuation company which I referred to briefly in my first speech. Mr Brown claimed that problems were being experienced in the selling of members' shares as they had received a greater number of requests than expected. Mr Suliman outlined how the superannuation scheme would be the saviour of the funds. They then asked me not to make any public statements about not being able to meet the 30 June deadline, and tried to convince me that they really had the shareholders' interest at heart. I informed them that I would give them no undertaking, but would consider the matter if they supplied me with further information.

I asked them to provide me with the names and addresses of the shareholders who had informed them that they wished to sell, the names and addresses of the shareholders who had had their shares sold and the names and addresses of the purchasers. To this request I received a letter that I will later table. It simply outlines the number of people still wanting to sell, which was 76, and the number of members whose shares they had sold—three.

I also asked for actuarial reports which they had told me had been done for the superannuation people and for further information on the superannuation scheme, including hypothetical superannuation figures with expected pay-out figures for anyone who joined the scheme. I received copies of actuarial reports which had been prepared for the mutual home loan companies in New South Wales during the 70s, all of which have been proved incorrect, and a ten-page document outlining the superannuation scheme, which was simply a sales pitch that told one nothing.

After assessing the information supplied and, more particularly, the information not supplied, as all the specific information I had asked for had been skirted around—not one name had been given to me, nor had figures or any actuarial report on the present state of the fund—I decided to inform Mr Brown that I intended to ask the Justice Minister for legislative controls over the companies. I informed Mr Brown of my decision by telegram on 30 June. I then received a telephone call from Mr Brown asking why I had made my decision, and I told him. Subsequently I received a telephone call from Mr Maher Suliman in Melbourne. I will refer later to that phone call.

On 19 July the company held a meeting at the Greek Community Centre for all members who wished to sell. At that meeting the company suggested that the members should form a shareholders' association to work with the company.

An association was formed, but unfortunately the company has not been very co-operative. The chairman of the association has written to the company asking that certain information be supplied to shareholders. To date, none has been supplied. Last Thursday, the chairman was told by Mr Barnett, the company secretary, that the company had more important things to do than answer questions put forward by the association—the same association that they suggested be formed.

I believe that their change of attitude since 19 July is because at that meeting an officer from the Corporate Affairs was present and they sold him the impression that they were concerned and would assist shareholders, but outside the meeting they once again just laughed at the shareholders.

I believe the questions asked by the association to be important. They include questions on the amounts of money lent to

other corporations, a list of shares held by the funds, and also other questions. I will table a copy of all questions which have been asked, none of which has been answered.

The companies, now safe in the knowledge that the Justice Minister will protect them, and in fact take no action at all to protect the ordinary shareholder, have offered shareholders 40 per cent of their money payable in six months' time.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Would you think there could be a possibility that they could be contributing to Liberal Party campaign funds?

Mr MACKENROTH: In Queensland, nothing would surprise me.

The shareholders' association has asked the companies to supply the names and addresses of the proposed purchaser for this deal, but once again they have refused to supply any information. The committee of the shareholders' association fears that the purchaser could be a \$2 company set up by the directors of the fund which could be put into liquidation, perhaps in five months' time, before paying any money. Therefore, the shareholders could lose their money. If the directors of the home loan companies continue to refuse to give this information, one can only assume that they have something to hide.

The offer I have referred to was included in the companies' latest news-letter. Also in that news-letter was a brazen use of the Justice Minister's name. It was implied in that news-letter that Mr Lickiss supported the companies. I would challenge the Justice Minister to categorically state his position in relation to these companies. I would like to know if he does support these companies, and if he is going to continue allowing them to use his name in their propaganda.

The Justice Minister continues to state that he will not take any action until there is disclosure of illegal practices. I think that the question is more a moral one: Should we, as members of Parliament, allow ordinary people to be fleeced of their hard-earned savings?

The type of people we are dealing with in these companies was shown to me on 30 June in the telephone call by Mr Suliman I referred to earlier. Mr Suliman, acting as a middle man for the home loan companies, phoned me and offered me a directorship of both home loan companies. He claimed that I could serve the shareholders of the funds better if I accepted this offer rather than call on the Justice Minister to take action. I took this offer as a clumsy attempt by the companies to shut me up, and I told him so.

I looked on this offer as an attempt to bribe me into shutting up. If I had proof of this attempt at bribery, I would have asked the police to take action under section 60 of the Criminal Code, which deals with attempts to bribe members of Parliament.

Unlike the Justice Minister, who wants his case presented to him all wrapped up before

he starts any investigations, I am convinced that these companies are not acting in the best interests of their shareholders, and when an investigation is held, I think shareholders will be in for a shock with the findings of that investigation.

The same people who are running the Queensland funds and some of the people who are running the superannuation fund were involved with three similar companies in New South Wales. Those companies are now being run by a New South Wales Government administrator. He has found that these people have been responsible for losing millions of dollars through bad investments, mostly in companies which they controlled.

Earlier in my speech I referred to the meeting that was held on 19 July. I attended that meeting as a proxy for a number of shareholders in Queensland, and it was the greatest farce that I have ever seen. Although the Minister for Justice requested that an officer from the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office attend the meeting, the things that were put over the shareholders there were farcical. The directors had at that meeting a man named Stephen Roy Coleman, representing the superannuation companies, who got up at the meeting and told the shareholders that he, acting for the superannuation company, was very pleased with the way that the company had presented its case that day. He said he would go back and report to the superannuation fund management on the fine state that these companies were in. Mr Coleman was appointed director of both the home loan funds on 17 July 1979. Other directors of the superannuation fund are directors of the home loan fund. Those people should well have known the state of those companies before 19 July.

As well, the meeting was attended by a man named Triggs from New South Wales. He stood up and told the shareholders that the last thing they wanted was Government intervention. He told them that if the Government intervened they would lose all their money. He told them that shareholders in New South Wales had in fact lost money.

I telephoned the New South Wales Government administrator on the Monday following that meeting and asked him if any shareholders in Sydney had lost their money. He said that up to that date there had not been any pay-outs, so therefore nobody had lost any money. He also said that the same Mr Triggs had been in his office on the Wednesday prior to the meeting on 19 July and had told him that the best thing that had happened in New South Wales was Government intervention. That shows this Mr Triggs to be a complete liar. At the invitation of these crooks who are running the Queensland company he attended the meeting to try to help them get over their problems.

Since December 1978 both companies have lent money to 20 loan priority numbers. This was told to the people on the day. One

would see that that represents only 10 people. That would make approximately five loans per company to these people. It shows that even under this new management—they are trying to convince the people that they are doing a good job—they are doing nothing at all.

They talk about the superannuation fund as being the saviour; they say it will save the Queensland home loan companies. It is a company that is registered in Canberra and has its offices in Melbourne. It operates through Melbourne and is now starting to sell home loan shares to a company registered in Queensland. The thing is that the same superannuation company went into New South Wales and asked the Government of that State for permission to sell a superannuation scheme through the home loan funds in New South Wales. However, the New South Wales Government kicked it out and would not have a bar of it. Queensland is going to allow it to con Victorians into buying shares in this Queensland company.

When I asked these people from the superannuation company how the system worked, they did not really want to tell me. After we went through the scheme with them and I subsequently asked further questions on the telephone, I found out that when a person buys a superannuation scheme a trust is set up, and when the person's trust is set up it buys home loan shares. Next, if his priority number which is owned by his trust should ever get a loan, his trust gets the loan for a house and he then has to rent his house from his own trust.

On today's housing costs, he would have to pay \$200 a month off his loan for his house and his trust would then pay off the loan. However, that cost goes up each year in line with inflation. We would find that in nine years' time, instead of paying off \$200 as a person would through a building society, he would be paying \$400. That is based on an inflation rate of 10 per cent, which we have at the present time.

This person would be paying that money into his own trust. I suggest he would be better off if he were to bank his money. If someone takes out superannuation in a superannuation company, he relies on his superannuation company to have a portfolio of diversified investments, thereby making sure that if anything goes wrong with one of the investments he will not lose a lot of money. Under the scheme that this company is proposing, all a person's eggs will be in one basket—in his own basket—and he will be paying his own interest.

I cannot see how that sort of scheme can possibly work. People should not be able to put forward such a scheme to Victorians, Queenslanders or any other Australians. These people will be selling that superannuation scheme and trying to say that the people will have the opportunity of getting

a cheap home loan. On many occasions I have said in this Parliament and through the media that these people have not received very many loans.

I refer now to some of the quick action that has been taken by Queensland Ministers in relation to these home loan funds. On 6 August, one of the people I am representing received a letter reading—

"I acknowledge receipt of your letter concerning the Federated Housing Fund, and wish to advise that this matter is being investigated—"

that is the crux—

". . . at the present time by the Minister for Justice, Mr Lickiss.

"I am hopeful a decision will be made in the near future. I have written to him to receive a letter of explanation and I shall write to you again as soon as possible.

"Yours sincerely,

"Dr L. R. Edwards

"Deputy Premier and Treasurer and Member for Ipswich."

He wrote that letter to one of his constituents.

Those people received from Mr Lickiss a letter dated 7 August. Remember that Dr Edwards had stated on 6 August that Mr Lickiss was investigating these funds and that he was hopeful a decision would be made in the near future. The people had written to Mr Lickiss as well and his reply reads—

"I am in receipt of your letter of 22nd July, 1980 concerning the abovementioned companies which were incorporated pursuant to the provisions of the Companies Act 1961-1978.

"I was requested by the media to make a comment on this situation which was then not accurately reported. For your information, I am enclosing herewith the comment which I made to the media.

"Your representations have received careful consideration but it is considered that the comment previously made by me still applies.

"I am advised by my officers that an offer has been made to shareholders of the companies—"

that is the 40 per cent offer—

". . . and that these offers are presently being considered.

"I would repeat that, should there be any disclosures brought to my attention concerning any illegality in relation to the management of these companies, I would certainly take whatever steps were necessary to ensure proper compliance with the law and I would add that no such disclosures have yet been brought to my attention."

The attached statement from the Justice Minister was released on 21 July. Remember that Dr Edwards said that it was being investigated. The statement reads—

“I have received a report from a Corporate Affairs officer who was present at Saturday’s meeting. Any action by the State Government in this matter will be dependent on it being established that there has been a breach of the statutory provisions under which the companies concerned operate.

“No evidence has been placed before me which would indicate there has been any breach of these statutory provisions. The present circumstances relate directly to the internal management of the companies concerned.”

It goes on to say that Lickiss did not intend to do anything.

This person then received a letter from Dr Edwards reading—

“I enclose a letter dated 8th August, 1980 I have received from the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, following representations made on your behalf. I understand that you have already received correspondence from the Honourable W. D. Lickiss, M.L.A., and trust that he has been of assistance to you.”

Assistance! All he told the person to do was to run away and forget about it because he does not intend to help him. In the statement that he released through the media, he said he wants proof. I do not know what the Minister for Justice wants me to do. Does he want me to bring these people along to his office handcuffed and in prisoners’ suits? Since March I have given in this Parliament and in the statements that I have made enough proof to warrant investigation by the Minister for Justice. In 1973, Mr Knox was Minister for Justice.

Mr Frawley: And a good Minister, too.

Mr MACKENROTH: He was better than the present one. At least he was willing to have a go. Even if he did make a complete botch of it, he did try. He set up an inquiry. At that time he did not have any proof. The present Minister for Justice says that he wants proof. The previous Minister did not have proof; he just knew that something was wrong and he got his investigators to go to the Companies Office, freeze all of these books and investigate them. The document of over 100 foolscap pages that the investigating officer compiled was tabled in this Parliament. I am sure it showed enough for the Queensland Government to take action in 1973 to close those companies down.

In fact, the Corporate Affairs Office tried that. It took the company to court and tried to get it closed down because it was not a building society. If one reads the transcript of that case one finds that the Corporate Affairs Office made a complete botch of its case. When the case went to court it was found that the entire report made by

the then Mr Connolly QC was inadmissible as evidence. The only evidence allowed was his summing-up, which ran to about four paragraphs. The evidence showed that a person named Brian Maher, of whom I have heard the honourable member for Archerfield speak in this Parliament, received \$50,000 in 1972 just for lodging company documents. With inflation that would probably be \$100,000 now, something for which any solicitor would receive about \$600.

Mr K. J. Hooper: With reference to Mr Brian Maher, do you realise that after I had exposed his crookedness in this House and the police arrested him, they were so inefficient that they charged him under the wrong Act and he was acquitted?

Mr MACKENROTH: That would be right; it is exactly the same thing. In 1973, the Justice Department made a mistake with its case. But when that case was thrown out of court, instead of coming back to this Parliament and introducing amending legislation or pursuing the matter in some other way, the Justice Minister forgot about it, and therefore he forgot the people of Queensland who were losing money. After that the companies went out and said, “We have beaten the Queensland Government on this matter.” People thought that the companies were in fact sound financially. Through an exposition of some of their business practices I have been able to prove that they were not. These men have been lending money to companies of which they are directors.

The Justice Minister wants me to prove everything. I have tabled documents in this Parliament which have shown that they have done this to one company called Rotashare. Surely the Justice Minister does not expect me to go out and do all of his investigations? That is what he pays public servants for. He has Corporate Affairs officers who are being paid as investigators. They should freeze the assets of that company until they check what has been done with the money and how much money has been lost in companies in which directors, either past or present, have a pecuniary interest. I think it will be found that there has been a lot.

I referred earlier to questions that were asked at that meeting and I will briefly mention a few of them.

Mr Frawley: The fact that they wanted you as a director should have convinced him they were a shocking company. What did they offer you? Tell us that.

Mr MACKENROTH: They offered me a directorship. Unfortunately, I did not string them along; perhaps I should have. I told the person who made the offer to go jump in the lake and hung up in his ear.

Mr Frawley: I am going to come into your electorate and help you retain your seat.

Mr MACKENROTH: I hope the honourable member is going to come in and campaign for the Liberal Party candidate, because that would ensure a win for me.

At that meeting we asked them to supply us within 14 days with a list of all moneys owing to the funds by either corporations or individuals outside loan allocations to priority numbers. I have shown here that about half of the money held by these companies is lent out to either corporations or individuals, but we are not able to find out to which companies it has been lent. That is something the Justice Minister would find out in an investigation.

We want to know the names of the corporations or individuals and the amounts owing. We want to know the original value of the loan, the date it was made, the interest rate, the type of security held by the fund on each loan and the expected date the loan will be finalised. I think if we found out that sort of information the people in those funds would be able to make a sound judgment on whether they should throw their shares away or keep going. People continually ask me what I suggest they should do, and this places me in a very invidious position because I do not know what to tell them. How can I tell people to throw away their life savings? If they were my shares I would throw them away because I believe that, if the Justice Minister in this State does not take some action, they are worthless.

I call upon the Premier or Deputy Premier of this State to order the Justice Minister to do something. If he will not do anything, he should be sacked. Around the corridors of this Parliament we hear Liberal members complaining about the Justice Minister, saying that he is weak and will do nothing. The back-bench members of the Liberal Party are just waiting for the day when he gets the sack. He is not prepared to do anything. The Premier or the Deputy Premier should force him into the situation where he will do something.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Mr Bourke shakes his head in the gallery. He agrees with you.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is good. I believe that the member for Sherwood has the long knife drawn for him. They should get rid of him and put in his place somebody who is prepared to do the job. I am sick and tired of continually giving the Justice Minister information about these companies and his not being prepared to do anything about them.

Mr Frawley: Who do you suggest should take his place?

Mr MACKENROTH: I think that Bob Gibbs would be the best man in the Justice portfolio.

I conclude on that note. It is about time that the Queensland Government started to look after the people who vote for it.

Mr McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (7.41 p.m.): I think it is rather a shame that we have to take part in this debate on the Appropriation Bill at a time when drought is crippling

many parts of Queensland. It is having a very severe effect on the finances of the people involved and also of the Government. I commend the Government for the initiative it has taken to try to cushion the effect of the drought on those people who have been affected so much by it. Of course, there are more ways of helping people than those presently sanctioned by law. This Government and the Federal Government should consider providing further concessions to the people in these areas.

At the present time the Queensland Government is losing revenue through what I believe is a needless industrial dispute. I am referring to the dispute about the tax on miners' houses. The Queensland Government is losing net income of at least \$4.5m a week. The miners and their families are suffering a lot of hardship, and they have my sympathy. As well, the Federal Government is losing revenue. Just as importantly, Australia and Queensland are losing their names as reliable exporters. I join with the member for Peak Downs (Mr Lester), the Premier and the Treasurer in calling on the Federal Government to take some positive steps to end this dispute.

People should not be fooled into believing that it is only a dispute between the miners and the Federal Government. It extends right across the board and includes public servants, station employees and just about everybody who lives in a subsidised home in the country. Traditionally, it has been the one incentive to attract people to those areas. It is time that the Federal Government found some means whereby the miners will not have to pay the tax. If this dispute is to be solved, I think that there has to be a face-saver on both sides. I do not think we should set the precedent under which the miners and others have to pay this increased tax. Our revenue is suffering immensely as a result of this dispute.

At the present time there is much talk about a tax revolt, and I am pleased that the Queensland Government has led the revolt. We have abolished many taxes. We have abolished road permit fees and road maintenance taxes. We provide the best payroll tax exemptions in Australia. We have abolished State death duties. In fact, we forced the Federal Government to follow our lead. The same comment applies to gift duties. Some say that this causes a loss in revenue. I dispute that because the increased employment that has been generated by the reduction of these taxes in Queensland has brought more revenue to the Government and has brought about increased employment in Queensland.

Mr Blake: Haven't we got any unemployed in Queensland?

Mr McKECHNIE: I am pleased the honourable member asked that question because I had the Parliamentary Library research the increase in employment in the various States

of Australia over the last five years. These figures come from the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics and indicate the number of people employed, including those who are self-employed. In the five years to February last, in Queensland employment has risen by 11.79 per cent. It is interesting to note that in what was the Labor State of South Australia employment has risen only 2.56 per cent. In New South Wales employment increased 6.12 per cent. In Victoria employment increased by 7.89 per cent. The figure in Tasmania is 6.32 per cent.

Honourable members opposite do not like hearing the truth, but the average increase in employment in the southern States in that period was only 6.32 per cent. If the other States had the same employment record as Queensland, there would be virtually no unemployment in Australia today.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: That is a fact. The Opposition does not seem to be capable of understanding it.

Mr Yewdale: Seven per cent of the workforce is out of work.

Mr McKECHNIE: The Opposition speaks of the percentage of unemployed in Queensland. Of course, this affects not only their lives—they are the ones I am most concerned about—but also the revenue of the Government.

The fact of the matter is that unemployment in Queensland is largely imported. If over the last five years every State had an increase in employment of 11.79 per cent, there would not be people coming here seeking employment because they would have jobs in their own States. Because this is a free country we welcome them to Queensland; we welcome new settlers. The reasons for the high rate of unemployment in this State are the policies of other Governments.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: If the honourable member wishes I will table the documents so that he can study them. I am sure Opposition members would not accuse the Parliamentary Library of political bias.

I think I have proved my point to any reasonable person, but of course the Opposition does not like to hear about the success story of development in Queensland. The Opposition does nothing but knock it. Every project that this Government tries to get off the ground, the Opposition tries to find some way of blocking it.

But the facts are here. In Queensland over the last five years there has been an increase in employment of 11.79 per cent. If the southern States had the same record, the unemployment situation in Australia today would be virtually solved.

Be that as it may, I am sure the Queensland Government will not rest on its laurels but will continue to try to find ways of overcoming the unemployment problem in this

State, which exists largely because the other States have not done their job. I believe that a major national study should be undertaken to determine logical and economically feasible long-term policies to improve the industrial relations climate in Australia.

I am not one of those, as the Opposition sometimes tries to make out, who put the cause of all industrial disputes at the feet of the unions. Just a while ago I said that the Federal Government had a very heavy responsibility in the current dispute in the mining fields. We have to find a better solution to the problems of industrial relations in Australia.

To aid youth employment, apprenticeship-training schemes should be widened and stepped up. There should be an urgent review of the apprenticeship Act. The block release scheme is not working—

Mr Vaughan: It doesn't exist any more.

Mr McKECHNIE: The member knows what I mean. It is the Industry and Commerce Training Act, if he wants to be technical.

Pre-vocational training in industry should be stepped up and encouraged. That is part of the Act to which the honourable member has just drawn my attention. Schemes should also be directed at training adults.

Mr Vaughan: That is in the new Act.

Mr McKECHNIE: Of course it is, but I am saying that it should be stepped up. I was pleased the other day to receive a phone call from a Government official in South Australia asking my opinion on it. He knew that I was interested in it and had done some research, because it was reported in the Press that I was doing some research on this matter.

To assist employer and employee harmony in the interests of keeping people employed, there should be wider avenues of appeal to the Industrial Court as well as a right of appeal to the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission so that both sides can have more faith in the arbitration system than they have now. Just the other day in relation to the current ETU dispute we heard that some of the unions do not have much faith in the commission. That would be a worthwhile measure, not only to give the unions more faith in the commission but also to give it to the employers as well. That would help employment and assist the economy of this State, and thus aid the Treasurer in his budgeting.

Mr Davis: Are you in favor of robot shearers?

Mr McKECHNIE: If the member for Brisbane Central was one, I would be.

Taxation concessions should be given to double-income families, to encourage those women who do not want to work but feel they have to through necessity, to stay at home, thus making jobs available to young

school-leavers. I am sure some members of the Opposition would agree with me on that.

This Government should step up its pre-employment training courses. There is such a course in Stanthorpe at the moment. It is the Grade 11 course, and it has given students a new form of education. I have no doubt that at the end of the year they will be much more employable than they would have been if they had not undertaken that course.

While we are talking about the Treasurer's problems in trying to administer the finances of this State it should be noted that the Opposition Leader (Mr Casey) recently announced that it was ALP policy to bring in reduced working hours over a period when the ALP considered that the economy could afford it. We are an exporting State, and there is ample evidence to prove that reduced working hours could lead to more unemployment, not less. The Opposition, with its tie-up with its Left-wing unions, is not prepared to face reality.

When the ALP spoke about the 40-hour week we had a very low rate of inflation and quite high employment. The argument that applied to the 48-hour week does not apply to the 35-hour week.

Mr Kruger: Do you agree with the statement made by Sir William Knox recently that, if people are left in the work-force longer, they will create more employment?

Mr McKECHNIE: What we should be doing at the moment is bringing about more early retirement. That should be done. However, a general reduction in working hours would be the greatest tragedy that ever hit Australia. It would create more unemployment.

I was amazed to hear the honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Wright) speak about socialised motels, and so on. Without doubt, the honourable member for Rockhampton is the member of the Opposition for whom I have most respect, and I respect him also as a person. The speech that he delivered today was well thought out, and it is obvious that it is Opposition policy. I took careful note of what he said. He believes that the Government should become more involved in socialising industry—that is what he meant—and he spoke about motels and other things. If that is ALP policy coming from the shadow Treasurer, God help Queensland if the ALP ever gains the Treasury benches.

The honourable member for Rockhampton spoke also about Government financing and being a partner in enterprises of many types. To do that, of course, the Government would have to borrow money before it could increase Government revenue as he suggested. The people of Australia have to wake up to the fact that one of the main

reasons why interest rates are high is that Governments are borrowing too much money in competition with the private sector, which drives interest rates up. When people come to me and say, "Why won't the Government do this? Why won't the Government do that?", I very politely point out to them that there are many things that the Government would like to do but that there is a limit to how far Governments can tax people and a limit to how much money Governments can borrow. That contrasts very sharply with the attitude of the spokesman for the Opposition, who thinks that the Government's providing more money is a cure for just about every ill. Australia is in the mess that it is in today because of the pressure generated by the A.L.P.

The Opposition has spent many hours in this Chamber condemning the multinational mining companies. I remember reading "Hansard" many years before coming into this Chamber and speaking to my father, who was then a member of this Assembly, about how much the Opposition knocked the mining companies coming into Queensland. They continually claimed that the State was not receiving enough royalty, despite the fact that the Government was receiving a massive profit from the operation of railway lines for which the companies provided finance. I gave the figures earlier. The Government of this State is losing \$4.5m net a week while the coalminers are out on strike. If that does not prove to ordinary people that the Government and the citizens of Queensland are doing fairly well out of the mining companies by way of revenue that never would have been available had the Opposition been allowed to squash such ventures, I do not know what will. These ventures were supported by the Government of the day, and Sir Gordon Chalk and Sir Frank Nicklin—in those days they were just Gordon Chalk and Frank Nicklin, Deputy Premier and Premier of this State—toured the world trying to get people to invest in Queensland. However, people were so used to 40 years of Labor Government that no-one wanted to come here and invest. The Treasurer's Budget is now at risk because some of that mining income is being cut off. If that is not proof of the contribution that the mining industry, encouraged by the Government, is making to the economy of Queensland, I will walk to Bourke and back.

The Government of this State has a proud record. The Government of Western Australia and the Government of Queensland are the two Governments that have created employment in Australia at a time when the economy has been depressed. I am amazed that Opposition members are not prepared to acknowledge that an 11.7 per cent increase in employment over the past five years is something to be proud of. I am amazed that Opposition members do not join with the Queensland Government in encouraging Governments in southern States

to take the same type of tax-cutting initiative as this Government has taken in an endeavour to encourage employment in Australia.

Mr K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (8.1 p.m.): I rise to express my disgust at the Government's giving a plum job to the former Deputy Leader of the National Party, Mr Ron Camm. Earlier today when this matter was raised, we saw the ruthless use of the gag and the brutal use of numbers. I was shocked. The Opposition was allowed to have only two speakers on the matter before the gag was applied. It was quite obvious that the Government had a lot to hide. It knew it was guilty of nepotism at its worst.

Giving that job to the former Deputy Leader of the National Party, Mr Ron Camm, reeks of nepotism at its worst. In fact, his appointment to the position of chairman of the Sugar Board reeks of blatant political nepotism. It is a further example of sinecures for geriatric National Party political hacks and boot-lickers.

I was appalled at the remarks made by the former Minister for Primary Industries and now Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Sullivan). He said that he had looked at other applications but had accepted Mr Camm as being the most suitable person for appointment to the position. The calling of applications for the position of chairman of the Sugar Board was an exercise in futility. The position was filled even before it was advertised. Today the Minister spoke hog-wash. He had already agreed to Mr Camm's appointment to the position of chairman of the Sugar Board.

Among all the 7 200 sugar-cane farmers in the State, people who obtain their livelihood from the industry, surely there is one who is equally competent as Mr Camm to carry out the duties attaching to the position of chairman of the Sugar Board. I am regarded in this House as a Nostradamus, and I make the prediction now that when the New Year's Honours List comes out in 1981—

Mr Porter: You'll be in it?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: No, not me. I am a republican; I do not believe in those useless baubles. I predict that Ron Camm will be made a knight of the realm.

Government Members interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: Let us wait and see. Look at two other National Party bagmen, Sir Rod Proctor and the other noble knight, or ignoble knight, Lyons. They are bagmen for the National Party and they have been rewarded with knighthoods.

Mr Camm's appointment as chairman of the Sugar Board is a further example of sinecures for geriatric National Party political hacks who are subservient to the Premier. If there was no subservience to the Premier, there would not be any plum jobs offering.

Another example of political patronage was the appointment of Sir Wallace Rae as Agent-General in London. I think all of us agree that in this modern day and age the position of Agent-General is an outmoded and unnecessary anachronism. It can be likened to the position of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. It is an expensive luxury that the State cannot afford. Indeed, I would suggest that the position of Agent-General is a relic from our colonial past. It is about as useful to the people of this State as a hat rack.

People other than Opposition members have expressed concern at the waste of public money in maintaining the Agent-General's office in London. In fact, my good friend the honourable member for Salisbury has been most trenchant in her criticism of the Government in this regard. In the Budget debate on 3 October 1978 she said—

"The estimated expenditure of the Agent-General's office in London is \$666,622."

That was two years ago. I guarantee that in the two years since then the figure has increased to an astronomical level. The honourable member for Salisbury is torn between two minds. She does not know whether she is a small "I" Liberal or a small "I" Labor person. If she is fortunate enough to be re-elected—indeed, I do not think she will be—and if she continues to improve, we might even accept her on this side of the Chamber. She is certainly the most attractive member in the Chamber.

The position of Agent-General, in this day and age, is a blatant waste.

"It appals me that Queensland, as a State of this Commonwealth, has so many migration promotion clerks in London."

These are not my words. They are the words of a prominent member of the Liberal Party, the honourable member for Salisbury, Mrs Rosemary Kyburz. She also said that this State is becoming a banana republic.

Mr Frawley: I don't believe that. She wouldn't say that.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: If honourable members want to disagree with me, all they have to do is peruse "Hansard" of that date and they will see that what I am saying is true. It is quite obvious that the honourable member for Salisbury does not disagree. If I was not spot on, she would have taken a point of order.

Mrs Kyburz: You told me you were going to say it.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I know. I like to warn the honourable member. While the honourable member for Salisbury is quite eloquent in the House at times, she is a very slow thinker and she is very slow on the uptake in regard to interjections. Being a gentleman, I do not want to take advantage of her.

Mrs Kyburz: That's not what you said this afternoon, either.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: And I rejected her proposition, too.

It is quite obvious that the extracts of the speech I have just quoted are an indication that Liberal Party members have reservations about the advantage of having the office of the Agent-General in London. I make it quite clear, and I am sure I echo the sentiments of all members of the Opposition, that the members of the Liberal Party do not have the intestinal fortitude to stand in this Chamber and say what they really think. They agree with me privately. I see in the Chamber the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services. I have his title correct this time. It is rather difficult to remember because, in the three years that he has held that portfolio, he has not introduced a Bill. I can see that he agrees with me. He said to me in the lobby a while ago that he agrees that the Agent-General is a sinecure. The position should be abolished. That is long overdue. It is certainly a relic not only of our colonial past but possibly of our medieval past.

It is strongly rumoured that Sir Wallace Rae is to be appointed as Official State Host. This is truly a joke. It is an example of blatant wasting of the taxpayers' money, which this Government tries to do from time to time. It is a blatant case of patronage and largesse by the Premier. Surely the duties proposed to be carried out by Sir Wallace Rae should be carried out by the relevant Minister or a senior public servant, not by a superannuated political lackey. It is another blatant example of jobs for the boys.

He is not in the Chamber tonight but normally we see the elderly member for Mirani waiting patiently to get the Premier's nod to succeed Sir Wallace Rae as Agent-General in London.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: He more than gave the job away. He was indiscreet in the early part of this year. He boasted that he was the next Agent-General in London. He embarrassed the Premier. He put his foot in his mouth. It is about the only time he has opened his mouth in the 8½ years I have been here. It is now doubtful whether the Premier will appoint him to this sinecure.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I am told that Sir Wallace took a lot of furniture with him.

I am reliably informed that the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs is to be appointed as Agent-General in Espiritu Santo when he retires from the House later this year. The mind boggles.

I should like to take this opportunity to refer to the Darling Downs College of Advanced Education. There is a gigantic smell and cover-up emanating from an audit of certain matters by the Auditor-General's Department. The audit was carried out by audit inspector Mr L. J. Scanlan. The report is dated 12 December 1979. I table it.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the report on the table.

Dr Edwards: Where did you get that from?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: As a matter of fact, it came from a member of the Treasury Department.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I find that very offensive to members of my department, and ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I do withdraw it. I certainly would not embarrass the senior member of the department who leaked the report to me.

The audit inspector discovered the following irregularities: firstly, as at August 1979 the institute had not submitted its final budget for 1978.

Government Members interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I am serious now. I think all honourable members would agree that this is a disgraceful state of affairs. One of the largest colleges of advanced education in this State had still not submitted its financial report for 1978 some 12 months later.

Mr Bourke interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I do not want to embarrass the honourable member for Toowoomba South, whose electorate the college is in. The honourable member for Lockyer, who lives in Toowoomba, would not have a clue. He does not know where the college is. There is a smell here. The whole of Toowoomba is talking about this, and something should be done about it.

Secondly, the institute's enrolment policies were in conflict with guide-lines laid down by Government legislation. That is stated in the report, and honourable members are at liberty to peruse it. They will see that what I am saying is spot on. Thirdly, the institute's main financial reports reveal certain inaccuracies. That is also a direct quote from the report of the audit inspector assigned by the Auditor-General to investigate the ledgers and financial statements of the institute.

Fourthly, there was a cross-membership between the institute's governing body and the board of directors of the Darling Downs Association for Advanced Education, a company which operated a residence called McGregor College for institute students. Fifthly, the audit inspector believes that the cross-membership could cause a conflict of interest between the directors of the Darling Downs Institute and the Darling Downs Association and those on the governing body of the institute. He also noted that substantial financial transactions occurred between the institute and the company.

Mr Deputy Speaker, as a man of great experience in this Assembly you would be aware that what I am saying is extremely serious and warrants the closest attention of

the Auditor-General's Department. I will make it quite clear: I think that not only should the officers of the Corporate Affairs Office be called in but that it is a job for the Police Fraud Squad.

Government Members interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I do not make that statement lightly.

I think there are too many instances of white-collar crime being swept under the carpet by this Government. On many occasions I enumerated to this Assembly the problems that existed within the building society movement. But nothing was done. The Queensland Permanent Building Society, the second largest in the State and the eighth largest in the Commonwealth, went to the wall, not with a bang but with a whimper, some three years ago, and despite that there has still been no report made to this Assembly. A lot of members will wonder why.

The answer is quite simple. A lot of the former directors of that society were prominent members and supporters of the Liberal Party. There has been a gigantic cover-up. I am only sorry that the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General is not in the Chamber tonight. I put it straight to him that most members know what I am saying is true. This Government's track record on white-collar crime is appalling. The company laws in this State are so wide that one could drive a bulldozer through them. In fact, even the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police could fit through them. The Darling Downs Association of Advanced Education is responsible for promotion and fund-raising activities. One of its prime functions is to assist in providing accommodation for students at McGregor College.

Mr Lee: What would you do to fix it?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I will take that interjection. I do not like being cruel, but the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services is certainly not the most shining light in Cabinet. We all know his performance when he was Minister in charge of building societies. Surely his skull is not that thick that I have to repeat what I said just a few moments ago. The way to tighten up on white-collar crime in this State is to tighten up the company laws. Also, officers of the Police Fraud Squad should be back where they belong—seconded to the Corporate Affairs Office—so that when there is any instance of fraud, not only do the accountants from the Corporate Affairs Office go out and investigate but the officers of the Police Fraud Squad go out, too.

Mr Bourke: You would want the police in the Education Department as well.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: That is one of the most stupid and inane interjections that have been made during my speech. It is

quite obvious that during the short time the member for Lockyer remains in this House he is doomed to remain on the back benches.

I think I have spelt out quite clearly what should happen to tighten up on white-collar crime in this State. Apart from the rather inane and facetious interjections from the lightweight honourable member for Lockyer, I can see from the intent look on the faces of honourable members on both sides of the House that they agree with me. I pay honourable members opposite this tribute: whilst some of them support big business and some are not bright, I do not think that they want to see straight-out roguery and the average person in the community being ripped off. They have the opportunity in the joint parties room to put pressure on the reactionary Premier and probably on the inefficient Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to do something about this matter.

One of the problems with this Darling Downs institute is that it conducted art unions in order to raise funds to purchase demountables, which were then erected on the campus and leased to the institute. I am not cavilling about that. Probably the motives were quite good. However, one of the matters that worries me is that the lease agreement was paid out in under three years under rather suspicious circumstances. I am sure that this warrants some investigation and explanation.

Dr Lockwood: What were those circumstances?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I think the honourable member knows as well as I do what the circumstances were. There is a smell attached to this matter. If I were to outline here tonight some of the smells that are attached to it, I might embarrass either the member for Toowoomba North or the member for Toowoomba South. So I suggest to the member for Toowoomba North that he should keep his tongue between his teeth because, quite frankly, he should remember the old adage, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

Dr Lockwood: Make an accusation.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: As I was saying, the lease was paid out within three years. Where the money was obtained has not yet been satisfactorily explained. Surely that answers the honourable member for Toowoomba North.

A perusal of the audit inspector's report reveals that he had difficulty in understanding the institute's finances. As a matter of fact, I have a number of copies of the report here. There is no need for the members of the Press to take notes; I shall take a copy of the report up to them. The report reveals that the financial certificate had been qualified to the extent of \$68,000. We all know—even people like the honourable member for Lockyer who has great difficulty in understanding the fundamentals

of accountancy would know—that if an auditor discovers that a company's accounts have been qualified, he then requires an explanation, or if no explanation is forthcoming moves are initiated by the Corporate Affairs Office and/or the Police Fraud Squad.

Mr Warner: I guarantee you that the DDIAE would welcome any investigation whatsoever.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I will accept that interjection from the honourable member for Toowoomba South for whom I have some respect. He is certainly not one of the most eloquent members in this House, but I do not think he is dishonest. I am only hoping that the Government takes up what the honourable member for Toowoomba South has suggested to me. If the institute welcomes an investigation, I think it should be conducted as quickly as possible in order to remove the cloud of suspicion that is hanging over the heads of all members of the academic and clerical staff of the institute. I think we would all agree with that suggestion. I think that the honourable member for Toowoomba South, who is a fair-minded man, would agree with it.

Mr Lee: You are planting the seed.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: It is probably a shame that the honourable Minister's father planted a seed in the first place.

There has also been a breach of the Insurance Act because the insurance company which was the insurer of the burnt-out administration building is controlled by a member of the council who is also a prominent member of the National Party. This is a Mr Griffiths, the managing director of Toowoomba Insurance and also the Southern Cross Foundry.

Every time the honourable member for Carnarvon speaks in this House, my good friend and colleague the honourable member for Brisbane Central accuses him of being a member of the League of Rights. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr Davis: I do.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I am not saying the honourable member is wrong. What I am saying is that it is well known in Toowoomba that Mr Griffiths has very close links with Mr Eric Butler, the Director of the League of Rights.

Government Members interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: It is common knowledge. I see the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs nodding his head in agreement. For him to do that, there must be a scintilla of truth in it because politically he is about 10 goose steps to the right of Genghis Khan.

According to information I have received, one of the fire chiefs reported that there were two doors open at the time of the fire and none was previously reported. There are also other allegations that two keys were found outside the building. There is a smell at this institute. What do I have to do to get this through the thick skulls of some of the honourable members on the other side of the House?

Mr Porter interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: The Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs is quite eloquent when he gets to his feet but he is a most annoying interjector. Because of his very light boy-soprano voice, it is very difficult for me to take his interjections. Had he lived in Italy some 400 or 500 years ago, I might have thought he had had some operation; his voice is extremely light.

There is seething suspicion that moneys have been paid into the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr Frawley interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: One only has to look at some of the people on the Gold Coast. Mr Keith Williams made a donation of \$25,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and was rewarded with two positions on Government-controlled boards. There is also Mr Kornhausen, another white-collar crook who went broke and ruined a lot of people. He made a donation of \$100,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and was rewarded with a very lucrative contract on the Gold Coast. Another gentleman donated \$100,000 to that fund and was given a knighthood. I will not give that honourable gentleman's name because he has gone to the great big Parliament in the sky. Honourable members can put their own connotation on that.

What I am saying is serious. The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation has a smell to it. It is widely regarded as Tammany Hall at its best. I am sure that some of the people who administer the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation would make the late and unlamented Boss Tweed of Tammany Hall green with envy. As I say, moneys have been paid in to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr Lee: By whom?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: By Mr Griffiths. The honourable the Minister wanted a name and now I have given him one. Let some member on the Government side produce evidence that denies that his money has been paid in. I challenge honourable members opposite to do that.

It is also true that the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation made a donation of \$5,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and he was rewarded with a

position in Cabinet, over the heads of some of his more intelligent and better performed colleagues.

Donations have been made by firms that are deeply involved in the conduct of the institute. I have spelt out the allegations quite clearly. The only problem is that I have spoken too late tonight. Had I spoken earlier in the day my remarks would have received wider Press coverage.

The allegations I have made are extremely serious ones and cast aspersions on directors of the institute. Mr Barker, a director, who I believe is a member of the Liberal Party, or was, said in a statement last week in response to an article of mine in the education supplement of "The Australian" that this was old hat and that the allegations were made two years ago. He said, "It is rather amazing that Mr Hooper raises the matter in an election year." That happens to be coincidental. It would not worry me whether it was an election year or not. It is my job and that of every other member of the Opposition to protect the interests of the little man in this State. We are not here to represent big business. We are here to represent the ordinary person in the community who needs a voice—the weak and the powerless. They are the ones we represent. When I look on the other side and see the fat plutocrats of the Government, I realise that all they are interested in is looking after big business. The allegations I have made tonight are serious ones.

Mrs Kyburz interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Salisbury is certainly not in the category I have just mentioned. As a matter of fact, since she has started to wear spectacles, I think she has improved in appearance. She has got rid of the Shirley Temple look. I would say she is now a cross between Shirley Temple and Dame Margaret Guilfoyle.

In all seriousness, what I have said tonight warrants thorough investigation by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. I hope that tomorrow there will be a ministerial statement to the House that he has ordered an investigation of my allegations.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (8.27 p.m.): First, I would like to say a couple of words about the disgraceful attack of the member for Archerfield. One can only call it that, because it is typical of the sort of attack he makes under parliamentary privilege. It is most unfortunate that people come into this place and, under privilege, make such scurrilous accusations against people who have done a tremendous amount, particularly in the Toowoomba area, in fund-raising for the McGregor College. They have done a fantastic job. I am sure that the other members who live in that area would back me when I say that the work of these people to establish the institute in the first place—and particularly McGregor College—is nothing

short of outstanding. I for one am most disappointed that the member for Archerfield would stoop to this sort of attack.

I take the opportunity of spending a few minutes during this debate on the Appropriation Bill to make an urgent plea on behalf of the electors of Cunningham. A number of matters are most urgent. We require funding in a number of areas. Obviously every other member of this Parliament will, when he has the opportunity, put his case for the electors of his area. After all, that is what we are here to do. The first thing that disappoints me immensely is—

Mr Davis: Soil conservation.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, soil conservation, as my old friend from Steele Rudd corner says. Aunt Glad isn't here tonight to hear him perform, but she will keep an eye on him, as she tells me now and then.

It disappoints me that the level of commitment from the State Government to date does not measure up to the requirements of that most serious problem. I would hope that the Treasurer would take my remarks on board. He has flown over the area at different times after some of the disastrous rains in the area. Fortunately we received some recognition of the problems caused by disastrous flood rains in the Clifton and Back Plains areas last February. I thank the Treasurer and other Cabinet Ministers who were involved, in particular the Minister for Primary Industries who was out there virtually the next day to look at the problem first hand. He was able to get us on the priority list and have it recognised as a disaster area. I thank him for that assistance.

I am particularly pleased that the new Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Mike Ahern) is taking an early opportunity to see at first hand the problems of the area. He is to visit the area, discuss priorities, and see for himself what a serious and wide-ranging problem soil erosion is. It is not something that can be put aside. Every day that action is delayed, it will cost more to rectify the problem, and every storm will cause damage that cannot be rectified. It is a once-only loss. That is not a situation that we, as members of Parliament, can sit back with a clear conscience and allow to happen, and it disappoints me that some members of the Opposition treat soil erosion as a laughing matter. As a member who represents an area with a very high proportion of the State's soil erosion problems, it disappoints me that the Opposition will not take the matter more seriously.

Mr Davis: Probably they have never been on the land.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, that would be dead right. The honourable member for Brisbane Central would understand the problem well.

I should like to deal also with the problem of the shortfall in water resources in my area. That problem has been accentuated recently by the drought, which has caused

the level of the Leslie Dam to fall lower than it has been for many years, and there is only a 45 per cent allocation for the ensuing year.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member thinks it is about time somebody said that. One would almost think he wrote my speech, because that is what I intend to say.

In my opinion, the problem is not just one for the electors and landholders of Cunningham, because it has far-reaching effects. It has a flow-on effect on all the secondary industries in the area, particularly the machinery manufacturers and the firms that supply equipment, and also on towns such as Millmerran and Pittsworth that rely on the underground aquifer for their water supply. I am sure that the honourable member for Warwick will have something to say about it later, because he faces a similar problem in his electorate. Its ramifications are far-reaching and will be felt throughout the region if something is not done to rectify the problem.

I should like to place on record tonight my thanks to all those who have been associated with the project. In particular I thank the honourable member for Warwick, the honourable member for Toowoomba South and other members representing electorates in the area who have supported us and assisted us to ensure that the problem has received at least some recognition. We have been able to obtain regulatory weirs that will ensure that the water in the Leslie Dam that is used for irrigation is not wasted. When one considers the length of stream between the Leslie Dam and the farms being irrigated down towards Cecil Plains, one sees how difficult it is to release the water so that it is not wasted and the wrong people do not pump it. The regulatory weirs are designed to control the flow between the Leslie Dam and the irrigation areas, and I am very thankful for the money that has been spent for that purpose and to provide the bridge that was part and parcel of the Lemon Tree Weir. Because the siting of the weir resulted in the inundation of a river crossing, thereby causing tremendous inconvenience to the landholders and other people on each side of the Condamine, a high-level bridge was built.

The other matter that I wish to touch on briefly tonight concerns education. I want to put in a plug for the provision of remedial facilities in country schools. I am sure that other country members would do likewise. The lack of remedial facilities is a serious problem confronting people who live away from the major population centres. Those of us who have in our electorates towns that do not have remedial facilities realise what a serious problem that lack of facilities is for parents and particularly for the children themselves.

Many young persons do not receive the full benefit of education. As they go through life they need remedial teaching. Unfortunately, some of them are not given it. Such children have a tremendous number of doors closed to them. I earnestly ask the Treasurer to look at education expenditure and to ensure that, if the present miners' strike does result in any Budget cut-backs, he not eliminate those crucial services such as remedial education. As I have said, the lack of remedial education is a grave problem facing people who live away from the major population centres. Its importance cannot be stressed too strongly.

I instance Millmerran particularly. The town has a great need for remedial facilities. If such facilities were provided, they could service not only the Millmerran State School but surrounding schools as well. That is a concept that we must push further.

I am sure that other members wish to make a contribution to this debate. I would have liked to raise other matters, but because time is short I shall allow other members an opportunity to make their points.

Mr GOLEBY (Redlands) (8.38 p.m.): I think all honourable members will agree that Queensland is the growth State of the nation. There is no doubt about its productivity and expansion under good Government. We have entered an exciting decade, one that will reveal continuous development and growth within the State. Queensland undoubtedly leads Australia in development in all fields, such as mining, secondary industry and primary industry. The encouragement given by this Government through the various departments, administered by our Ministers, has led to an expression of confidence in this State that is unparalleled in its history.

For too long Queensland was treated as a branch office State. Unfortunately, from time to time it is still treated in that manner by Canberra in the allocation of funds.

Queensland has a tremendous road network, one that cries out for expenditure. Roads are very high on the people's list of priorities. A great deal is said about education and health, both of which are of utmost importance. But I cannot stress too much the need to have an excellent network of roads. A good road network has top priority in the eyes of the public.

Queensland is experiencing a population explosion. In fact, it is the only State that can boast a large increase in population. It is interesting to note that the people are coming from the southern States, particularly Victoria.

Recently I addressed the 300 children at a school in my electorate. I asked those who had come from southern States to raise their hand. To my amazement, approximately one-third had come from New South Wales and Victoria, with the majority coming from Victoria. I was also interested to learn that, in the last two years, quite a percentage had moved into my electorate from New Zealand.

Queensland's claim to fame as a State of tremendous potential and development has spread across the Tasman to New Zealand and has encouraged many people to seek a new life-style here.

The honourable member for Carnarvon mentioned job opportunities. I also have the figures that he quoted and I confirm that they came from the Parliamentary Library. The growth rate in new jobs created in the last five years is 11.79 per cent, the exact figure that the honourable member quoted, compared with the Australian average of 6.23 per cent. This clearly indicates that Queensland is the State on the march and the State that offers the greatest opportunity not only for Queenslanders but also for many people who have been attracted from southern States. There would be no unemployment in Queensland today—in fact, there would be job vacancies—if it were not for migration from other States. The creation of new jobs in this State is not keeping up with that migration.

The majority of the people coming to Queensland are settling in South Queensland. As I indicated, the census I took at one of my local schools bears this out.

Mr Kyburz: Queensland has very good weather, too.

Mr GOLEBY: Many things other than the weather attract people to Queensland. In addition to the creation of job opportunities, we have the lowest taxes in Australia. We have abolished death duties, road maintenance tax and many other taxes and have reduced pay-roll tax. Anybody wishing to start up a small business finds it much easier to do so in Queensland. More people start new businesses in Queensland than anywhere else in Australia.

The average home buyer from the South will tell any member of this Assembly that he can buy house and land in Queensland for little more than half the cost in Sydney and Melbourne. That is an incentive to young families to settle here.

Tourism is virtually an untapped industry in Queensland. Although it is the tourist State, there is still a long way to go. I give full credit to the Government for its encouragement to tourism and also for the introduction of international flights to this State. I understand that that will be on a permanent basis next year. It will bring many people into the State from the near Asian countries and beyond.

The changes in the school holiday system will make a big difference to tourism. People will now have the opportunity to travel throughout this State with their children. I am sure that the tourist industry will capitalise on it. I would like to think that the Government will continue the campaign to See Queensland First. Queensland has many attractions of interest. It saddens me at times when I hear of people travelling overseas. They come to my office to have their passport photographs endorsed. I find quite often

that they have not seen very much of Queensland and have very little knowledge of the State, let alone Australia. The Government should encourage our people to see our great State and nation and to make full use of the facilities here before venturing overseas.

The Commonwealth Games will be held in Brisbane in two years' time. This will give a great impetus to tourism. I am pleased that the Minister controlling sport is doing everything possible to make sure that the Games are a tremendous success. It behoves all Queenslanders, particularly those in Brisbane, to open their homes to the 35 000 overseas visitors who are expected to be in the Brisbane area at that time. Besides giving us an opportunity to offer friendship and welcome these people into our homes, it gives the tourist entrepreneurs in this part of the State an opportunity that comes only once a century. The impact on the State will be enormous, and I know that the local authorities in this region are gearing themselves to play a very active part.

Transport is a top priority for any developing State, and I feel sure that it will be one of our top priorities in the 1980s. The population of my electorate has doubled in the past six years, and many of the residents commute to Brisbane. It is therefore most important that a fast and efficient transport system be provided for them. The growth rate in the area is second only to that of the Gold Coast, and I believe that in the 1980s the area between Brisbane and the Gold Coast will become one large city, and I therefore believe that we must now provide every encouragement for a fast and efficient transport system to service this population explosion.

While on the subject of the population explosion in the Moreton region—not so long ago an overseas professor was commissioned to carry out the Moreton Region Growth Strategy Investigation. The population of my area in the year 2000 was estimated to be 65 000. This was arrived at only after three deputations from the Redland Shire Council, because Professor Stevens originally believed that there would be only 32 000 residents in the area at that time. I have to report that the present population of the Redlands is 40 000 and will far exceed the estimated 65 000 by the year 2000. In fact, it will far exceed 100 000.

I am sure that every member has been concerned about the tragedies on our roads in recent weeks. Road safety is one of the top priorities in the mind of every thinking member, and I believe that to get to the root of this problem road safety has to be taught in our schools. It should be a curriculum subject on which students are examined in both primary and secondary schools. We believe that our education system is framed so as to set our children on the right road for life, but I believe it has one glaring gap. Unless we insist that children are taught road safety and examined

on it, we are failing in our duty as legislators. Many children are in a position to obtain a driver's licence before they leave high school, but they start to learn road safety only after they get out on the roads. I believe that if they were taught the fundamentals of the motor vehicle and how to use it, along with the rules of the road, many road tragedies would be avoided.

I referred earlier to tourism. Off the shores of southern Queensland lies Moreton Bay, which has a tourist potential equal to that of any region. I suppose that from time to time when we have travelled to Sydney each of us has looked forward to travelling along the shores of Sydney Harbour, but I believe that Moreton Bay has far greater advantages than Sydney Harbour has ever had, including scenic beauty and the facilities looked for by the boating enthusiast. It is a sheltered waterway containing many islands and is rated as one of the finest waterways in the world.

The area will see major development in the 1980s. Tourist operators are already conducting trips throughout the bay islands, and I would like to see some of them, in particular Peel Island, used as recreational parks. For a long time now Peel Island has lain dormant, with only a caretaker looking after its few facilities. Very restricted use has been made of it. We all know that Peel Island was formerly a lazaret. The island has beautiful sandy beaches and live coral below the low-water mark. This provides much enjoyment for the tourist. I urge this Government to develop it into a recreational park so that the people who use these sheltered areas of Moreton Bay can not only have a boat anchorage but can also enjoy the many natural resources on the island.

For many months we have read in the Press reports about the problems facing our Fish Board. From time to time we have seen recommendations that the board should be abolished. I believe that the board should be retained, and it should be retained for a very good reason. We all know and acknowledge that from time to time there have been problems in the administration of the board. Neither the Government nor the fishermen are blameless for many of the problems concerning its administration. I believe that both must share the blame for the problems with the Fish Board over many years.

I think we have reached the stage where the fishermen themselves have closed their ranks and are now prepared to ensure that the Fish Board, if given another chance, will work. We all know that from time to time many fishermen, particularly the trawler operators, have sold their catches outside the board. They have not given the board the opportunity that it should have to retail their catches. The net fishermen, particularly those on the ocean beaches in my electorate, have made suitable marketing arrangements.

They have been happy, the board has done quite well and the public has been able to purchase fish that normally would not have been available to it. Those fish would have been sold interstate.

I believe that we must cast aside many of the old and antiquated ideas of management and bring the Fish Board under the control of the Primary Industries Department. We should give it a completely new life. The fishing industry is little different from many other primary industries. The Fish Board could operate along lines similar to those of the Brisbane Market. The fishermen should organise themselves into a group and operate under guide-lines and rules similar to those governing the COD, which has been so successful in this State since the 1920s. The COD, in the marketing of fresh fruit and vegetables, has been the envy of every other State. I can see very little difference between the fruit and vegetable industries and the fishing industry. The fishing industry has perishable items, as have the fruit and vegetable industries.

There are four principal types of fishermen. There are the net fishermen, the trawler operators, the line fishermen and the crabbers, and they cannot be mixed. They are four different identities. They all harvest the sea, but they have completely different ideals and different methods of operation. There is no way in which they can be mixed up under one body and one committee. The COD has its sectional committees dealing with the various types of fresh fruit and vegetables. The Fish Board could operate along similar lines with sectional committees covering the various types of fishermen that I have mentioned. They are all earning their living from the sea.

This is far too important an industry to this State to be allowed to drift away and pass into the hands of co-operatives and the like. I believe that conservation is very important to the fishing industry, and this Government has the responsibility to make sure that the industry is administered, and administered well. That is why I appeal to the Government not to disband the Fish Board but to make sure that it is put in a position in which it can operate efficiently.

Recent Press headlines have indicated that this State has been subject to take-overs involving some of its primary industries. This time I refer to the poultry industry. I think that every member of Parliament in southern Queensland was dismayed to hear that 150 people from Provincial Traders Pty Ltd were sacked just recently when the company was taken over by Inghams. I remind honourable members that the poultry industry is a very large industry in this State and throughout Australia. Unfortunately, it is falling into the hands of two or three of the major food chain operators, some of whom belong to the multinational groups from overseas. In the long term, the public

of this State will be the losers. The Steggles group in New South Wales has also been taken over.

Those take-overs have caused the retrenchment of a lot of workers. Many small, successful operators have been swallowed up. They may have been public companies but they were too small to be able to resist the tentacles and the strangehold tactics of the larger companies. The Government must do something to protect the smaller companies, just as it has brought in legislation to protect manufacturers in the bread industry. The same sort of thing is happening in the poultry industry. Before long there will be take-overs in the poultry industry just as there were take-overs by Vestey's in the beef industry years ago.

Price wars have been started deliberately and this makes the small companies bow to the dictates of the larger companies. The bread industry suffered from the plant bakeries and the poultry industry suffers from the multinationals such as Weston and Amatil, and the Australian Ingham group. Those three groups will control the Australian poultry industry before long unless something is done.

Earlier today members of this House mentioned our standard of living and the 35-hour week. I want to make quite clear to this House that I do not support the moves for a 35-hour week and I know that the thinking person in the electorate believes the same. People in Australia, and particularly in this State, realise they are fortunate to have the life-style they enjoy. No-one will convince me that the introduction of the 35-hour week will improve the standard of living of people in Queensland. It will improve the living standard of a minority but it will make things a lot harder for the majority, because of increased prices. That will be a difficulty not easily overcome. The majority of the community are still paying off their homes and they cannot afford the inflation that would accompany the introduction of the 35-hour week. I appeal to this Government to do all it can to resist the introduction of the 35-hour week.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (8.57 p.m.): September 1980 will see the electrification of the railway to Ipswich, an event for which the Australian Labor Party and the electors of Ipswich City and surrounding areas can justly take credit and be proud of. It has been brought about by the tremendous support and the swing towards the three ALP candidates in the Ipswich area in the last State election of 1977. I defeated the Government candidate in Ipswich West and Mr Bob Gibbs took the seat of Wolston with a handsome majority. Mr Joe Sciacca gave the Treasurer and Leader of the Liberal Party the greatest fright of his political life.

In early 1978, when the Minister for Transport was forced out into the open, he admitted that it would be at least five years before electrification would come to Ipswich.

That meant that it would not arrive until 1982, not 1980 as we now have it. The ALP campaigned heavily on the electrification issue and forced the National/ Liberal Government to bring forward the estimated date of completion to 1980, not 1982. The Government provided extra funds so that the project could be completed within three years. Now the program will be operating before the 1980 election in an attempt to save the Liberal leader's political neck.

Mr Moore: What is wrong with that?

Mr UNDERWOOD: Nothing is wrong with it for Ipswich because it is great that we have been able to force the Government into providing electrification. So that is a feather in the cap for the Australian Labor Party and the people of Ipswich and their good sense in voting for us.

We are delighted that the electric trains will be running, even though they are over 20 years late, in accordance with a previous State Labor Government's electrification program.

I am proud to say that there have been important State public works carried out in the Ipswich West electorate over the term of this Parliament. To instance some of the major works that have been completed, are under construction or are on the drawing board, I only have to look at the modern facilities for the workers at the Ipswich Railway Workshops, the new grade 8 centre at the Ipswich High School, the Blair pre-school, the library facilities at St Joseph's school, the library and administration facilities for the Brassall State School, and the new Amberley State School that has been campaigned for since the mid 1960s and which has been finally given the nod while I have been the State member of Parliament for the area.

We have seen a boom in pensioner-unit accommodation, eight having been completed recently and another 10 being due for completion and occupancy by Christmas. In fact, it is pleasing to see what I hope is a change in the policy of the Housing Commission in that pensioner units are now being peppered throughout the suburbs that require them. The commission has recently purchased and prepared land in West Ipswich for the construction of another 12 units for pensioners. Building plans are being drawn up now. That will complement the Ipswich City Council's pensioner units at Brassall. I hope that we will be able to have some more constructed at North Ipswich and the Blair Saddler's Crossing area, which will give my electorate of Ipswich West a fair covering of pensioner units.

The North Ipswich pre-school facility program has been revised and the centre is coming to fruition. Repair work has been done and is programmed at numerous schools in my electorate, notably repainting of the Leichhardt school and the North Ipswich school. A home economics and manual arts block is to be commenced at the West

Ipswich Special School. These are just some of the major projects in my area. In addition, innumerable small works projects have been carried out over the last three years.

New industries have been attracted to the area by the Wulkuraka Estate, in spite of the stranglehold on the development of Ipswich industry by the weighbridge placed on the boundary with Brisbane city at Wacol, which allows trucks to transport goods around Brisbane with uncontrolled loads and weights. In spite of that, we have seen a large increase in the development of industry on the Ipswich Industrial Estate. Jordans, Portion Control Foods and earthenware companies are expanding or commencing new establishments there.

We have seen massive expenditure on road-works in the area, particularly on the Warrego Highway and the Brisbane Valley Highway. Work on secondary roads includes the upgrading of the Mt Crosby Road in the near future and the Wulkuraka connection road.

I turn now to the field of education. The concept of free education is a long-gone myth. It is a tragedy when one considers what the Government is providing these days. A heavy financial burden is being placed on our schools, our p. and c.s. and on parents in trying to provide the funds to fill the ever-widening gap since the State and Federal Governments' cut-backs on expenditure on State schools in particular. However, one does not have to go to Labor areas to see problems in our schools. In fact, in the Ipswich area the most overcrowded classrooms are to be found in the Treasurer's own electorate of Ipswich. One sees that by perusing the figures that were taken out earlier this year, as I have told the Parliament on a previous occasion. In Ipswich West there are problems with crowding in class-rooms, but not nearly as bad as in the Treasurer's next-door electorate. We have seen wonderful innovative programs such as the Theatre in Education, which was doing tremendous work until last year in assisting children with learning disabilities and social problems. They have overcome those problems and, probably for the first time, taken an interest in their class-room and started to come to grips with the work and progress with their learning. However, the Government refused to continue that funding and the program was scrapped. It was a small program, but a very important one for many children in the Ipswich area.

There is a crying need in Ipswich for speech therapists and remedial teachers. In fact, people in those professions consider that Ipswich has a chronic problem. By the admission of the Minister for Education himself there is a desperate need for speech therapists in particular. He virtually admitted that there are extensive waiting lists for both speech therapy and remedial work. Almost every school in Ipswich is faced with the problem of not being able to assist to the

necessary degree a large number of students so that they can catch up and maintain a respectable level of work in their education.

One has only to look at some of the facilities in schools to see how funds for them have decreased. Take the funding for school libraries. Even for reasonable-sized schools we have seen cut-backs of over \$1,000 in real terms. There have been similar cut-backs for sporting equipment. These gaps have had to be filled by p. and c. associations, but, as is often the case, those associations are not able to make up for the cut-backs. Therefore, the standard of resources at schools is definitely deteriorating in all electorates, whether they are electorates held by Government members or by Opposition members.

Book allowances must also be reviewed, because in a large number of cases—and I give art as an example—the book allowance by no means covers the cost of the expensive books that are required by students, particularly those in secondary schools.

To find the reasons for these cut-backs one has only to look at the comments of the Minister for Education earlier this year, who said that the State Budget for the last financial year provided inadequate funding to meet the needs of his department. That reflects directly on the member for Ipswich and Treasurer, who is providing inadequate funds for the education of our young people, who are probably our greatest resource. This is one of the most important aspects of Government funding, yet the Government fails to recognise that and put it into practice.

Pensioners and old people who have worked hard all their lives are neglected by society and, in particular, by the Government. In this State we see the incredible situation of the State Government's refusing local authorities any assistance towards providing rate remissions for pensioners. Only in some areas, mainly those controlled by Labor councils, are rate remissions provided for pensioners.

Accommodation provided by the Queensland Housing Commission is in serious need of upgrading, and maintenance. Because of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, to which the Government of this State has agreed, working families are moving out of Queensland Housing Commission accommodation into private rental accommodation because they find that, in many instances, it is cheaper and there are fewer restrictions. In addition, the suburbs that they move into from Housing Commission areas have more services and facilities available, one of the main ones being public transport in the form of buses. What is happening, of course, is that single-parent families are moving into the vacated houses, and this is creating all sorts of social problems in Housing Commission areas not only in Ipswich but also in the Brisbane metropolitan area.

Accommodation for pensioners needs to be considered seriously and revised. In south-eastern Queensland, which includes Ipswich, about 400 pensioners are seeking Queensland Housing Commission accommodation. The waiting time is 18 months to two years and, as a result, quite a number of pensioners die before they are offered accommodation. Pensioners should not have to wait so long before being given accommodation. It is not unreasonable that they should have to wait a short time; they certainly should not have to wait 18 months to two years. If the Government had set about spending some of the money that it failed to spend in the previous financial year, such a large waiting list would not have existed over the past 12 months.

Pensioners and other members of the community are hit by increased costs, and price control is definitely an area of State Government responsibility. There has been a definite neglect in that respect; in fact, one could say that the Government has encouraged price increases, particularly in view of the massive increases in the cost of gas and electricity over the past three years.

The Queensland Government has also discriminated against pensioners in respect of reciprocal travel arrangements between the eastern States. It would cost the Government very little to grant that concession. Say a Queensland pensioner travels interstate to Sydney and queues up with pensioners from other States for a package tour to Luna Park. That trip involves a ferry ride across the harbour, a tour of Luna Park itself and a return journey by ferry or bus. There is the recent case of a Queensland pensioner who queued up with a Victorian pensioner and both asked for a concession fare. The Victorian was granted it, whereas the Queenslanders was told that, because Queensland does not give concessions to pensioners from southern States, he could not be given a concession fare. This Government's penny-pinching attitude has resulted in discrimination of that type against Queensland pensioners who visit southern States. That type of attitude makes it very difficult for Queensland pensioners who travel interstate.

An area of concern that has been ignored and neglected by the Queensland Government for many years concerns zoonosis diseases. The Ipswich area contains several meatworks. Meatworkers are the prime targets for zoonosis diseases. They affect not only meatworkers but other workers as well in the meat industry, whether they be rural workers, transport workers carting livestock or processors. This Government's inhuman and callous attitude towards Queensland workers, particularly meatworkers, concerns us. Zoonosis diseases have a devastating effect on the life-style of workers who contract them. In fact, some workers who could not live any longer with the effects of the diseases have taken their own lives.

Zoonosis diseases are transferable from animals to humans. The most common of the diseases are Q fever, brucellosis and leptospirosis. The only redeeming feature of the diseases is that apparently they are not contagious between humans.

Let me look at the situation that prevails in places other than our supposedly progressive State of Queensland. On the Federal scene, some six years ago the Federal ALP Government introduced measures that provided adequate compensation provisions for its meat inspectorial staff. On a national basis, Federal meat inspectors are covered by workers' compensation for the effects of these diseases. That action ensures that a meat inspector will continue to be compensated for brucellosis, whether blood tests are positive or not. I shall refer to that aspect again later.

In February 1979 that progressive measure was updated when the Federal Government—a Tory Federal Government, by the way—advised the medical profession that a meat inspector was to be given the benefit of any doubt when the doctor suspected that he or she had contracted brucellosis. So Federal meat inspectors have not only compensation coverage but also advice from the Government to the medical profession.

On a national basis, the AMIEU is very concerned about this aspect of the industry in which it is involved. It is demanding the same provisions for its members throughout the industry. I challenge the Minister for Labour Relations to convince the AMIEU and its members and their families, particularly those who live in the Ipswich area, as well as a host of other workers in the primary and transport industries, that they should not be treated as normal human beings and not be compensated for infections attributed to their occupation.

The employers, through the Meat and Allied Trades Federation, are arguing that meatworkers should use up their sick leave entitlements instead of having compensation cover similar to that of meat inspectors. The discrimination extends further than that. The employers say that meatworkers should have to use their sick leave, although meat inspectors receive compensation. Why should one section of an industry receive preferential treatment while a large number of members of the AMIEU are discriminated against? That is not fair play.

The Queensland Division of Public Health conducted a survey at a Brisbane meatworks and proved conclusively that meatworkers in Queensland do not receive justice in the area of occupation health. The Government's own department proved that.

This is a question on which the State Government will not negotiate, and it will not provide compensation for meatworkers in this State. One of the Government's own departments conducted a survey at a

Brisbane meatworks and indicated that meatworkers are not receiving the benefits of occupation-health provisions. That is why I am referring specifically to Brisbane.

Of 58 meatworkers with symptoms of brucellosis, only six received compensation. In addition, none of 26 leptospirosis victims received workers' compensation. The particular diseases were defined, but the victims were deprived of workers' compensation.

With the exception of New South Wales, States are demanding positive pathology tests from patients suffering from zoonosis diseases such as chronic brucellosis. I am categorising New South Wales now.

Sydney medical practitioners were recently interviewed on the subject of industrial health and brucellosis. In general terms, the medical practitioners lack background experience of factory workers and abattoir workers. Even in an area such as Ipswich where they are making continual contact with it, a number of medical practitioners fail to recognise the symptoms.

In spite of that, they make judgments about the ability of workers to return to work. These medical practitioners contend that members of their profession erect a false image of themselves as knowing all about the matter. Doctors must be able to admit that they do not know everything.

The number of areas in the meat industry in which workers can become infected is amazing. I will cite some examples. Vets or laboratory workers can become infected through obstetric procedures or calving. Employees in skin sheds can become infected because discharge can contaminate tails, skins and hides. Slaughterhouse labourers can become infected through handling parts of the animals such as hocks, which can infect through fluids in their joints, or from cleaning parts of the floor that are contaminated. Meat inspectors run the risk of infection from parts of an infected carcass that are being examined. Pregnant cows, calving or miscarriages in the yard, or cows excreting in dust, expose holding-yard employees to the risk of infection.

In fact in the Ipswich area, a school is virtually next to a holding yard and the dust is a very serious problem from time to time, so that the students as well as the adults in that area are at risk.

Vaginal discharges from diseased cattle can contaminate trailers, so that transport drivers can be exposed to the risk of infection. Infection in the uterus or udder of a cow threatens slaughtermen handling those parts. They are also vulnerable to infection from spillages. Maintenance workers run the risk of infection from dust on equipment, which may be disturbed during maintenance.

It is pertinent to note that a large number of workers are blood donors. I quote a letter from the New South Wales Commissioner for Environmental and Special

Health Services to the secretary of the New South Wales Branch of the Meat Industry Employees' Union. The letter says—

"Members of your Union have, over a number of years, assisted the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service by regularly acting as blood donors.

"The Blood Transfusion Service has recently conferred with the Health Commission concerning the possible risks of transmitting Brucellosis or Q fever by blood transfusion and because of the increased risk of abattoir employees being infected with these diseases, it has been decided that they should not in future be used as blood donors.

"I would be glad if you would convey this information to your members with the thanks of both the Health Commission and the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service for their generous support in the past."

It was only yesterday that I learnt of a case of both a husband and wife contracting zoonosis disease which laid them both off work for a considerable period. It had a consequential traumatic effect on the financial and social aspects of their family life.

That letter states that health authorities in New South Wales will not take blood donations from abattoir workers. It is not because all the workers are infected but because the possibility of infection is there and, through blood transfusions, infection could spread among the community.

Recently, the export of feral pig carcasses has been drawn to the attention of the community. Feral pigs are handled by meatworkers, thereby exposing them to the risk of infection.

The New South Wales Government has legislated in an attempt to do something about the disease and has told the medical profession in New South Wales how to recognise and diagnose the symptoms. In New South Wales, compensation is paid.

In contrast, the Queensland Government is not even prepared to talk to the medical profession about it. It is not even prepared to consider the matter. The Government should appoint an officer in its Health Department to make a complete study of these diseases in the meat industry. As a State Government, it should do that in the interests of the workers and their families. In one instance in New South Wales, a young pregnant woman working in a meatworks was aborted when she contracted a disease in the meatworks. The meat companies are dodging the issue on the basis that the production line would slow down if animals carrying the disease were treated.

I repeat that the Government continues to ignore the situation and the Minister is not prepared to do anything about it. There have been discussions held between Ministers, but at the moment they are stonewalling and

refusing to do anything about it. The people of Queensland should be told what is happening.

Another serious problem exists in Ipswich, where it is probably more serious than in other areas of Queensland. I refer to rising prices and how they affect the family budget. There are also problems of a lack of job opportunities for people in Ipswich, particularly young people, job security for those already in work, for instance in the railways, and the decrease in value in real terms of wages, salaries and benefits. We find, for example, that in the employment field there are approximately 75 young people for every available job in Ipswich while the State average is something in the vicinity of 25 to 1. Members can see from those figures that the youth unemployment problem in the Ipswich area is very serious indeed. The Government is not prepared to take any real initiatives in the Ipswich area to provide employment for young people. I can give them a suggestion here and now. The Golden Circle Cannery—the Queensland co-operative—is at present investigating moving into the frozen processed vegetable market, along with other big multinational companies such as General Jones, Wattie Pict and so on. If Government policy does not change by the end of the year that processing facility will be established somewhere on the east side of Brisbane and not in the Ipswich area, which is the logical place because we have a serious unemployment problem, vegetables are grown in the Fassifern and Lockyer Valleys and we have the necessary water and the other infrastructures required for a major processing industry. But I imagine that Golden Circle will, with Government approval, establish its plant in Brisbane rather than in Ipswich.

I strongly urge the Government to reverse its policy and check that move by Golden Circle to make sure that the frozen processed vegetable facility will be established in Ipswich to provide much needed work. The type of processing envisaged by the company is fairly labour-intensive. We have already seen one example of a similar industry in Laidley which the Government failed to assist. It had up to 90 full and part-time workers on its books. In the past the Government has seen fit to support industries in other areas that did not measure up as an accountant would have liked them to measure up, but at the same time it failed to move in and assist this company which was making significant inroads into the market despite competition from multinational companies and the fact that it was suffering financial problems in establishing itself.

I look, for instance, at the job security of people, particularly in the railway workshops. I only have to look at what has happened in the foundry section of the Ipswich/Redbank workshops. The Government refuses to spend the money necessary to update the foundry machinery in order to ensure the job security of the men employed in that particular section of the workshops. In fact,

less than \$70,000 would be required to ensure those jobs for future generations of railway workers. The work that would have been done by the foundry at this particular workshop has been sent to two interstate foundries. The Government is exporting Ipswich jobs to the southern States. These jobs involved making castings for the electrification program.

At the end of this year thousands of young boys and girls will be applying for apprenticeships in South-east Queensland. Only a few years ago approximately one in six young people applying for apprenticeships in the railways received one. These days the ratio is about one in 1 000. So job opportunities for young people in the railways are virtually non-existent. On past experience, about two dozen apprenticeships will be offered to school-leavers this financial year.

I turn to the matter of the decrease in the value of wages, combined with increased prices. This is an area for which the Government is responsible. Over the last five years, the value of the minimum weekly wage of approximately \$136 has decreased in real terms by some \$18 to \$20. I seek leave to incorporate in "Hansard" a table showing the increases between 1975 and 1980 in prices for basic commodities in the household shopping list.

(Leave granted.)

	1975	1980
Steak (1 kg)	\$1.35	\$5.20
Biscuits (450 g)	74c	\$1.17
Potatoes (1 kg)	18c	42c
Milk (600 mL)	18c	29c
Coffee (100 g)	\$1.01	\$2.23
Apples (each)	6c	20c
Oranges (each)	8c	20c
Bananas (1 kg)	62c	\$1.22
Flour (2 kg)	62c	98c
Beer (1 bottle)	40c	93c
Butter (500 g)	70c	\$1.15
Soap Powder (1.25 kg) ..	\$1.57	\$2.12
Eggs (55 g (12))	88c	\$1.41
Cabbages (each)	32c	\$1.40
	\$8.01	\$19.72

During the last year the price of food has increased by 18.5 per cent. The cost of health and personal care has increased by 17.1 per cent, the cost of transportation has increased by 11.2 per cent, the cost of recreation has increased by 10.5 per cent, the cost of housing has increased by 6.7 per cent, and the cost of clothing has increased by 6.4 per cent.

The only action taken by this State Government to control prices was the introduction of a minimum price scheme for bread.

The scheme is being ignored by the big bread manufacturers in this State. They are moving into country towns, such as Charters Towers, and killing off the small bakers, whom the minimum price scheme was supposed to protect. The Queensland Government is failing even to implement legislation that it introduced recently. Between March 1978 and March 1980, the price of men's and boys' clothing, which is important to young families with young children, increased by 58 per cent, the price of women's and girls' clothing increased by 75 per cent, and the price of footwear increased by 67 per cent. Family living standards will continue to be eroded as indirect State taxes continue to be increased, as Commonwealth financial assistance decreases, as the financial burden of local authorities gets heavier, and as personal income tax is increased. The answer is to offset the tax burden and provide the necessary revenue to fill the gap.

I refer in particular to two major industries in Queensland: the tourist industry and the mining industry. Queensland is the richest State in Australia in these two areas, yet at the moment this State Government is selling these two industries short and forcing financial hardships on to the people of Queensland. If we received a decent return for our minerals, the people of Queensland, to coin a phrase, would have to pay hardly any tax at all.

In February this year the Queensland Treasury prepared a 143-page submission for presentation to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. One of the more startling statistical revelations was that Queensland had the lowest household income per head of mean population of all of the States. It also had the lowest level of savings per capita.

In relation to companies, the submission went on to reveal that although Queensland has approximately 15.5 per cent of total population, it generates a substantially lower percentage of manufacturing value added, only 10.4 per cent. Even if mining value added was taken into account, Queensland's percentage of total value added was lower than its population share at 12.9 per cent. Compared with other States, Queensland's per capita value added for the mining and manufacturing industries was 81.9 per cent of that of New South Wales, 71.8 per cent of Victoria's, 80.1 per cent of Western Australia's and 89.1 per cent of Tasmania's. It was only slightly more than that of South Australia.

While these comparisons should be recognised by the Commonwealth Government in distributing revenue under the financial arrangements and should support the case for a better deal, they also now raise serious questions about the claims of this Government of how well off Queenslanders are under the National/Liberal administration. To hear Government members speak, one would think that the average Queensland

was on a financial Easy Street instead of having the lowest household income in the nation.

With all the puffing and blowing about development under this Government, it might come as a shock to some of the Government's supporters that on a per capita value added basis its mining and manufacturing industries rate even less than those of Tasmania. This has meant borrowing at more than twice the usual interest rate and one estimate has been made that this has added approximately \$250m to the interest bill owed by the State in the last four years.

The quickest way to bring a business to its knees is to force it to service hard money loans. That is what the Fraser Liberal Government is doing to the State of Queensland and, in turn, is doing to local authorities. In turn, they are placing the financial burden on the community.

Every now and again we see political grandstanding by a few State Ministers when they complain about the poor deal they are getting from the Commonwealth Government but, just like the Treasurer, they are still prepared to cop it. It will not be long before they cop stage 2 of the new Federalism proposal and impose a State personal income tax levy. Western Australia has already indicated that it is prepared to do so and, if Fraser and Howard have their way, eventually Queensland will have no choice.

Queensland is under attack financially from the Commonwealth and this Government has no defence. With attacks on every side we find a tightening up of matching arrangements for programs, forcing the States to commit more of their untied funds in order to qualify for the maximum amount of Federal allocation. For example, before 1976 dental schemes were totally funded by the Commonwealth. They are now on a 50/50 basis. Health planning agencies were subsidised on the basis of \$2 for \$1 and now are \$1 for \$1. Home-care services were subsidised at \$2 for \$1 and now are \$1 for \$1. Senior citizen centres were subsidised on the basis of \$2 for \$1 and now are \$1 for \$1. Transport (planning and research) was two-thirds and it is now one-half. In relation to housing, prior to 1978-79 there were no matching arrangements, but in 1978-79 a base amount was provided with the rest on a \$1 for \$1 basis.

The effect of these changes has been to tie up around \$170m of State funds in 1978-79. No wonder the States' indirect taxes have sky-rocketed. One only has to look at the fees and charges of all departments to see that that is so. In the final analysis it is the people of Queensland who pay. It is the people who suffer.

Let it not be misunderstood by the electorate that a vote for the Liberal Party will mean a change. In fact, the events of this Parliament have shown that whether it be a Liberal/National coalition or a National/Liberal coalition, Queenslanders will get the

same shoddy, undemocratic deal. A vote for the Liberal Party is a vote for Bjelke-Petersen and his neo-Nazi style standover tactics.

Whilst some Liberals do a lot of talking in the newspapers and on TV about their opposition to Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, their record in Parliament shows that Bjelke-Petersen cannot implement his undemocratic programs without Liberal support; or, to put it another way, if the Liberals voted against Johannes's outlandish proposals, they would be defeated. None of that has occurred in the last three years.

These are the facts. There are 82 members of Parliament in Queensland. The National Party holds 34 of those seats. To have a matter passed by the House, he must be able to control 42 votes (one more than half of the House of 82). All the controversial, irresponsible, unpopular, totalitarian legislation has been passed because the Liberals have voted to support it. The Liberals have 25 votes; the ALP has 23 votes.

If the Liberals were truly opposed to Bjelke-Petersen's actions on street marches, education, "Bellevue", SEMP, MACOS, essential services legislation, Tarong, electricity charges, the Ron Camm appointment, etc., they have the right to vote with Labor and the total of 48 (25 + 23) votes would defeat these outlandish measures. A search through the official record of of parliamentary debates ("Hansard") shows that 99.9 per cent of the time all Liberals vote with Bjelke-Petersen. On a rare occasion one or two cross the floor and vote with Labor, but never in sufficient numbers to defeat the legislation. So this well-orchestrated, highly publicised limited vote against the Government gains the Liberals some form of respectability while allowing the undemocratic legislation to be adopted and enforced.

If we think the Liberal leader would be different from Bjelke-Petersen in Government, we should remember that Dr Llew Edwards has always, without fail, voted with, and for, Johannes Bjelke-Petersen and his infamous legislation. If we need proof of the concern felt by true Liberals over the voting record of the State's Liberals, a former national president of the Young Liberal movement is on record as describing the Queensland National Liberal Government as follows—

"They are a pack of cronies who are prepared to destroy police reports and lie about it . . . who are prepared to try and turn the police into a political tool and who see the workers in trade unions not as people, but as potential victims to be used for the purpose of political confrontation.

"The Premier daily brought public contempt on parliamentary Government and the democratic process.

"But that is not the tragedy—the tragedy is that he only manages to get away with

this because the Liberal Party of Queensland willingly and knowingly connives to sustain this iniquity."

That is the view of a Liberal. He would not be acceptable to the Liberal Party in Queensland.

Let us look at the Liberals and what they have voted for, adopted, endorsed and enforced on the electorate's behalf.

(Time expired.)

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (9.33 p.m.): Earlier in this debate on the Appropriation Bill we heard a number of wild accusations by the member for Wolston. I will examine them in fine detail tomorrow. What he has said cannot be expunged from the record, but I will compare the statements he has made in relation to Toowoomba with the truth and perhaps speak in greater detail on them tomorrow or Thursday. Suffice it to say that his motives were purely political, and I believe that the statements were made purely to embarrass his lifelong enemy, Lindsay Jones. I can say at this stage from my recollection of representations made at my electorate office that of all the names of persons he read out this evening only one of them has seen me. He was quite concerned about paragraph 2 (a) of his mortgage agreement, which reads—

"The Mortgagor shall whilst any money remains outstanding and unpaid hereunder pay to the Mortgagee interest thereon at the rate of 14.00 per centum per annum calculated from the date of the advance and thereafter such interest shall be calculated and charged on monthly rests in accordance with the provisions of 'The Money Lenders Acts 1916 to 1969'."

He was concerned about another matter, too. He feared that his mortgage agreement, which ran for five years only, could result in a snap sale of his property if he was unable to pay out the loan in full or renegotiate a loan. I understand in his instance finance was arranged with a group called Permanent Finance Company. It has to be pointed out, however, that after he had entered into arrangements with that company it wrote to him offering a further loan for home improvements, which he accepted. He went to them and accepted a further loan and entered into arrangements to further improve his home.

I remember his problem very well. He had a perfectly legal document. It was duly signed and witnessed. He had his solicitor, the railway credit union solicitor, act for him, and he did all of this before he saw me. He took advantage of offers that Peter Kurts and PFC make to attract home buyers who have very little to offer by way of deposit when they seek to buy a home. A person with a low deposit of \$1,000 or \$1,500 cannot approach a building society. However, by approaching PFC and Peter Kurts, he can obtain a mortgage over five years, and it is a general condition that is offered on many mortgage loans today. It allows review of

the interest after five years. At the end of five years also, if the home purchaser has managed to get some equity in the home, he can use that equity as a deposit to refinance a loan with another finance corporation.

It is one way of getting a home on a very low or absolute minimum deposit. There is, of course, a danger, and the danger is that the person who is buying the home needs to have an assured income to meet the repayments. A person may not have, as part of that deal, accident, sickness or unemployment insurance. He certainly should have the mortgage debt covered for fire and other damage. I point out that anyone entering into the Queensland Housing Commission rental-purchase plan will need a much larger deposit before the commission will accept him, even though the Government is assisting with a Government-subsidised interest rate that allows lower repayments.

My inquiries on behalf of the person concerned reveal that it is most likely that the PFC will not force a snap sale on him at the end of the five years. If it did that once, the word would be out and I am afraid the company's business would be ruined. As I said, there is opportunity for him and other people who have taken deals of this type with a low deposit over five years to refinance them if they have sufficient equity. The problem is that at present they do not have sufficient equity in their homes after two years to approach any organisation to refinance them. They are looking again at legal fees, which could be as high as \$500, and they are looking to an equity that building societies would regard as a satisfactory deposit to allow home-owners to enter into realistic repayments that they are able to meet, and these would have to be payments that would meet the interest and allow some reduction in the amount owing.

If the ALP really believes that Peter Kurts discriminates against the low-deposit home buyer, honourable members opposite have the remedy in their own hands. I challenge the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Casey) to move for the disendorsement of Joe Sciacca, the ALP candidate for Ipswich, who is also the solicitor who draws up the mortgage agreements for Peter Kurts.

Mr Bourke: Wouldn't you say that Mr Gibbs treated those four people downstairs with the utmost contempt and bad manners when we were down there at about 6 o'clock?

Dr LOCKWOOD: I thought so.

Mr Bourke: He just walked off laughing.

Dr LOCKWOOD: I continued to talk to them. I must say that I had never seen some of them before. One man I had met before—only one. Mr Gibbs sees them as something of a political football to be kicked round, and he is not interested in solving their problems.

As I said, he can move with the Leader of the Opposition to have the ALP candidate, who is the solicitor for Peter Kurts, disendorsed. If Opposition members feel strongly about it, they can move for his expulsion from the Labor Party. Now we will put the member for Wolston to some test as to the merit of his comments and his feelings for the people whom he claims his heart bled for.

Mr Bourke: Wouldn't you say that he is a pretty poor messenger boy for Lindesay Jones in Toowoomba? He didn't do a very good job.

Dr LOCKWOOD: He didn't do a good job at all. I will read "Hansard" to compare his statements and accusations with the known truth.

If the Labor Party does not make that move, it shows that its declared concern is only a sham. It knocks the low-interest home buyer while it supports the solicitor who draws up the document. The ALP says, "Too harsh." So the ball is back in the Opposition's court; it can make the next play.

One of the major problems that have confronted this nation is the fuel price rises that we have faced over the past few years. The parity pricing policy introduced by Mr Fraser is a real policy and I support its introduction. I must say, however, that I do not support the Fraser Government's attitude to the huge windfall that it has gained from that policy as it applies to fuel. It has obtained thousands of millions of dollars from its policy. I would support the use of that money to reduce the deficit. However, a great deal of that money must go back to the States in which it was raised. Very little of it is being applied to the roads in the States in which the revenue was obtained. Very little of it is going to transport. We know that over the next three, four, five or 10 years major changes will have to be made to ensure that our nation has adequate transport and is able to meet its domestic, commercial, industrial, agricultural and defence needs. The Federal Government could be doing far more than it has done to ensure that Australia survives in the field of transport.

Some very real problems have arisen. When Mr Fife was the responsible Minister he advocated the introduction of what became known as the Fife package. It was favoured greatly by the service-station operators throughout Australia. He plugged for three points: firstly, no price discrimination between the prices at which bulk fuel was offered to company-owned, company-leased and privately owned and operated service stations; secondly, no company retail outlets; and, thirdly, moves to end harsh and unconscionable contracts as they applied in the service stations.

Mr Fife believed that a service-station lease should offer security of tenure, that

retrospectively should always be considered and that compensation should be considered when a lease was resumed.

Mr Burns: You know he made his mind up two years after the royal commission had recommended the same things? Why did he wait two years?

Dr LOCKWOOD: I do not doubt he considered it. What concerns me is that, the royal commission having sat and he having made up his mind, he was not allowed to proceed.

Mr Burns: Because of the donations the Liberal Party collects from the oil companies—

Dr LOCKWOOD: It is not in my pocket. It is quite empty.

Mr Burns: You sold out the farmers and the retailers.

Dr LOCKWOOD: I doubt very much whether the Liberal Party would have got as much as the Labor Party got from ACTU-Solo and its sweetheart deals.

Mr Burns: Any time you like to get the Liberal Party books and compare them with the Labor Party books on oil company donations, we will put you to the test.

Dr LOCKWOOD: If the honourable member can arrange that, I would be pleased to look at them.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to participate in this debate.

Dr LOCKWOOD: Several attempts have been made by the large multinational companies to squeeze private operators out of their service stations. Some have backed down and withdrawn but, following the recent Commonwealth decisions relating to service stations, a new ball game has emerged.

I am sorry to say that Caltex, which was formerly quite a good oil company, has now resorted to putting the weights on the small private service station operators by removing their tanks and pumps. Caltex has given notice to a man in Toowoomba that that is what it aims to do. Prior to that, I thought that Caltex was playing the game as fairly as possible with its service station outlets.

I believe that the Prices Justification Tribunal needs to thoroughly re-examine all of its deliberations on fixing what it considered to be the base cost of petrol.

Mr Burns: Do you know that Dr Edwards wants the Prices Justification Tribunal abolished?

Dr LOCKWOOD: So do I. I do not believe that it is doing a good job at all.

Mr Burns: You just asked that it do something. You had better make up your mind.

Dr LOCKWOOD: If it cannot inject realism into its decisions, deliberations and recommendations, it is time it went.

I will now refer to one of the things about which it is being unreal. At various times it has made recommendations on price increases. Various companies can sell petrol at their outlets below that recommended price. If they can do that, they are either robbing the leased and privately owned outlets in favour of their own company-operated, company-managed outlets or they are telling lies to the PJT about the real price of petrol ex refinery.

Mr Burns: What about the doctors who charge more than the recommended fee?

Dr LOCKWOOD: They have that right and the patient has the right not to pay the amount. The patient can make his own choice.

If the PJT wants to be real, one of the things it should do is find the lowest price at which petrol has been sold in bulk ex refinery, declare that that is the going price and maintain that price until the oil companies can demonstrate, with facts and figures, that there needs to be an increase. There could be, at the refinery, a deliberate overpricing of fuel of somewhere between 3c and 6c a litre.

Mr Burns: That is what the royal commission found.

Dr LOCKWOOD: And I reckon that it is still right.

Harsh and unconscionable contracts apply to service stations, shopping centres and hire-purchase agreements in various forms. The company-managed site operators are looking to a large volume of sales and do not really care how they get it. They resort to a great many things, such as gifts and gimmicks, and free car washes had to be one of them. The leased site where the operator looks to a profit rather than a wage has been discriminated against. Quite often that operator is paying a definite 3c a litre more than the fellow selling the same brand from a company-owned and company-managed site.

Why is there this problem? Part of the sop that this country was fed about the time Labor lost Government in this State was that we should do everything with petrol. It has perhaps been the biggest mistake the coalition Government has made. Oil company greed has seen the oil companies in liaison with motor vehicle manufacturers to increase the size of engines. Everybody entered the horsepower race and the humble Holden ended up with a 5 litre V8 engine. The people's car was O.K. while there was cheap petrol.

Cheap crude was also associated with a very high mark-up by the oil companies and this led them to spy on each other—industrial sabotage—and build sites where anybody had reasonable sales, so there was a proliferation of service station outlets, far more

than this country ever needed or deserved. With the rise in the price of crude there was, of course, a real search by the motoring public to find out what size motor they needed, whether they really needed a 5 litre V8 in the family sedan to transport one person or whether they could manage with a smaller motor.

Policies introduced by the Federal Government have already led to a 10 per cent drop in petrol sales around the nation, and so the service station boom is over. Economy is the name of the game, and the oil companies cannot play that game with the number of sites they have. It has been mooted that the fuel war will close dealers, and this is exactly what the major oil companies want. They want the leased and privately owned sites to go broke. One fellow closed his pumps and put a sign on them which read, "This pump is being closed because of price discrimination." He closed reluctantly; perhaps he did not have any more tricks to play. But that is just what the oil companies wanted; he played right into their hands. I do not know that he could have kept his pumps open any longer, having dismissed all his staff and watched the oil companies come at their various blockade tricks, as was mentioned earlier by the honourable member for Redcliffe.

But there has been another nasty little cancer creep into the fuel war, and that is the role of bulk jobbers. It has been claimed that some of them are financed by major oil companies. Border-hopping is done in two ways. There is the real border-hopping, and the other kind which I think is just a paper entry. The real border-hopping probably starts at Newcastle, goes as far west as Moree and then allegedly comes back to Toowoomba. It seems an incredibly long route and must be associated with a great deal of expense. I fail to see how a man could operate a run like that and still discount his petrol sufficiently to put local service station operators out of business. There has to be a subsidy in it somewhere if that is in fact what is done.

It is my belief that many of these people are doing a paper entry and buying their fuel at the refinery in Brisbane. They make a paper entry of a run to the Tweed, another paper entry of an unloading at the Tweed, another entry of a transfer at the Tweed, another paper entry of a run back to Brisbane and the fuel then goes to Ipswich. But all the time it has never done more than the 40 km to the Ipswich depot.

In addition, I believe that a great many trucks are operating in absolute defiance of our law. Under our law trucks are not allowed to proceed further west than Gatton without a special permit from the Transport Department. I believe that a lot of these bulk jobbers are operating in absolute defiance of that law. I also believe they may be coming from another site. As yet I do not have the evidence I need to make any announcement on that.

I am totally opposed to any form of monopoly. I am just as opposed to the multinational monopoly of the oil retail business as I am to Government nationalisation, socialisation or monopolization of that same industry. The multinationals have their role; they are good at it. I do not think they are good at retailing, as their record in this country proves. I believe greater economies can be made if we keep them out of the retail business. I believe greater economies can be made to force down the real price of all petrol as it leaves the refinery gate and allow various forms of discounting for bulk and bulk transport.

I would now like to address myself to some of the things that are happening with workers' compensation in this State. One problem that has long existed in this State and, indeed, throughout the world is that a great many of the more seriously injured workers have not been considered for rehabilitation until a long time after their accident. The figures show that if rehabilitation is left until two years after an accident, there is an extremely low rehabilitation rate. Rehabilitation must be commenced as early as possible. The real advocates of rehabilitation say that it commences in the ambulance or vehicle on the way to the first medical treatment or hospital. Certainly in this State we are moving towards providing rehabilitation as soon as a seriously injured man can leave hospital. This step is overdue, but it is most welcome. I am pleased to see that it is being introduced. Towards this end, the Workers' Compensation Board is establishing a rehabilitation section. It will have two recreational officers who will work at rehabilitation through recreational sports, activities, etc.

Another matter that I think the Workers' Compensation Board in this State can be very proud of is that more than 50 per cent of our injured workers receive a workers' compensation payment in the first week after their injury. I know that a free-enterprise Government is supposed to stand up and scream free enterprise for everything. A free-enterprise police force does not work, neither does a free-enterprise road system. One cannot buy a little bit of railway track, carry it around in a port and lay it where one wants to go. Some things have to be done by big organisations, and sometimes governments do them best. I think this is clearly the case with workers' compensation.

People in Queensland might complain about the rates charged for workers' compensation, but they are much lower than those charged in New South Wales and Victoria where private industry, through insurance companies, runs the compensation schemes. Our record of payments is much better, too. All too often in the South an injured worker has to wait for a lump-sum settlement until he is totally rehabilitated after a serious injury. It might take 1½ to two years before he receives his first cent of compensation.

That is simply not good enough for a man who is trying to feed his family and meet his other commitments for clothing, housing and various hire-purchase agreements.

The member for Ipswich West spoke at great length about the various meatworks fevers. I think that sometimes doctors do not take an adequate history when they are treating a man who could have meatworks fever. Not enough detail is gone into. I can remember one man who came into the Ipswich General Hospital, where most of the meat workers who get sick go. One can find meatworks fever in people by the most obscure methods. One of the things that has not been mentioned is that a worker can get meatworks fever by drinking water from the wrong taps at the Bremer meatworks. The killing floor is washed down and the water is recycled. It contains impurities and infections. If any person strange to the meatworks and not knowing the system drinks from the yellow taps, he almost certainly will get meatworks fever. So a person does not need to be a meatworker with a knife in his hand to get these fevers.

It is true that they are spread by dust. There have also been accidental inoculations with the OXK 19 strain. People who have been inoculating animals have, through the merest scratch, inoculated themselves. I think that they are entitled to compensation.

I am afraid that some of the people who have come to my electorate office seeking information about meatworks fevers have not had all the necessary tests done. This makes it extremely difficult, in retrospect, to decide whether they have or have not had acute meatworks infection. Probably the Workers' Compensation Board should put a lot more time and energy into informing the working public, particularly those associated with the meat, cattle and sheep industries, about the risks, dangers, early symptoms and what they should ask the doctor, particularly if they are sick from a fever or illness.

I very much doubt whether the member for Ipswich West is asking for compensation for every meatworker who is ill with flu or an ordinary virus or any fever that did not develop purely as a result of his work. If he is, that would flow on to the whole of the working population and reduce the workers' compensation payments available to those who were severely and genuinely ill as a result of their work.

These are a few of my comments in relation to the Appropriation Bill. I congratulate the Treasurer on a job well done. I believe he is facing a very difficult time as a result of the cut-backs in revenue caused by the prolonged coal strike. It is not of his making but it will severely affect his work. I do not doubt that day by day he is looking at that Budget and seeing the amounts dwindling and seeking for ways to save another few million dollars. I wish him all the best in his deliberations, and I hope that the strike is soon ended.

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (10.5 p.m.): We are daily confronted with the evidence of the emergence of economic uncertainty, both here and abroad, and the assumptions and expectations of a generation of Australians from the late 40s to the early 70s about work, affluence, security, the role of Government and correct economic theory have to a large degree come undone because of that uncertainty.

Growth, greater self-sufficiency, more equitable distribution of income and of welfare services, and the commitment of strong and powerful allies can no longer be depended on as they once were. The good years of historically unprecedented growth of the 50s and 60s may perhaps have happened because of wise and sound political and economic decision-making. However, they may well have happened because of the incidental development which took place in Australia at that time. Although the onset of our economic uncertainties seemed abrupt in the mid 1970s, the evidence of the coming stresses was already developing in the world economy in the late 60s and the early 70s.

The difficulty then, as now, is how to read our experience and how to pursue goals for the future. Do we persist with the theory strongly held in some quarters in response to the changing world of change at any price, or do we realise that supply and demand are powerful forces, but it is not necessarily clear what drives or changes them?

The free trade philosophy, as an alternative to Government intervention, cannot guarantee reasonable equity or expanding market forces and response. Consumers are no longer so easily tempted into pushing the economy along. I say "Bravo" for that change. People have increased their savings as a proportion of their earnings. However, prices have increased as a response. Sharp rises in fuel costs are changing property values, increasing transport and travelling costs, reducing net earnings and adding to the cost of job-hunting for the unemployed.

There is a need now for the future planning both on a national and State basis. What might be the national goals or, indeed, universal goals or universal values as we see them? The most important job now, I believe, for any Government is to attack and overhaul the whole taxation system as we know it in Australia. On the admission of the Federal Treasury, 80 per cent of all taxation revenue is paid into the Federal Treasury by wage and salary earners. That leaves only 20 per cent to be paid in from companies and other sources. After all, there has to be a realisation on the part of the public, as it is I believe a great realisation on the part of every member of Parliament, that we need wealth for welfare. There is always a trade-off in any form of economic necessity.

What then could be our national goals? First of all, they should be growth and wealth. Some would say that in a conservative society that would not be a primary

national goal. Secondly, I see a need for a greater equity—power-sharing and participation—both within Australia and within our Asian neighbourhood. I believe that the difference between the haves and the have-nots in Australia is getting far wider than an economy the size of Australia's should have. Thirdly, there should be ecological balance and national development. Fourthly, there should be national self-determination. Australians must decide where Australia is going. Fifthly, there should be recommitment to the value of the individual, which means recognising human rights—indeed, the rights of minority groups, the rights of blacks and the rights of other people who have, I believe, suffered under the economic circumstances in which we now see ourselves. We must also realise that those human beings have different needs and different associations on an economic basis from some of those that we profess.

As a consequence of those national goals, in an overall economic context, how would we then see the future, or indeed how should we see the future in this high growth, high technology scenario.

We now have an opportunity to turn the development of our favourable energy position to the benefit of large numbers of Australians. We have also a second major development in the tertiary sector, that is, in the information economy, which has an immense benefit capacity. I believe that the information economy is the scenario of the future for Australia. We do not have a great deal at the present time, but we will be able to buy information from abroad. Thirdly, I believe that we should aim to marry these in a high energy/high technology scenario so that ecological balance is improved in the long term.

Our future determination lies in not going back to agrarian values but in going forward. How then will we come to this information economy scenario? In the future education will be of primary importance in the overall economic scenario. First of all, we will have user-run or consumer-run education. All of us will participate in this education process, because I believe it will be far more ongoing than it has been in the past. The use of computers will be extremely widespread. That will allow participation in decision-making. It could well be that in the future individuals will have a microfiche. They will be allowed to participate and play their particular role in decision-making by placing their decision on the microfiche and then allowing it to be fed into a central computer bank. Thus, everyone will have his say. It could be on a more simple basis.

The future scenario for the use of computers in the educational field is very widespread and indeed very exciting. I also see extended opportunities for personal development and leisure by buying this information scenario. This economy of the future will provide new and interesting jobs simply by

being innovative and totally changing our present aspect and conditioning towards work. I believe that the increased wealth from this high technology/high growth scenario will be used to fund a more equitable society. I also foresee a national superannuation scheme for a guaranteed minimum income as part of our commitment to minorities and individuals.

Local control of resources is a must—a must for the whole of Australia. Development must be equitably controlled locally. I also believe that the mechanism of local ownership through a national superannuation scheme is extremely important. We must, in other words, channel superannuation funds into the development of resources that we have in Australia, instead of looking overseas for capital. The generation of Australian capital is extremely important. In the future it will probably be very difficult, as it has been in the past, to generate Australian capital, but I believe that at least 20 per cent participation is presently available, were it stoked up by Government sanction for insurance companies and superannuation funds to invest in such developments. New wealth generation also must be used to reposition Australia as a supplier to the information economy, both domestically and in our neighbouring regions. That includes Asia, which I believe will be the most important economic future for Australia.

As a State and as a nation, we must espouse a commitment to a national policy of full employment and full personal activity. That does not mean everyone packing his little lunch and trundling off to work. It could mean people staying in their homes, having purchased this high-technology information economy that will be possible in the future. It will only be a few years before people working in the computer field will be able to stay at home and do their work. Therefore, as I said earlier, we must look very carefully at this high-technology scenario, particularly in the field of education.

As to energy—the whole future of the energy policy of Australia, and primarily of Queensland, must be turned to the value-added system of taxation and of energy. We must not just dig up coal and sell it; we must sell it as a primary energy source.

Mr Vaughan: Well!

Mrs KYBURZ: What is so new about that?

Mr Vaughan: You have been reading my notes.

Mrs KYBURZ: If the honourable member could read my scribble, I would suggest that he had been reading mine.

There are indeed great problems for the future, and I believe that each and every one of us who lives in this society has helped to cause them. Among them are the problems of social stress and cultural stress. We have problems of demography, of an ageing population; problems of people who will still

turn blind eyes to the fact that we have a multicultural society in Australia, people who are still saying, "This is a white-majority country and nobody else is welcome." That is just not on any more. It is a multicultural society, with its inherent stresses and its equally inherent benefits. Obviously, then, the great debate of the future will be on the social contract between wealth and growth for future welfare and for resource development.

I must say, though, that another one of the fears of the future must be the balance between man and the environment. After all, we have seen bio-engineering taken to a rather high degree, and the recent concern about plant breeders' rights must put that in its true perspective. However, it does offer a hope for a more finely tuned human being in the long run and, one would think, a more highly evolved human being. That is, of course, if one believes in evolution, which most intelligent people do.

The next worry of the future is in social administration. How are we going to govern further education? I believe that the future of further education will be in using the school as a social resource centre. In my opinion, the school will be the centre of a community's activities. It will not only have the central computer controls for that area; it will also have the resources to allow people to barter both their knowledge and things that they may manufacture or make—pottery, and so on.

We must also be concerned about the apathy and alienation of large sections of our society at present. That is the sort of thing that allows groups such as the League of Rights to breed, fester, multiply and turn into a stench that disgusts me. We must also be concerned that these very same subversive groups are attacking the values and expectations of society. Our major concern must be motivating people—motivating every person, in fact—to be part of the high-technology society.

I must say now that, as far as the future of the Liberal Party is concerned, the major point I would like to see come up for Budget decision is rate remission for pensioners. Because, as I said earlier, income is inequitably distributed in society at present, and is most inequitably distributed in the case of pensioners, I have recommended to the Treasurer that major concessions be given in rates, at least for aged pensioners. There are anomalies in the local government sphere at present because of a complete lack of uniformity in rate-remission schemes for pensioners throughout the State.

Although local authorities have available to them two types of scheme—deferred concessions and write-off concessions—too many shires still are not using either of those schemes. I have outlined in my position paper the deferred scheme. I think that could probably be put to more use in other shires. Some shires do not give any rate rebate at all to pensioners. Those shires include Beaudesert,

Boonah, Kilcoy, Landsborough, Moreton, Biggenden, Kingaroy, Mundubbera, Perry, Tiaro, Woongarra, Nebo, Croydon, Richmond, Bulloo, Bendemere, Cambooya, Chinchilla, Clifton, Glengallan, Inglewood, Murilla and Rosenthal. The Treasury has to increase the local government grants to those shires—the cost would probably amount to \$1.4m—to allow a 25 per cent rebate in them as a starting point. That would be most useful. Obviously sweeping and wide changes would be unacceptable in the overall economic context of restraint.

Today I have listened with interest to this debate, particularly to the contributions from Opposition members. For six years I have sat in this Chamber and listened to the ALP attacking the Premier. Not that I have not done so myself! He was the usual focus of the Opposition's attack.

An Opposition Member: Not today.

Mrs KYBURZ: No, not today. Today we have seen a totally different proposition. Indeed, one senses either a panic or a group not being led. Every speaker from the Opposition side has either squeaked, grunted or droned a criticism of the Liberal Party—except the honourable member for Archerfield, who took up outside points.

I demand to know, and I believe that the rank and file of the ALP will demand to know, whether a sweetheart agreement has been entered into between the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr D'Arcy) and the National Party on the allocation of preferences. In a debate on this Appropriation Bill, a debate dealing with the appropriation of money for good government in this State, we must raise the question of the blatant decision to allocate out of the blue a research assistant to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Nobody knew about it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is, after all, only a back-bench member of Parliament.

I ask if this blatant act of political opportunism, which is being spoken about openly in some sections of the ALP—it depends whether one is new guard, old guard, mud-guard, front guard or rear guard—is part of the pay-off deal being entered into on preferences by the National Party and Mr D'Arcy, most particularly in the South Coast seat. Is this part of the ploy to ensure that ALP seats are propped up in order to prevent the Liberal Party winning them? If that is so, then the concern of the average ALP voter, which is being expressed at the moment, is justified. A true Labor man will be horrified to learn of this sweetheart deal. And public it will be, because it seems now that this once great party is up for sale. I berate that fact.

ALP branch members would indeed be incensed at knowledge of this deal entered into behind their backs with their traditional opponent, Mr Bjelke-Petersen. I predict that there will be a revolt in the rank and file of

the Labor Party at such a disgraceful, distasteful deal. If Mr D'Arcy has perpetrated this deal, the National Party and the Labor Party will have trouble keeping it quiet.

What is certain is that out of the blue Mr D'Arcy has received an additional staff member. I do not know what his pay is. However, obviously it would be quite substantial. Probably it will be the pay of a teacher who has been teaching for eight years or so. Perhaps Mr D'Arcy could tell us what his staff member's pay is. I believe that an additional staff member has never before been offered to a Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who, as I said, is only a back-bench member after all.

One must say that the Leader of the Opposition is quite entitled to have staff. However, whatever the precise nature of the reward given to Mr D'Arcy, or indeed to Mr Casey, one thing is certain: any attempt to channel ALP preferences to the National Party will probably spontaneously be rejected by the ALP voters, anyway. I must say that my informant was indeed a person in a Labor Party branch and, as members of the Opposition will know, women do talk.

For the moment, let us have a look at the other party in this deal of preference-sharing. That is, of course, the National Party. As we approach this election, with the Liberals having announced that they intend to give the electorate a choice—that is, someone to vote for if they have found the National Party conduct unacceptable to them—panic has suddenly set in. Paranoia is so widespread it is funny.

After all, that is an area where the National Party is most experienced, that is, in finding a way out, in rationalising situations. It did this in the seat of South Coast in 1969. I believe that, in 1969, a deal was done with preferences and Mr Hinze's preferences were to go to the ALP and vice versa. In its bleating about coalition harmony, coalitionists first, and so on, who comes out as the worst coalition party? One can only ask that.

Not only may this deal expose the two participants for what they really are but also may it reveal the National Party as a party of political expediency. The National Party would have us believe that it is the only party of integrity, that it provides the major opposition to the socialist Labor Party, that it provides the political purity that guarantees firm opposition to the ALP and a continuation of our Queensland way of life via Eric Butler. It has been alleged in the media, however, that there has been a deal between Mr Hinze and Mr D'Arcy for an exchange of preferences in that seat. I must say that that could well expose them both for what they are. The Labor Party—National Party grand plan must be exposed for what it is—political chicanery of the worst kind and, indeed, an incestuous relationship in Queensland politics.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (10.27 p.m.): It would seem to me that the Liberal Party is running very scared tonight in this Parliament, and the speech by the member for Salisbury is an indication of the fears confronting the Liberal Party as it faces this election.

I should like to spend a little time looking at the Liberal leader, if I may. I am told by the Liberal member for Salisbury that the Liberals intend to give the electors a choice. Let us have a look at the Liberals' choice—Dr Edwards, the leader. As I understand it, he was elected as a result of a move to dump Bill Knox which was planned while Mr Knox was at his mother's funeral.

Government Members interjected.

Mr BURNS: They should not run away from it because when we start to talk about Dr Edwards and his leadership we must remember that people in the Labor Party and people throughout the community expect to see a man have the guts to face up to others and not do things behind their backs.

Immediately after Dr Edwards was elected as the leader he promised to reshuffle the Cabinet. One of the loudest voices singing out in the back belonged to one of the people who helped him to do in Mr Knox on the promise of a Cabinet appointment. Let me deal with the Cabinet reshuffle that he promised.

We read in "The Courier-Mail" in December 1978 that the Liberals' action man, Dr Llew Edwards, was to announce the new Ministers the following day. "The Courier-Mail" said that Bill Hewitt was in and Mr Greenwood was out. The public was told through Liberal-inspired Press leaks that this was Dr Edwards taking control and making his mark.

We were told not to expect a swap of portfolios between Health and Treasury, between Knox and Edwards. That was not on; that was not to happen. That was reported in the newspapers. If any member wants to read them, I have the cuttings here.

Queenslanders were told also that Bill Knox would not be honoured with a knighthood. This man who says that the Liberals will not be a party to National Party control is reported in the Press as having discussed the ministry twice in eight hours with the Premier, the National Party leader, Mr Bjelke-Petersen.

What happened? There was no Cabinet reshuffle, Mr Knox and Dr Edwards swapped portfolios, Mr Bjelke-Petersen was reported to have clearly outmanoeuvred the Liberal Leader and Bill Knox became Sir William Knox. So we have had a rejection of all the things Dr Edwards promised when he was elected as leader.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen was so pleased to have clearly outmanoeuvred the Liberal leader, as he has done on every occasion since, that he said in "The Australian Financial Review"—

"I am pleased he co-operated with me fully and I am pleased he is as dedicated and determined to make the Coalition function as I am."

If he had heard the speech made here a moment ago by Mrs Kyburz he would not have thought she was interested in the coalition, but her leader was recommended to us by the Premier as a coalitionist.

Let us go a little further. "I am pleased he co-operated with me fully", said Mr Bjelke-Petersen. That was the first abortive step to give the Liberal Cabinet a new Llew Edwards image. Then in March 1979, three or four months later, the papers trumpeted that Liberal action man Dr Llew Edwards was again to act. Lickiss and Greenwood were to be axed on this occasion and the new people to come in were Hewitt, Lane and Akers. They were all to be promoted. "What the Liberal leader planned to do was manipulate around the back bench, get a few of them here and there getting the idea that they might be Cabinet Ministers and as a result they will all stand up and help their friend Llew in his campaign against Joh."

Dr Edwards: You didn't stay too long as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BURNS: I had four years as Leader of the Opposition. Let me say this to you, Doctor, that if I were you I would do the same thing as I did; I would step down, because you are a failure in your position; you are a disgrace to the position you hold.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr BURNS: All right. Through you, he ought to stand down.

After those great articles and all the newspaper stories that were leaked, what happened? Dr Llew Edwards failed to act again! There was no reshuffle of the Cabinet. Let us now go on to September 1979—six months later. Again we read in the paper, "Lib. 'team' shake-up?" The article stated that Dr Edwards expected to ask two Ministers to resign after the Redcliffe by-election. The Liberal executive was reportedly prepared to back this fearless leader. Three days after that we were told that the Ministers to get the axe on this occasion were Mr Lee and Mr Lickiss, new Ministers being added to the list of those being axed. Those facing promotion were Hewitt, Lane, Austin or Scassola. "Here come a couple more back-benchers to keep the pot boiling. It is a nice stew. We get one or two new names—"

Mr K. J. Hooper: Why has Dr Edwards never considered the member for Ithaca?

Mr BURNS: With due respect to Mr Deputy Speaker, I could not answer that question.

Then 20 days later it was announced that the action man was again not ready to act. "The Liberal reshuffle is not on yet." That was 23 September 1979. Energy Edwards, as they told us he was, had now become Lethargic Llew. What did his party think of him? In January 1980 the Young Liberals hit out and said that they—

"... were awaiting a tangible display of his capacity to lead the party."

That was the Young Liberals talking about the leader in January this year, awaiting a tangible display of his capacity to lead the party. The Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs, Mr Porter, said he did not think Dr Edwards would make as good a Premier as Mr Bjelke-Petersen. That is loyalty from his own front bench. That is the measure of the leadership of the man. "The Australian Financial Review" quoted one Liberal back-bencher as saying of his leader that "he had a mandate for a dramatic change but did nothing". The Liberal member for Townsville, Dr Scott-Young, accused Dr Edwards of having failed to stand up for his members in Cabinet. He went on to say—

"I often wonder if the Liberal Party does not sell a portion of its soul every time one of its members is elected to cabinet, and loses his identity to the will of the coalition Premier."

That is Dr Scott-Young, one of the back-bench members who Dr Edwards professes to lead into government. It says a lot for all the Cabinet Ministers, not only Dr Edwards, when Dr Scott-Young said that each and every one of the Liberals who went into that Cabinet sold a little bit of his soul. If Mr Bjelke-Petersen handles the Liberals after the next election as he has done in the past and if the coalition is unfortunately returned, I believe Peter McKechnie will probably be the Treasurer or, if not, it will be Tony Elliott. But there will be a National Party Treasurer. The National Party took Transport away last time and the next one will be the Treasury. Dr Edwards's desire to remain in Cabinet and in the coalition above all things and at any cost proves that Dr Scott-Young was right.

I draw honourable members' attention to an article in the "Sunday Sun", in which Dr Edwards is reported to have said that he was against any suggestion that his party should withdraw from a coalition with the National Party. He said that if that happened the National Party would continue to govern as a minority party and the Liberals would be on the cross benches with no influence on Government decisions, no strength in debate and no effect on development. Is it not true to say that 18 months later, after he has sat in the plush chairs, been driven around in the Jaguar, been flown in Joh's plane and had his overseas trip, he is saying that he has had no influence on the debates, he has had no say in development, and it

has been the National Party that has made all the decisions all the way along the line? What difference would it have made if he had got out of the coalition 18 months ago? So, 18 months later, after enjoying all that plush life, we are told that what he predicted would happen if the Liberal Party got out of the coalition in fact happened.

Let us again look at what his members think of his leadership. A report in the "Telegraph" stated that angry clashes were heard in the Liberal Party room. I am reminded of the fact that at that time he said he was disenchanted with some of his back-benchers. They were just as disenchanted with his leadership. The Press reported that the disenchantment had reached the verbal stage where they were having it out and saying it publicly. Dr Edwards spoke of knockers and whingers in the Liberal Party and called on the Liberal back-benchers to work hard. I read that the member for Salisbury, the member for Pine Rivers, the member for Southport and the member for Surfers Paradise all got upset about this and started to say some very nasty things to Dr Edwards in the party room. It is all there and it has never been denied. This is the leader that the Liberal Party is going to take to the next election. We are told that these Liberals believe he will be the next Premier.

The Press also reported his clash with the members for Surfers Paradise and Southport over the Gold Coast land deal. He dumped those two back-bench members, and the reports make it very clear that he dumped them. He is understood to have told them at that stage that he could not support them. He could not support his own people. Talk about loyalty! He got a little upset when I talked about loyalty and mateship at the beginning of this speech. There are such things as walking away from one's cobbers and mates when they are in a bit of trouble. That particular day Dr Edwards walked away from his cobbers and mates.

In January this year the Liberal Party executive director, Stephen Litchfield, the man who I think might have written the speech of the member for Salisbury tonight, spoke of the party leader and the party itself. He told the Young Liberals in January of this year that they must be utterly determined to cast off an image of a "doormat party" in Queensland. He said, "Let's be leaders, not followers." This is the party that has been led for 18 months by Dr Edwards. The executive director of the party called it a doormat party. He added, "Let's be leaders, not followers." I repeat that was what the executive director of the Liberal Party, Stephen Litchfield, said when addressing the Young Liberal organisation in January this year.

Dr Edwards is the man who pretends that he wants to be Premier. In articles in "The Courier-Mail" in October 1978, and on a number of other occasions, Dr Edwards has said that he does not want to become

Premier. It is on record in the newspapers that he has said he does not feel the desires or the need to become Premier. On 21 July this year, which is only a month ago, he said he doubted that the party would be able to govern without the Nationals. That is what the leader of the Liberal Party said on 21 July last. He added that a Liberal-led coalition would be the second best form of Government. He is saying, "If you vote Liberal at the next election, it will be the second best form of Government." He is asking the people to accept second best. I agree with him on that. I think that anyone who votes Liberal is voting second best. I must say that that is one of his statements that I accept as being correct.

Let us return to the 1977 election. I have seen the polls that have been made up by the Liberals and fostered by "The Courier-Mail", showing that the Liberal Party will get 57 per cent of the votes. In 1977 the National Party out-pollled the Liberal Party in a State election for the first time since the Liberal Party was formed in this State. The Liberal Party polled 25.2 per cent of the vote and the National Party 27.1 per cent. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer was the victim of a gigantic swing in the seat of Ipswich and held his seat with a majority of only 4 per cent over the Labor Party. A number of Liberal politicians, including the member for Salisbury who made her valedictory speech here tonight, found themselves winning by a handful of votes. The member for Stafford, the member for Salisbury and a number of others won by only a handful of votes. If they are counting on the Deputy Premier to lead them to victory, they are in trouble.

Let us have a look at the election results. The National Party won 35 seats and the Liberals won 24. The figures are now 34 and 25. The National Party forced the Liberals to hand over some of the more powerful portfolios such as Transport and in return gave them the portfolio of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I have watched the honourable member for Carnarvon (Mr Peter McKechnie) here tonight and I can assure honourable members that he will be the Premier's new Treasurer if and when Mr Bjelke-Petersen is returned as Premier of this State. It is a fact of life that the Liberals will not have the Treasury any more.

Despite all the huffing and puffing of the newly elected Liberal State President (Dr Herron), he has said that if the Liberals did not win seniority there would be a reworking of the coalition. So what the Liberals are really saying to the Queensland public in this election campaign is "Vote Liberal and we will win." However, Dr Edwards has said that the Liberals will not win, as has Dr Herron. Surely the two good doctors could not possibly be trying to mislead the people of Queensland on this. They have both said that the Liberal Party will not win and they have both said that after the election they will go back into coalition with that terrible National Party, a party which they will spend

the next three months attacking and which they have already spent the last six weeks attacking.

Already the people of Queensland have been given an assurance by the Liberal State President that the coalition will come together again. The Liberal leader has already told us that he does not expect his party to be able to win on its own, that if it is to govern in this State it will have to govern in coalition with the National Party. So people should be reminded of that and I will remind them of it right throughout the State. The Liberal Party is campaigning on the basis that the people they are now attacking, the people they want to get rid of, will be their hand-in-hand partners in coalition after the election.

Dr Edwards: You will collapse as soon as you have pressure put on you again.

Mr BURNS: Is that right, dear doctor?

As the "Telegraph" reported in June 1979, one Liberal speaking on the withdrawal from the coalition said that the Liberal Party did not have the principle or the guts to do it. The Deputy Premier has not got the principle or the guts to withdraw from the coalition and he has not got the guts to stand up to the Premier on any of the issues on which he has failed in the past.

Dr Edwards: I would not say too much about the strength of anybody, because you have not too good a record in that regard.

Mr BURNS: I will be around and I will be able to take it on the chin. I will not do people in when they are at their mother's funeral. I will stand up to them face to face whenever they want to.

Another Press article stated that Liberal Party strategists said that Dr Edwards has an infuriating habit of qualifying every public statement he makes. After the Deputy Premier had had a Press conference stating how he was going to reform the Parliament, we found that he spent most of the time apologising for it. That is a report from Quentin Dempster of the "Telegraph". The Deputy Premier refused to be drawn on questions associated with the coalition and he ran away from it. That is part of his normal practice.

At this time members were not flocking to the Liberal Party. A country vice-president of the Liberal Party, Mr Kevin Coughlan, resigned and it was reported that membership in Queensland had slumped from 10 000 to 5 000. In all of its troubles today with the old guard and the new guard, the ALP has more members than that.

Malcolm Fraser obviously has little regard for "Noddy". After the Liberal Convention had decided on a separate Senate ticket, the doctor, Mrs McComb and others all flew to a secret meeting at The Lodge in Canberra to discuss the Senate ticket and a deal to do away with and bypass the original decision that was made at the Liberal Convention.

The Deputy Premier did not deny it in the paper. He decided at that time to ignore this particular matter; but the deal was proposed down at The Lodge. After the discussions down there, I might say that I can understand his anger when his own Federal leader, Mr Fraser, did a deal with the Premier over the election date and did not even consult him. The Liberals were left right out of the arrangement and Dr Edwards had to come out in the newspapers again to complain that the Liberal Party Federal leader was not taking any notice of him or consulting him over election matters.

The people of Queensland share the feelings of back-bench Liberals, the Young Liberal movement and others of the Treasurer's poor leadership qualities.

Dr Edwards: You must be very worried.

Mr BURNS: I think the Deputy Premier is worried. When the Liberals cook up stories like that one about 57 per cent in the paper this morning and the member for Salisbury gets handed a speech tonight to attack some sort of fancy deal we are supposed to be doing with preferences, I think they are worried—and they should be. Anyone who has been involved in party politics for some time would know that they shot their bolt too early. At the Liberal conference they made all of those statements through Dr Herron about how they were going to take on the National Party, how they were going to defeat the National Party and how Dr Edwards was going to become Premier. But most people do not believe them.

Most people see the Liberal Party as a very weak party. They do not believe that, collectively, the Liberals have been prepared to take anyone on. They think of Tarong, Iwasaki, the Bellevue, street-march legislation and attacks on churchmen. They think to themselves, "How many times did we see the Liberal Party do something about it?" We know that on every occasion they would have to say to themselves, "They didn't."

Mr Blake: Wasn't it a Liberal who called them the doormat party?

Mr BURNS: That is right. The director of the Liberal Party called them the doormat party. He said that in January this year—just recently.

Someone spoke about surveys. I like to look at surveys. Here is one that refers to a swing to Joh. It talks about leadership qualities. It says—

"A survey of swinging voters looking for strong leadership qualities found that only 8 per cent, or 8 out of every 100 surveyed, thought that Dr Edwards would be a strong leader."

Eight out of a hundred! I would hang my head in shame if I ever got eight out of a hundred. This is the man we are told is the only Liberal worthy of leadership. It doesn't say much for the others.

Let me quote a few of Dr Edwards's statements on Cabinet and the coalition—

"The National Party cannot govern without us and we cannot stay in Government without them."

Every time we hear Mrs Kyburz, Dr Edwards, Mr Innes, Mr Bishop or any of the others attack the National Party, let us remember Dr Edwards's words: "The National Party cannot govern without us and we cannot stay in Government without them." They will be back as kissing cousins after the election. They will be back here doing as the Premier says after the election. They will be toeing the party line. I ask Queenslanders to keep that in mind as the Liberal pretenders try to con voters that all bad decisions were made by the National Party. The Liberals can't stay in Government without National Party support. After the election the two partners in crime will be back holding hands.

On Cabinet decisions, Dr Edwards said that the Liberals' contributions to them were not widely recognised.

Mr Yewdale: There's the new Treasurer just coming into the Chamber.

Mr BURNS: There's Peter McKechnie, the new Treasurer—the man who will be Treasurer after the election. I recognise that he will probably be a stronger and more forthright Treasurer than the one we have had for the past couple of years.

At this stage I would like to refer to the contributions by Dr Edwards about the coalition. He said that National Party members or Ministers did not make all the decisions. In June this year he took full responsibility for the wasteful extravagance by Cabinet Ministers when speaking of Liberal Ministers featuring themselves in Government advertisements. I would like to read this point from Dr Edwards because it shows why, when he was asked if the Government was arrogant, he said, "No."—

"The Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Dr Edwards) said yesterday that the Welfare Minister (Mr Doumany) could continue to appear in Government advertisements. 'After all, I pay the bills,' he said."

He pays the bills! I understood that the taxpayer of this nation paid the bills. I understood that the same man was saying that we would have a public accounts committee to look at Government spending. "After all, I pay the bills," he said.

He claims that all of the economic decisions have been made by Liberal Treasurers. We ought, then, to have a look at some of the things that he approves. For the ministerial junkets—and Mr Camm was attacked this morning over retiring soon after his overseas trip—he pays the bill. When Mr Porter went overseas on his retirement trip, Dr Edwards paid the bill. When Joh flashes round the countryside in his aeroplane, Dr Edwards pays the bill. When "The Sunday

Mail" reports that there is a public relations staff of 60 journalists and a multi-million dollar PR outfit in this State, Dr Edwards pays the bill. Obviously he approves of it, because he has said it can continue.

On 26 July this year, Dr Edwards said that he was tired of the National Party taking credit for the economic initiatives of Liberal Treasurers. I am reminded that the Liberals have always held the Treasury portfolio and have been responsible for the economic management of the State. It has been those economic ministerial mismanagements that Liberal Treasurers have endorsed over the years.

Let us look at the speech of the honourable member for Greenslopes (Mr W. D. Hewitt), who this morning in this Chamber spoke about the democratic process. I can say quite truthfully that I am becoming tired of his pontifications on this issue. He is a very experienced Chairman of Committees. However, while he has served in this House, the democratic process has been assaulted and battered till it no longer resembles that in any other parliamentary democracy in the nation. I am reminded of the lack of Liberal action relative to the story of the two members of Cabinet who signed undated written letters of resignation—who resigned before they got the jobs. They went to the newspapers and said, "I resigned beforehand."

Mr W. D. Hewitt interjected.

Mr BURNS: The only thing the honourable member did was write a smart letter to Mike Ahern. That is the only action that he or the Liberal Party took on the issue.

Mr W. D. Hewitt: I publicly criticised it.

Mr BURNS: Publicly criticised it! The honourable member is a paper tiger. He has been roaring and ranting about parliamentary democracy in this Chamber for the past five years, but nothing has happened. They were very good speeches but a very poor performance. That is what the facts show.

But what about these two Ministers? I tried to find out whether it was possible to charge the Premier with blackmail, because I think it is blackmail for anyone to suggest that he will hold the threat of forced resignation over anyone's head. But it is impossible to find out what type of oath Cabinet Ministers in this State sign. If one goes to the library, one can obtain a copy of the oath that the Governor takes and a copy of the oath that the judges take; but one cannot obtain a copy of the oath taken by Cabinet Ministers.

If one reads what Privy Councillors sign and thinks of the system of honourable Ministers, one sees that Ministers were placed on their honour to put their country above themselves, to put their country above personal considerations. They are called honourable Ministers because they took the

correct step, the step that was in the nation's interest. But how can a Minister claim to be an honourable Minister when, in essence, he says to the Premier, "Here is my resignation. You can slip the date on it whenever you like. If I don't toe the party line and do as I am told, if I don't do as you want me to, you can cut my throat."? For the honourable member for Greenslopes to rise in this Chamber this morning, after nothing has been done about that by the coalition Government, and speak about parliamentary democracy and responsibility is a sham—a complete and utter sham!

There is even worse than that. What about this story: "Camm: 'I'd make more by telling'?" This is probably one of the most disgusting stories to come out of the coalition Government in this State in this century. The newspaper article said—

"The National Party Deputy Leader, Mr Camm, retired yesterday with a parting shot at people who claimed government Ministers were being found well-paid retirement jobs—

"I could use the knowledge that I gained as Mines Minister to reward myself far greater by disclosing information and tactics to many mining companies in this state," he said."

Mr K. J. Hooper: And he has.

Mr BURNS: No, I would not say that.

Mr K. J. Hooper: You are more charitable than I am.

Mr BURNS: I may be more charitable but I will not say that.

Dr Edwards: After your performance tonight, I would not say that you are very charitable.

Mr BURNS: Let me say to the Treasurer that I think it is impossible to ask people to believe in the parliamentary process, in the system of parliamentary democracy, in Cabinet Government and in the way that Cabinet should operate if it is even suggested that a Cabinet Minister might use the knowledge that he has gained in Government after he has left office to the advantage of some company or sell it on the open market. A statement of that type brings all Cabinet Government, whether it is Liberal Party, National Party or Labor Party Government as we know it—and it is Cabinet Government, not Parliamentary Government, in this State—into disrepute. I wonder why the Liberal Party, which is now making so much noise, did not do anything about it.

The honourable member for Greenslopes also spoke about other democratic processes. Let me look at what the Liberals have failed to do. On every occasion they have failed to support Opposition attempts to make Parliament responsive to the aspirations of

the ordinary people in the community. What did the Liberals do to protect the parliamentary process when Mr Speaker announced that a Speaker is elected to apply the wishes of the Government he represents?

Mr Akers: What did you do?

Mr BURNS: What did we do? Look back through the records. The honourable member is part of the Government.

Mr Akers: I am a back-bencher.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member is a back-bencher, but he is a member of the Government.

Let me read what Mr Speaker said, and his comments were supported by the member for Pine Rivers and all the others. Mr Speaker said that a determination on the function of Parliament should be made by the Government. He said he believed it should be the Speaker's responsibility to interpret these decisions in the manner the Government of which he is a member would wish. He said that a Speaker is elected to apply the wishes of the Government he represents.

Is that the type of parliamentary democracy that the member for Greenslopes was talking about today and that he expressed concern about? That is the type of parliamentary democracy that the people of Queensland have come to expect from the Liberals and the National Party, which form the coalition. The Government parties should be able to do something about it. If the Liberals cannot do something about it, they should get out of the coalition. If the Liberals are second-raters in the coalition, always lose the fight and are always pushed into a position in which they cannot win, they are a spineless mob of animals if they do not get out.

Let me deal with the question of the redistribution. We are told now that the Liberal Party is concerned about parliamentary democracy and that the Liberals are going to do something about changing the system. I am reminded of a statement made on 22 February this year by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer when he was talking about a partial redistribution proposed by the National Party. He said that a redistribution, even a partial one, as has been suggested by the National Party, would be an admission that the 1977 redistribution was askew. What he is saying there is that there was nothing wrong with the 1977 redistribution. What does he mean by saying the 1977 redistribution was not askew?

Mr Bourke: It could have been better.

Mr BURNS: Thank you very much! The honourable member is in disagreement with his leader. Dr Edwards did not want any changes; he was happy with the 1977 redistribution.

Let me go a little further for the benefit of these democrats, such as the member for Greenslopes and others who claim they believe in parliamentary democracy. We are told that when the National Party said that it would bring back first-past-the-post voting, the Premier and others said that preferential voting was introduced in Queensland at the Liberals' request because they could not save their seats if it was not brought in. It was not because it was democratic; it was not because it was a fair and just system; it was because it would help the Liberals save their seats. And this morning the member for Greenslopes had the hide to rise and talk about democracy and the democratic process.

Let me go further into Liberal Party policies. The Young Liberals said that recently they had completed two years' work on detailed proposals for the composition and powers of a State Upper House. The Young Liberal man was reported as saying that it was important that, if an Upper House be not just wasted spending on more politicians, at least two conditions should hold. He set out the conditions. Two years' study in support of an Upper House by the Liberal Party! Unless it be thought that no-one in this House supports it, I point out that Sir William Knox said yes to an Upper House. The establishment of an Upper House must be part and parcel of the Liberal Party's policy these days.

Today I ran into a fellow—I shall not mention his name—who said that the Liberal leader changed his mind from day to day. He said, "If you are in today, you could be out tomorrow; if you are out today, you could be in tomorrow."

The Liberals say that they are opposed to the Government's street march policy. The Liberal leader has said, "The only way to do it is get the numbers in the coalition. Get the numbers in the party room." Let me deal with the report about the party room and the Liberal Party's policy on street marches.

On 20 July 1978 the Premier was reported in the Press as saying that only eight Liberal back-benchers supported a motion in the joint Government parties meeting to have the legislation changed. In other words, of the 24 Liberal Party members who are elected here—all of whom tell us they want to do something about it and all of whom support the Liberal Party's organisational wing in its trumpeting around the streets saying, "The only way we can do it is in the joint parties room"—only eight voted for the legislation to be changed. In other words, 16 are hypocrites and false pretenders.

I heard Mr Hewitt say this morning that the Labor Party would tie the community up in red tape by the establishment of committees. We should have a look at some of the Liberal committees. I understand the Premier

said that the Liberals would tie the community up with committees. Dr Herron made a statement about committees. He said he wanted a Liberal committee to probe the fire boards, and I think Mr Lane was one of the members to be appointed to it.

The Liberals intend to set up a privacy committee. I do not hear one Liberal member talking about the young Warwick lady who was fined \$20 by the Liberal Federal Government on 13 August for refusing to supply information. The information that was sought on the CES form included whether she lived alone, who visited her house during the week and the names of all persons, including visitors, who were living at her home during the week. What value is that information to an unemployment office? She was fined because she said it was an invasion of her privacy. At the same time as that, the Liberals are saying, "We will set up a privacy committee."

Mr Shaw: They are hypocrites.

Mr BURNS: Of course they are hypocrites.

Where were the Liberals and their privacy committee when the Police Act Amendment Bill was before Parliament? The Liberals voted for that amendment which allowed police files to be circulated to insurance companies and Government agencies.

Mr Jones: It was 46 to 24.

Mr BURNS: Right.

When will the Liberals implement their policies? They do not implement them. We have only to remember Malcolm Fraser and his broken policies. A headline reads, "Libs ignore own finances policy." The article reads—

"Liberal Party policy on politicians' pecuniary interests is being ignored by Liberal Cabinet Ministers.

"A detailed resolution on Cabinet Ministers' private interests was passed by the Liberal Party in 1970. . . .

"The Liberal policy also calls on any new Minister or incoming Opposition Leader to give up all shareholdings and other investments to trustees."

Ten years later that policy has not been implemented.

Last year the Bowman area conference of the Liberal Party debated a Chatsworth Young Liberals' resolution for extra tax on working wives. Is this the Liberal Party attitude—that working wives should pay extra tax? Another article goes on to say that the Liberal Party is against the elimination of pay-roll tax. Dr Edwards said that in the newspapers. The Liberal Party opposed the National Party scheme to scrap death duties, and I would have supported them. Sir Gordon Chalk was beaten on that stand.

Anybody who wants to talk about honesty and decency in Government and parliamentary circles should look at the operation of the Liberal Party in the selection of an Aboriginal lady by the name of Mrs Scott as a candidate for the electorate of Cook. The Liberals are sadly misusing that lady and her race. That sort of shabby trick will be proved wrong. The Aboriginal community in that area will wake up to what they are trying to do. They are trying to put two Scotts on the ballot paper in the hope of confusing the people there. They will find that their racist idea that local Aborigines will not be able to work it out for themselves will be proved wrong. Bob Scott will be returned as the member for Cook. That sort of shabby trick and the misuse of that good lady are very wrong.

If the Liberal Party is fair dinkum in opposing the collection of money by the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, it should do something about it. I said tonight to Dr Lockwood, and I will say it again: the Labor Party has been prepared for years to accept a motion in this Parliament, and it can be backdated for a few years, that every donation to a political party or candidate be made public and that it be an offence not to provide the details. If the Liberals are worried about the amount of money that the ALP receives from the unions, it will be surprised, when it gets the facts, just how little it receives, but we will get the Liberal facts about the oil companies and the other big companies involved in the port and other areas, and we would be very interested to read the details.

Mr Vaughan: The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is not a political party.

Mr BURNS: The funds can be covered the same as in America on a number of occasions. If the honourable member gets a copy of the Hatch report he will be able to read all about it.

What did the Liberal Party do about these absurdities? The first prosecution of a white woman for living with an Aborigine occurred under this Government. An absurd situation, a terrible situation! No Liberal in this Parliament did anything about it. What about the refusal for a permit for one man and his dog to march along a secluded road outside Bundaberg at 2.45 a.m.? Opposed by the Liberal and National Parties in this State! The Liberal Party said he was a threat to the nation! What did it do when the Premier gagged the reply to a censure motion on the Opposition that he had moved? What did the Liberals do then? What did the democrats do then? Where did they go? What did they do about Tarong, Iwasaki or the "Bellevue"? Nothing other than wring their hands.

Mr Bourke: Where were you?

Mr BURNS: I was over here voting against you, and I will be here voting against you as long as I am able, make no bones about it.

Finally I say this to members of the Liberal Party as they go out onto the election stump to tell the people of Queensland how different they intend to be: when Dr Edwards was asked had the Government become arrogant he said, "No." I say to Liberal Party members that if they believe they can sell Dr Edwards and the Liberal Party policies and the Liberal Party leadership to the people of Queensland on the basis that if they lose they will come back here with the bloke they are attacking; if they are going to come back on the basis that whatever happens they are not going to win on their own and will have to come back into a coalition with the people they are vilifying on the stump day in and day out, then they are trying to treat the people of Queensland as fools, and they are not fools. They are aware of the Liberal Party now, they know it is weak and I know they will not vote for it.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (11.6 p.m.): During this debate we have heard statements by many speakers about what a wonderful State this is, and rightly so, but unfortunately the National and Liberal State and Federal Governments stand condemned because today we find that the finance necessary to develop our State is sadly lacking. We have the highest unemployment rate in Australia. We also have the highest taxation, both personal and indirect. The Treasurer said that we have a wonderful State, one of the richest in Australia, but the honourable member for Rockhampton produced figures which showed that Queenslanders as a whole have the lowest household earnings per head of population of all Australians. But it is totally different when we look at the profits of the multinational companies. Queensland should be the richest State in Australia, but unfortunately it is not the Queensland people or the Government but the multinationals who make vast profits and yet employ so few people in comparison to the throughput of materials that they have at their disposal. If Queensland was receiving a fair go and a fair return for our mineral exports, why then do the Queensland railways run at a loss which continues to mount each year while carrying ever-increasing amounts of freight?

We have a State Government that cannot provide adequate housing and has a long list of people in every city and town waiting for housing accommodation. We have children who have never been able to obtain pre-school education, and when those children are admitted to primary and later secondary school they are educated in demountable accommodation which is grossly overcrowded. We also have a State Government that cannot provide sealed all-weather roads which would ensure safe, comfortable travel at all times. We have a State Government that does not and cannot assist local authorities sufficiently so that finance is available to provide the infrastructure that is

necessary to meet the needs of the population growth in the developing areas of the State. We have a State Government that, because of cost, does nothing to ensure that pollution is controlled and, in fact, eliminated, but instead is allowed to cause problems to health, property and primary industry. It is also a fact that because of the finance provided to the Government parties and the pressure placed on them by big companies the Government allows those companies to dictate the terms and conditions of their operations at the expense of the people of Queensland.

I shall speak in more detail about some of the areas of concern that I have mentioned. Firstly, I must mention the railways. Its losses are very serious. Last year I think the Queensland railways lost \$97m. As I have said, no doubt this is due to the secret freight rates that this Government has given to the multinational coal companies operating in Queensland. We find that railwaymen, those dedicated workers who work all hours under all conditions, are not adequately housed. Over the years the Government has promised railway workers in this State that they will be provided with adequate housing. Although increased tonnages are being carried by the railways each year, such great losses are still being suffered and railway workers are still living in substandard houses. These houses would not be accepted by workers in any other area of Government employment in the State.

Mr Powell: What sort of houses did you give them?

Mr PREST: Unfortunately, we have been in Opposition for 23 years. This Government's reign is coming to an end. The honourable member will be lucky to hold his seat of Isis at the next election. As has already been mentioned, he could not get enough votes in his own party to become the party whip. He was defeated not only by the member for Balonne but also by the member for Caboolture.

There will be a great increase in the coal traffic from the coalfields to Gladstone. So it will be absolutely essential to build a double line from the coalfields to Gladstone. People do not patronise the railways today because the trains carrying coal for Japan are given preference over the passenger traffic. I am quite certain that if the Government gave more consideration to the people of this State, a greater number would use the railways. There is no better form of travel than rail travel. It is very safe.

I am sure that in the very near future—it will not be in this Budget—a freight and fare rise will be imposed upon the people of Queensland in order to subsidise the coal traffic that is subject to this secret agreement.

Mr Powell: Do you use the railways to travel backwards and forwards between Gladstone and Brisbane?

Mr PREST: Of course I do. I enjoy travelling by rail. I can leave Gladstone at 6.30 p.m., travel in a sleeping compartment and arrive in Brisbane at 7 a.m. the next day. Sure I use the railways.

Mr Powell: When did you use it last?

Mr. PREST: If I have no business to attend to on Monday night, it is nothing—

Mr Bourke: How often? Did you come down by rail last night?

Mr PREST: There we have the chemist from Laidley. He is commonly referred to as "Pierre the Frenchie".

Queensland children are being deprived of an education. We must look at our schools. We have heard about the great development that will take place. A little while ago we were told that the development that is taking place in Central Queensland will provide 11 000 job opportunities.

Recruiting the skilled tradesmen necessary for the construction of the projects we are hearing about today will be a great problem. The greatest emphasis must be on apprenticeship training. At the present time a technical college is being built in the city of Gladstone. That will be a great asset. We are looking not only to private enterprise to employ more apprentices but in particular to Government departments to play their part in taking on more apprentices so that we can get skilled tradesmen who are Queenslanders.

A great majority of the development work that will take place will create employment for men. To have a contented and balanced work-force we must provide in these developing areas some sort of employment for women. We all know that today more and more women are entering the work-force. Of course, we know that the opportunity is there to provide jobs and, as I said, there is a very high rate of unemployment. One Press release stated that there are 430 789 people out of work. That is a crying shame.

Not very long ago the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services said that many job vacancies could not be filled. In March 1980 I wrote to the Minister stating that I had been approached by tradesmen desirous of contacting some of the firms with a view to obtaining employment. I asked if it was possible to obtain a list of these firms with vacancies as the tradesmen were prepared to travel anywhere in Queensland. Unfortunately, I received no reply to my letter. I telephoned the Minister's office on two occasions but was told that he was unavailable. I was also told he would contact my office when he was available. I still have not heard from him. To me, his silence proves that the statement that there were job opportunities could not be substantiated. In fact, such a statement did not warrant Press coverage because vacancies, when they do occur, are isolated and can be readily filled by tradesmen in the particular

area. Such statements give some hope to the unemployed but it causes them bitter disappointment when the Minister refuses to give details to substantiate the statement that there are vacancies for tradesmen.

Unfortunately what is happening is that the Government is neglecting to assist areas in which great development is taking place. Not only is great development taking place in the Central Highlands where the coalfields are expanding, but it is also happening in the Gladstone/Calliope region. That area needs some financial assistance from this Government and also from the Federal Government. Over the past few months I have been accused of being a knocker. I was simply saying that industry should be making a greater contribution towards the infrastructure. I am very pleased to be able to say that those who were accusing me of being a knocker have now come on side.

The Treasurer has stated today that the Rundle project is a great development for Queensland. I quite agree with that, but there are too many ifs at the present time. I thought that agreement would have been a document that had been thoroughly investigated before presentation to this Assembly. However, I am now concerned because I have a release from the Co-ordinator-General in relation to Rundle which states—

"It is too early to say what problems would be created in the Gladstone area by the Rundle oil shale development, according to the State Co-ordinator General, Mr Syd Schubert.

"Mr Schubert accompanied State Premier Mr Bjelke-Petersen on an inspection tour of the Rundle lease on Wednesday before yesterday's signing of the Rundle oil shale agreement.

"It's early days yet', replied Mr Schubert when asked what problems the massive project would cause throughout the Gladstone area."

Before presenting that sort of agreement to this House for approval, the Co-ordinator-General should have investigated all of the problems that such a massive development would have brought to the area. Then the Premier of this State made a statement, which was reported in the following terms—

"But Mr Bjelke-Petersen said that the State Government needed Federal Government support for infrastructure costs as the project proceeds.

"The Federal Government will have to help shoulder the huge costs in Government work needed to support the project', he said.

"The Federal Government cannot leave a project of this size to the State Government and the companies, especially when you consider the huge royalties from petrol tax they will receive."

The Premier should have spoken with the Federal Government about this massive project and the agreement before it was signed,

giving some indication of what he would be requiring the Federal Government to fund and making certain that those funds would be available. The Gladstone City Council now says that the companies coming to Gladstone should make a major contribution to the infrastructure of the city.

The other day the mayor of Gladstone and the chairman of the Calliope Shire met Mr Anthony and put their case to the Federal Government. Of course, the reply they got was, "Prove you have a case." After the horse has bolted, they now have to submit a case to the Federal Government for some assistance. They said that, unless the companies made a major contribution, they would not be granting approval for the construction to take place in the area. Subsequently the Premier said that it is very dangerous for local authorities to make a threat about halting further industry in the area. He warned that the attitude could discourage industry from coming to Queensland. I do not think so. The Government should be putting pressure on these companies and telling them exactly what it wants. The companies will only give what they are asked to give—and no more. I have spoken to people from ESSO and SPP. They are quite willing to come to the party when the time comes.

We should not have more caravan parks. What we are looking for is permanent housing. I do not believe that children should spend the best part of their lives living in the cramped conditions of caravans and caravan parks. I will read a letter that was handed to me. A copy has gone to the Queensland Housing Commission. It is from a departmental social worker and it has gone through the Queensland Housing Commission as a case from people living in a caravan park. It reads—

"Dear Sir,

"I would like to submit the following report on the . . . family in support of their application for a Housing Commission home.

"I first made contact with (the family) in May this year soon after their arrival in Gladstone. I have been visiting the family at the Caravan Park on a regular basis since then, in an attempt to help alleviate some of the problems they were experiencing.

"The . . . have three children, 12month old twins and a three year old daughter. They are living in an extremely small caravan, approximately 12ft. The living area in such a small van is obviously minimal and sleeping conditions are cramped and insufficient. There are two permanent beds in the van and the table can be converted into a double bed if required. Due to lack of space the table must be used as a storage area and (the mother) sleeps on the floor with the twins.

"The children are suffering developmentally as a result of the poor accommodation and living facilities. The van

has no annex and the children spend most of their time playing on the concrete slab beside the caravan. The babies must be watched constantly and this is placing a severe emotional strain on their mother. As there is no privacy in the van, the babies cannot be put to sleep undisturbed.

"Mrs . . . has been unable to commence toilet training with the twins due to the cramped conditions in the van, the lack of privacy and the distance to the amenities block. Their are no baths in the female block and consequently the children must be bathed in the laundry tubs."

I have made many appeals to the Minister, and he has been willing to listen to what I have had to say about housing in Gladstone. However, we have a major problem on which we have run up against a brick wall. Housing Commission houses are taken by companies such as QAL and the QEGB at a guaranteed rental. Recently 24 houses were still vacant. I have suggested to the commission that if they are not being used by the companies, they should be taken from them and rented to people who are on its list. I am certain that at least 50 people with a high priority are waiting for houses in Gladstone, and another 150 with lower priorities are waiting for accommodation.

I reiterate that the situation is serious, and I hope that in the coming Budget the Government will take action to ease the problem. I give the Housing Commission credit for the fact that there are 1200 Housing Commission houses in Gladstone. Unfortunately, some of these have been built for companies, and unless a person comes from outside a radius of 60 miles of Gladstone city, the companies will not allow him to enter into a tenancy agreement for a house that is vacant.

The Gladstone City Council has again departed from its by-laws to allow backyard caravan sites on a temporary basis. That means that there will be a return to the dark ages of the last big development that took place in Gladstone, when there were caravans in virtually every backyard. The situation is unsatisfactory and further permanent accommodation is needed.

I have approached the Gladstone Area Water Board, which has 20 three-bedroom houses and 30 unoccupied caravan sites at Awoonga Dam. The board has been talking since 1976 about the extensions that it intends making to the dam wall, but nothing has yet been done. When I asked the board to allow workers into the vacant accommodation, it said, "We cannot let them in because we will be calling tenders for a job in the near future; a few weeks after that we will be letting tenders, and a few weeks after that we will be doing something constructive down there, after the next wet season." The board is under the Premier's control, and I suggest to him that, because

of the serious shortage of accommodation, something should be done at the Awoonga Dam.

Schools are overcrowded and inadequate, and many children are working in demountable class-rooms. In addition, many children have been unable to attend pre-schools. The latest figures supplied to me show that the population of Gladstone is 22 000 and by the end of the year it will be 25 000. In 15 years' time—1995—the population of Gladstone is expected to be 75 366, and the population of the Gladstone/Calliope region is expected to be in excess of 86 000. Gladstone is expected to be three times bigger than it is now, so a great deal of assistance is required from both the State Government and the Federal Government.

These are the places where the great development is occurring and where the Government is making money. Comalco has been condemned because it is building homes with the assistance of the Queensland Government. At Boyne Island the company established a caravan park containing 150 sites. No more than eight caravans are in the park, yet the company will not allow anyone into the park. The Calliope Shire Council is not very happy about that, nor am I. In fact, I believe that today the unions were going to confront Comalco over that issue.

Assistance is needed in the provision of hospital and medical facilities. The hospitals board has been trying to build a new wing at the hospital. Unfortunately, the Government gave very little support to the board's efforts to raise the \$2,500,000 that is necessary for the first stage of the new hospital. It is looking for some assistance in that regard.

A matter that concerns me is local government. Throughout the State the local authorities are faced with unrest. Approximately three or four local authorities have asked the Minister for Local Government to intervene in their affairs. Requests have been made for the dissolution and even the sacking of some councils. I do not believe that such a step is necessary. However, I know that approximately 6 000 ratepayers in the Maroochy Shire have signed a petition seeking the dismissal of their council. Today I received a letter from Herberton indicating that the ratepayers are in conflict with the local authority.

The increases in rates that have been imposed this year are sounding the death-knell of local government. If the Treasurer goes ahead with his planned review of subsidies paid to local authorities, he will cause a great recession in the development that is occurring in the various local authority areas. He will thrust great financial hardship onto local government.

Rates in two local authority areas have risen by 11 per cent and, in the Landsborough Shire, by as much as 75.6 per cent.

Esk ratepayers face a 37 per cent increase. Those in Toowoomba have to meet a 16.12 per cent increase. In the Calliope Shire, where great development is occurring, the increase has been kept to the level of the increase in inflation, namely, 10 per cent. The ratepayers in Gladstone are faced with an increase of 14.19 per cent.

Some years ago Gladstone was not in the top 20 highest-rated towns in Queensland. However, three years ago it was 17th and last year it was 9th. The present rate increases will lift the rates in some parts of the city to \$640 a year.

Mr Scott: The people can't afford it.

Mr PREST: No, they cannot. Imagine how the aged pensioner feels when she is given a rate notice for \$640 a year. A revaluation is due in Gladstone.

Some real estate agents are not afraid to offer big money for blocks of land in Gladstone. Some blocks containing old residences are attracting \$65,000 or \$75,000. Prices such as that are paid only for the block of land; the old homes are knocked down because they are virtually worthless.

What happens to the pensioners who live on either side of such a block when they see flats or units erected on it? They cannot sell out and move to the suburbs, because Gladstone does not have adequate bus transport. So the old people have to stay there and be adversely affected by the sharks in the real estate business. The worry that is being inflicted on the pensioners by not being able to pay their rates will hasten their trip to the cemetery. Those are some of the major problems stemming from the development that takes place in these areas.

There are other problems. Agents are evicting people and every day people are saying, "I have been evicted. My house is for sale and I cannot afford to pay \$100 or \$150 a week for a house." This is ridiculous. I do not know how the ordinary worker can be expected to keep his head above water.

Development creates many problems and one of our major problems is caused by the Gladstone Power House. Industry needs massive amounts of power. The State Government is not sincere about controlling air pollution or any other sort of pollution.

The Air Pollution Council employs 22 officers. Only two of them are employed outside Brisbane. There is one in Townsville and one in Gladstone. The officer who has been in Gladstone for some months does not have an office, a phone or any equipment. How can he do his job? The people are saying that it is a sham and that he is only there to say that everything is OK. I am almost assured that he has been told not to come up with any air pollution figures

that would embarrass the Government, particularly just before a State election. There is no answer to the powerhouse pollution. The stacks pour out pollution.

"The Gladstone Observer" of 5 July 1980 reports that crops in the Yarwun area were hit by the city fall-out. It said that the Yarwun papaw farmers complained that pollution from the Gladstone Power Station and possibly QAL was destroying thousands of dollars worth of crop in the Yarwun/Tarwon area. It is so bad that the students attending the Catholic high school in Gladstone are writing letters to the Premier asking him to do something about pollution in the Gladstone area.

If the Government does not put its own house in order and does not control pollution, how can it expect Rundle with 40 retorts, the coke plant, QAL, Comalco, Alcan and many other companies to control pollution? QEGB might be able to do something about the pollution that is coming out of its stacks. This pollution has been going on for too long—since 1976—and we have been told that when the power-station comes on line fully in 1982 some of the problems could be alleviated. As Mr Camm said, it would cost the Government about \$30 million to stop pollution. I do not think that cost should be a consideration in view of the thousands of dollars being lost by the Yarwun papaw growers and the health problems that are being created. The State Government has created these problems. This power-station has already cost hundreds of millions of dollars. The Government entered into contracts for the supply of this equipment and it should have purchased equipment able to cope with these problems.

I want to return to the subject of development. I was very concerned to read a Press release No. 93 on 4 July 1980 by the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services (Mr Lee), who is always advertising Queensland-made goods and flashing all he has inside his coat. He says that Queensland-made goods are the best, but this release reads—

"The Industry Minister (Mr. Lee) hopes to be on hand to greet a trailer driver when he reaches Gladstone in three weeks' time at the end of Australia's longest delivery run—6,600 kilometres across the continent.

"The trailer will leave Perth on Monday hauling a 62 tonne fabricated steel dryer shell across the Nullabor Plain to South Australia then heading north to Alice Springs, Tennant Creek and Mount Isa.

"The rest of its route will be determined by prevailing road and weather conditions."

That is so in Queensland; we cannot travel on our roads at all times. The release continued—

"On arrival at Gladstone the driver will hand over a letter of good wishes to Mr.

Lee from the West Australian Industrial Development Minister (Mr. Graham Mackinnon).

"The cylindrical dryer shell is part of a \$7 million contract under which Noyes Brothers Limited, of Sydney, will supply cement clinker manufacturing and raw material processing plant to the Queensland Cement and Lime Company's Fisherman's Landing project.

"Mr. Terry Roberts, Noyes' Engineering representative in Gladstone, said the cost of the shell, including transportation, was \$200,000.

"It had been made by a Perth firm under sub-contract. Its overall length was 12.75 metres and maximum diameter 5.2 metres.

"Said Mr. Lee, 'I imagine the trailer driver will also bring a big thirst with him which I hope to alleviate with a Queensland-made product.'"

That means a beer.

This sort of contract should have been let in Queensland. This type of fabricated shell could have been made by one of our engineering workshops. I want to know why these contracts are being let outside the State. Why is our Minister, a man who says we must buy Queensland-made goods, going to fly to Gladstone at the taxpayers' expense to greet this trailer driver when he arrives from Perth with a letter from the Western Australian Government? As I said, I do not believe it is necessary. This dryer shell should have been made in Queensland, and if this could not be done we should be doing something to ensure that engineering workshops in Queensland are equipped to handle the building of any sort of equipment.

We did read in that Press release that the route through Queensland would be subject to our road conditions. That is another problem we face—our roads. The Queensland motorist has been ripped off for the past 10 years by the Federal Liberal-National Country Party Government. As the honourable member for Rockhampton said, the cost of a litre of petrol has risen from 9c in 1970 to 36c today. Most of this money should be coming back into Queensland and being spent on our roads. Why should we in this State have to wait for good weather conditions before we can travel? We should have roads, particularly in country areas in the North and in Central Queensland, on which motorists can travel safely at all times.

We are looking for funds to construct a bypass road from Gladstone to Benaraby and then on to the Boyne Island turn-off. The cost of this 15 km section will be in the vicinity of \$8m. I do not believe we should have to wait for \$8m in the next Budget. That road could be constructed in sections. Money could be allocated for the construction of bridges and culverts in the first year and the next section could then

be constructed from Gladstone to Velina Estate, which would service the suburbs in that area. In the third stage, construction could go from Velina Estate to the Boyne Island turn-off. If we wait until we get all the money for the job, we might have to wait for years. There will be an escalation in costs and we could be looking at a cost of about \$12m to \$15m. I ask the Minister for Main Roads to get on with the job. The proposal has been on the drawing board for a number of years. I would say that it has been there for the best part of eight years. Each year we find it is shelved because we do not have \$8m. As I have said, it should be done in stages.

Only last year I appealed for assistance for the Citizens Advisory Service in Gladstone that was closing down. During the latter part of 1975 it was funded by the Whitlam Government. At that time it was called the Gladstone Social Area Development Board. There was a grant of \$2 per head of population. There were social workers to help all the itinerant and construction workers with their problems. The Gladstone City Council, which has funded this project since 1979, has now ceased to fund it, and the centre has closed down. I made an appeal on behalf of this centre last year and the Government said that it had not received an application for assistance. I know that it received an application from the Gladstone City Council in October or November last year. It is too late to provide assistance now. However, I am looking for money in this coming Budget to employ a social worker, who could work from one of the Government departments.

(Time expired.)

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (11.47 p.m.): We have seen in this House today a massive attack on the credibility of a failing Government. Members from all parties in the House have charged the Government with irresponsibility in managing the affairs of a State that should be great. The only members who have not attacked the Government are the weak-kneed ones holding National Party seats, who are suffering the same problems in their areas as the rest of us but are not prepared to be honest. The reason for the attacks is that the Government is not spending money in the right parts of the State.

I have many charges of neglect in my area, particularly in relation to roads and schools, to lay at the door of the Government. My secretary told me today that people from Cooktown were ringing up wanting to take up a petition about the Cooktown road. It is not long since a petition was taken up and presented to the Minister for Main Roads about the road to Chillagoe. The roads in that area are in a shocking condition. The tourists and those who use the roads to bring their products to the market are all suffering because of their poor condition.

What have we got? We have a Liberal Treasurer as part of the Government, who is determined to make promises about what he will do after the next election. I draw honourable members' attention to an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 13 August headed "Liberal pledge on roads and schools". I shall just read a little of it, in these terms—

"A Liberal-led government would encourage decentralisation of industry, and improve services, roads and communication in rural Queensland."

When is the Government going to do it, and why have we got to wait until after the election for that sort of thing to happen? We on this side of the House listened this evening with great pleasure to a stinging attack by the member for Lytton on Dr Edwards, who sat back and cringed in his seat. He sat there and copped it because it was an honest and fair attack. It showed up every weakness in his party. These matters will be brought out in greater detail as the election campaign proceeds. If I were the Treasurer, I would prevail upon the Premier to hold the election now because it is his only chance of getting off the hook and saving any of his party's seats. He should not wait, because his credibility will plummet further as the public realistically examines his performance as Treasurer, his party's performance in the coalition, and the whole of the coalition Government's performance. I could spend considerable time on that line of attack.

The same newspaper contained a statement by Sir William Knox headed, "Problem is state's size". I will quote only a small portion of it, in these terms—

"Sir William said the vast area of Queensland prevented effective and fair health facilities for everybody."

In North Queensland we are suffering not from the vast size of the State, but the inadequacy of the Government and the inadequacy of the Treasurer.

This evening I shall speak particularly about the lack of a water supply at Karumba, which is a shocking indictment of this Government. People in that part of the State will note with great interest the Treasurer's advertisement. I should like to be able to show one to the House. It consists of a map of Queensland and is filled with little bits of machinery here and there to indicate the activity taking place in the State. What interests me and the people in the Gulf area is that it clearly shows that money is coming into the State from that area and is being used in the south-east corner of the State; that is where it is being applied. The money earned in the North and the West is used for the benefit of the south-east corner. The Treasurer's little device, which he hoped would be a good advertisement for this State, shows that, and people in the North know what is happening.

The story of the Karumba water supply is an extremely sad one. I can show

honourable members a document prepared by the resident engineer of the Carpentaria Shire, who works for Cardno & Davies. There are over 40 items of correspondence referred to between the end of 1977 and 1980 relating to the simple matter of a water supply for a town that is in great and urgent need. The Government has done nothing about it. Representatives from the Carpentaria Shire formed a delegation to meet the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police (Mr Hinze), who gave them an undertaking that the prawn processors in the town would not be required to pay in half a million dollars, which is what the Government has asked them to contribute for a town water supply scheme which is necessary for that area. That is an area that is earning money.

In no other similar town are producers or manufacturing processors being asked to contribute in that manner. If those people were spread out along the Brisbane River and were contributing to the industry of the city of Brisbane, or if they were in the town of Gladstone, whose case has just been put so adequately by my colleague the member for Port Curtis, they would not be asked to contribute that amount. That promise was made by the Minister for Local Government (Mr Hinze), but the Government has now reneged on it. Is that reneging the result of an argument between the National and Liberal members of the Cabinet?

Recently one of the prawn processors received a letter signed by the Under Treasurer. That letter contained a straightforward threat. It was a threat to the effect that if the processors did not weigh in with not half a million dollars but \$600,000 in cold hard cash, that water supply scheme would not proceed. When that letter was received up there, a wave of anger went around the town, not only among the prawn processors but also among the ordinary people. I attended a very angry meeting in that town, at which 50 people wanted to know why special conditions were being applied.

I remind the Treasurer of the financing of that scheme. It is to cost \$2.8m. There is to be only a 50 per cent subsidy given by the Government, which is the normal state of affairs. So nothing special is being given to that area. There is to be a special grant of a lousy \$100,000. What is \$100,000 today from a Government with a Budget the size of the State Budget? It is nothing! The Treasurer is screwing those people up there for the last cent. The council must find the balance of \$1.3m from charges to industry and through loan borrowings. Current estimates of operating expenses for this scheme indicate that the cost per residential allotment will be, on average, \$410 per year. What an incredible charge that is to householders in that area for the basic necessity of a water scheme.

The people up there have received a letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury welsching on a promise given by a Minister of the Crown. I hope the Treasurer spends a little time answering the many charges that have been levelled at him tonight. I hope he explains to the people in Karumba why it is necessary for them to privately finance this scheme. Karumba is a viable town with a proven record of export earnings. It is exactly what we are asking people in this State to do: earn money, produce and live in remote areas. I will be reminding them during the election campaign with a little symbol of the State of Queensland where the money is going in up in the Far North and being taken out for the people down in the south-east corner, who already have quite enough.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.46 p.m.): After listening to some of the debate on this Bill, one would wonder about the sensitivity of the Liberal Party. Let me deal with the Federal Budget, which was delivered tonight. After hearing it, one realises how little the Liberal Party has done for Australia. Mr Fraser, after all his broken promises—and they have been extensive—tonight had to explain to the Australian people how his Budget in 1980 was going to see Australia through another 12 months.

Mr Blake: Stagnation.

Mr D'ARCY: Stagnation! Tonight's Budget has been described as boring and priceless. All Mr Fraser's promises since 1975 have been broken. This Budget has done nothing about unemployment. Petrol pricing has helped him balance the Budget, but none of the money has been returned to the Australian public.

When we look at the areas he has spent money on, we see that he is as divisive as the Liberal Party in Queensland, and is as non-thinking. Defence spending is up, which I think is a good thing. However, welfare spending is almost at the same level as it was for the past 12 months. Education expenditure has increased by 10 per cent, which only keeps pace with inflation. However, one of the sad things about education expenditure—and this illustrates the divisiveness of the Liberal Party in Queensland—is that it resurrects the State-aid issue. There is an increase to non-Government schools of 12½ per cent, but only 3 per cent to Government schools.

My colleagues tonight have pointed out the great need for housing in this State, and welfare housing in particular. This is one of the areas in which spending has been slashed by the Federal Government. How are we going to get extra housing when the Housing Commission in this State is already well behind? As I have told the Minister on many occasions, I believe the Government has no heart on housing matters. It is aggressive to people.

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: It is in my area. Sometimes I think the Minister is a Liberal spy.

We have a working core in Australia and it is absolutely necessary that housing be supplied in welfare areas. The wages of Australians are falling further and further behind. We know that the real wage today is about \$18 lower than it was when Mr Fraser came to office. The Liberal Party was going to abolish unemployment but it has an unemployment rate of 400 000 people. So many young people will never obtain jobs. This is the Liberal Party which was going to reduce inflation—one of its Ministers, the Minister for Finance in the Federal House, said earlier in the year that it would drop to 6 per cent—yet now the real inflation rate is about 13 per cent.

One of the things that must frighten every voter in Queensland is that this Government and this Liberal Treasurer, who scurried out of the House when the member for Lytton was speaking, are just waiting to raise interest rates again. We know that he has been saying, "We will keep them down." He is keeping them down only until election-time. Housing interest rates will go up again in this State by up to 2 per cent. Well over 50 per cent of Queenslanders are trying to pay off a home. The rates will be kept down only till election-time.

[Wednesday, 20 August 1980]

As I said earlier, the Federal Budget makes a mockery of Liberal Party policy; it makes a mockery of the Liberal Party. One of the things that disturbs me about the Liberal Party is that it cannot tell the truth about anything. One honourable member made the point that my research assistant had been granted by someone, but I do not know who she meant. I understood that the appointment had been approved by Cabinet, eight members of which are Liberal Ministers. It is interesting to note that on 20 February this year, when I was appointed, I, in conjunction with my leader, wrote to the Premier requesting a research assistant and additional staff. We wrote several times, after we had been in touch with every other deputy leader in Australia. It was pointed out in writing by other States that Queensland had the worst conditions for a deputy leader in Australia, even including the Northern Territory. In general, they all still have better conditions than we have in this State. In New South Wales and Victoria, chauffeurs and cars are provided.

Mr Bourke: We should get you a keeper rather than a chauffeur.

Mr D'ARCY: That would be all right, too. This debate on the Appropriation Bill—

Dr Edwards: On the Liberal Party.

Mr D'ARCY: It should be on the Liberal Party, too. It is obvious that the Liberal Party is wrecking this great country.

In this State, one must look at two factors. The people of Queensland should be much better off than the people of any other Australian State, but they are not. We are continually told that this State has great wealth, but wealth really flows into this State only when the Australian Labor Party forces it into the State.

Dr Edwards interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: I will give the Treasurer some figures. The State derives some of its wealth from royalties, and if one looks at the figures between 1971 and 1978, one sees that there is a great discrepancy. Till the late Rex Connor introduced a decent subsidy system and forced the Government of Queensland to take better royalties, no royalties of any consequence were being paid to the Government. In 1973 royalties amounted to less than \$5m. In 1974 the figure was just over \$8.75m. In the year in which the subsidy system was introduced, royalties to the Government of Queensland were in excess of \$40m. In the following year, they increased to \$44m, then to \$50m, and then to \$52m.

Dr Edwards interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: Queensland is a wealthy State; it has great mineral reserves. However, it has the lowest wage structure and the lowest mean average wage of any Australian State, with one exception. The great wealth of this State is not being passed on to those who need it most; it is not being passed on to the average worker. The average wage rate shown by the latest figures, which were published late in 1979, show that the average wage for Brisbane—and it must be realised that Brisbane rates are higher than those in many centres throughout Queensland—was \$199, compared with \$242 in Canberra, \$210 in Sydney, \$211 in Melbourne, \$200 in Perth, and \$195 in Adelaide. The Treasurer may laugh, but he is laughing at the people of this State who are trying to make a go of it on the minimum wage. Let him try to feed his family on \$136 a week, which is what his Government gives as the minimum wage. It is unbelievable that that is the minimum wage in Queensland. The Woodridge area contains a large number of people who take home less than \$150 a week.

Last week Mr Justice Staples, in a decision that is worth quoting, said that less than \$160 a week take-home pay, that is, after tax, meant undue strain. He said that the Arbitration Commission had called for a minimum wage based on fair basic living standards and suggested that such a wage could be fixed at a "tolerable proportion" of average weekly earnings. He said that adults taking home less than \$160 after tax were being subjected to undue strain and denial in keeping body and soul together.

That is what this Government is subjecting Queenslanders to by its mismanagement and failure.

The Full Bench judgment was the second in which Mr Justice Staples participated since his relegation to Full Bench only duties. Honourable members might recall that he was one of the commissioners the Liberal Party tried to keep off the Full Bench.

Mr Justice Staples went on in his judgment to say—

"The claim if granted would bring the weekly pay of hospital employees after tax to between \$144.64 and \$148 a week for a single man and \$159 and \$163 for those with one dependant. Under the conditions in our society at this point, adults taking home less than \$160 a week or so are, in my observations, subjected to an undue degree of strain and denial in keeping body and soul together, in making plans and keeping self-respect on high."

That is the situation. He said that in Queensland the present minimum wage under Federal awards is \$136 a week and the average adult wage was up to \$226 a week.

In this great and wealthy State of ours housing is not provided to the extent it should be in the welfare area. This Government is going to cut it. We have great mineral wealth in this State, and the people who most need this wealth are not seeing it.

It is interesting to note that on the same day as the Full Bench judgment a Federal Liberal member criticised the Queensland Government for its failure. He said, "You are not doing a good enough job in your coalition Government. You do not intend to pass on the wealth or distribute wealth. You look after the vested interests of the mining companies and that is all."

That Federal Liberal member went on to say—

"It is high time we looked seriously at decentralising the nation's wealth. As a nation we ride relatively easy in the saddle because of the wealth of Queensland and Western Australia. However, the average income in Queensland has to be compared more with the poorest State, Tasmania. Locally, it's time we traded off a little of our mining royalties in return for undertakings to permanently establish headquarters here."

The only headquarters ever established in Queensland by a major mining company was the headquarters of Mount Isa Mines Ltd. Its headquarters were established here at the request of the Labor Government of the day.

One of the things that must concern us is the imposition of a value added tax. It has been mooted. Such a tax is a highly inflationary one. The public should be warned that if they re-elect the Liberal Government in Canberra and the coalition Government in Queensland, they will have additional taxation

imposed on them. Queensland will end up with State taxation. We know that the Liberals cannot keep their promises.

This morning mention was made of the Deputy Premier's comment that there would be no more jobs for the boys. He looked foolish on television tonight. The media have finally woken up to him. I can remember in 1975 Mr Fraser saying, "There will be no more jobs for the boys." Look at his record! The position was so bad that he had to appoint the defeated Opposition Leader in New South Wales, Mr Coleman, to Norfolk Island. It was once a convict settlement, and perhaps that is where all defeated Liberals should be sent.

Some problems in this State need to be looked at specifically. I have spoken before about the ambulance service. It is an absolute disgrace that the Minister for Health—and Dr Edwards can claim some credit as a previous Minister for Health—organised an inquiry into ambulance services over 18 months ago, and it has not brought down a finding yet. Ambulance brigades and committees are framing their budgets without knowing what the Government intends to do. If it continues with its record, it will do nothing.

Tomorrow I shall present to Parliament a petition signed by over 12 000 people throughout the length and breadth of the State asking Parliament to improve ambulance services. The ambulance people deserve a better deal and the public deserve a better deal. One matter for consideration is the better training of ambulance officers to paramedical standard and the upgrading of the vehicles used in emergency work so that standardised equipment will be available.

The State Budget will be introduced at the end of next week, so we must look at what is really being offered to the people of this State. One of the biggest problems facing Queensland is unemployment. This Government has done nothing to overcome unemployment. The Minister for Works and Housing lets contracts instead of using day-labour, and he has contributed to additional unemployment.

With the introduction of each Budget, the Treasurer cons the Press which carries banner headlines about more jobs for Queensland. I think it was 5 000 more jobs last Budget and 5 000 the Budget before. What happened to those jobs? They were not created. Lies were told and we ended up with one of the highest unemployment rates in the Commonwealth.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (12.13 a.m.), in reply: At the outset let me point out that I intend to reply only to the speech of the Opposition spokesman on economic affairs, Mr Wright. I place on record my utter disgust at the contributions of other Opposition members. They degraded this Parliament in a way that has not been seen in the history of this State. I place on record my disgust and

I shall treat them with the contempt they deserve. I shall reply only to the speech of the honourable member for Rockhampton because he made a sensible contribution. He left personalities out of his speech and levelled constructive criticism at the Government, which is his right and responsibility.

His assessment of the Queensland Government's submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission was a justifiable statement and analysis of the situation. If the honourable member would like to have a look at the total submission, which consisted of something like 20 to 25 booklets—not the 36-page summary to which he referred, but something like 40-odd documents—I will be happy to discuss the matter with him.

It is true, as he indicated, that this State has not received from any Commonwealth Government the assistance it deserves. This is why we believe that we must justify our case. I am pleased that he saw the value of the submission the Government made. The submission brings great credit to my officers and the other people who worked so hard on its preparation.

The honourable member made one or two points to which I would like to reply. He said that Queenslanders had the lowest household income per head of population in Australia. That is basically because we have the highest percentage of pensioners of any State, and this tends to lower the average income level, as he indicated.

The honourable member also referred to dual taxation and predicted its introduction. A couple of other speakers also referred to this point. For us to introduce stage 2 of the Federal Government's policy would need legislation in the House, and we have said that as a State we will not be part of stage 2 legislation, and we therefore will not be imposing a State tax, despite what has been said here this evening. I might also add that no other State has agreed to introduce stage 2 of their taxation. This was discussed at a Premiers' Conference held in Melbourne a week or so ago.

The honourable member for Rockhampton also referred to the Local Government Grants Commission, and for once he agreed with Alderman Pilbeam. It is interesting to note that members tend to agree and disagree with people when it suits their political philosophy or argument, but unfortunately on this occasion Alderman Pilbeam is well off the beam. He said, for example, that Rockhampton had been discriminated against, but I will cite some figures to show that he was incorrect. For example the Gold Coast received \$12.3 per capita compared with Ipswich \$13.23, Brisbane \$11.51, Rockhampton \$14.56, Toowoomba \$12.06, Bundaberg \$12.43, Logan \$11.77, Pine Rivers \$12.16 and Redcliffe \$11.65. He also indicated that the basis for allocation was a political decision. That was not a correct statement. The commission is a totally independent body

appointed by the Government consisting of representatives of local authorities who make recommendations to the Government on a basic formula.

Mr Warburton: Not the number of people, though.

Dr EDWARDS: The honourable member does not understand the facts. The basis of the allocation is, first of all, the population and area of each local authority; secondly, the revenue capacity of each local authority relative to the rest of the local authorities; thirdly, the relevant road costs, health, recreation, culture and library costs of each local authority and, fourthly, any special expenditure items which may have to be borne by particular authorities such as hostels, childminding centres, garbage disposals, precepts, soil erosion, school bus routes, urban drainage, noxious weeds, public order and safety and so forth. There is also allowance made for any isolation factor when this is relevant. I might add that when we released this figure, which was approved by the Federal Government, there were only one or two complaints throughout Queensland about the way the allocation had been administered by the Grants Commission. I have every faith in the way it has been administered. I spoke to the leaders of several local authorities today, and they said that this year was one of the fairest distributions in the history of the Grants Commission.

The honourable member for Rockhampton also referred to the policy of the Labor Party. I think the honourable member for Greenslopes covered those points very fully.

There is one other point I would like to make very clearly, and that is that this Government will continue to adopt policies which will benefit the people of Queensland. Our record stands for itself. I believe we have contributed a great deal to the development and growth that is now the envy of every other State. We have the best fiscal position of any State, and this is recognised at Premiers' Conferences. We have the best employment figures for any State and the greatest job-creation figures. I can state quite categorically that this State has been the recipient of Government policies and programs which are bringing progress and development to the State. It is regrettable that when we have the opportunity in this Parliament to spend the time debating economic matters we hear nothing but scurrilous attacks on people both inside and outside this Parliament which add nothing to the dignity of this House. I wish to dissociate myself totally from such attacks. I am totally responsible for my integrity, and I leave it to the judgment of the people of Queensland. I would hope that the Budget debate will result in a better debate in this House. I look forward to hearing the contributions from members in that debate.

Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

The Chairman of Committees (Mr W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes) in the chair
 Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.
 Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr Edwards, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 12.22 a.m. (Wednesday).