

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1980**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1980**

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

**PAPERS**

Report of the Police Superannuation Board for the year ended 30 June 1980 (laid on the table on 9 September) ordered to be printed.

The following paper was laid on the table, and order to be printed—

Report of the Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs, Book F.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Rule under the Coroners Act 1958–1980.

Report of the Queensland Law Reform Commission for the year ended 30 June 1980.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****REPORT OF AUSTRALIAN ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO DRUGS**

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.1 a.m.): On 18 March 1980, I tabled in this House Books A to E of the report of the Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs. It was stated in that report that the commission would proceed to examine the desirability of presenting, to any of the four State Governments from which it had received a commission, a report dealing with matters of particular relevance to that State which had not been specifically covered in the major report.

At the end of November 1979, when the commission was engaged in writing the main report, the Queensland Government requested the royal commissioner to defer the preparation of the report covering issues relevant to Queensland until after consideration had been given to allegations that certain members of the Queensland Legislative Assembly and certain officers of the Queensland Police Force had been involved in the illegal drug trade. This request was agreed to, and subsequently the commission's report on the allegations was tabled on 17 April 1980. Honourable members will no doubt recall that the commission's conclusions on the allegations were an undeniable condemnation of the Leader of the Opposition.

The commissioner, the Honourable Mr Justice E. S. Williams, has now presented the report on the Queensland matters previously deferred. It deals with coastal surveillance, drug-related criminal activities in North Queensland, the use of serialised prescription pads as a means of preventing the forging of prescriptions and the illegal diversion of licit drugs, and drug education programs. An examination of the recommendations made in the report will proceed, and I would assure the House that, along

with those in the reports presented earlier, they will receive the earnest consideration of the Queensland Government.

However, before I table the report I would like to bring to the attention of honourable members the commissioner's findings in relation to certain assertions made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House on 20 November 1979. Members will recall that the Leader of the Opposition said there was reason to believe the owner of McDougall Airways, of North Queensland, who held a contract with the Federal Government for coastal drug-surveillance work, had close associations with a Mr G. Burnell who was named in the report of the New South Wales drug inquiry as being involved in the drug scene. The honourable member named also a number of other air services.

I quote the comments Mr Justice Williams made, in regard to these statements, in the report I am about to table:—

"The Commission's inquiry therefore revealed no basis for indicating that any of the companies named by Mr Casey or those associated with them have been knowingly involved in illegal drug trafficking with the single exception of Northern Air Pty Ltd and Garry Julian Burnell. Such associations as existed, including those with Northern Air Pty Ltd and Garry Julian Burnell, are explicable in terms of normal business dealings. It must be remembered that all the companies concerned were involved in light aircraft operations and, with the exception of Lobegeier Holdings Pty Ltd, were centred, if not based, at Cairns Airport. It is not surprising that those involved with the northern companies knew one another and associated with one another.

"The Commission's consideration of the matters relating to coastal surveillance raised by Mr Casey, reinforces the Commission in a view that those who have information bearing on criminal activities relating to drugs best serve the community by making that information available to Police who can then assess the information in the light of knowledge of the overall situation and act on it as they see appropriate. Publication of material having its origin in rumour without attempting to verify any of the allegations or to ascertain the full facts is, in the Commission's view, at best irresponsible and at worst positively harmful to efforts against criminal drug traffickers, to the attaining of an educated public opinion in drug matters and to the unfortunate persons and bodies who may be unjustly named. Mr Casey's allegations made in the Parliament on 20 November 1979 fall in this category."

Once again the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned by the commissioner. Once again he has been proven utterly wrong. Once again he has been found guilty of indulging in a cynical exercise in political opportunism. I need add no more.

I now lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs to the Queensland Government on Matters of Particular Relevance to the State of Queensland, and move that it be printed.

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

#### ACCOUNTABILITY FOR MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.7 a.m.): The wise husbandry of public money has always been of the highest priority to my Government. My Government has always gone to great lengths to ensure that taxpayers' revenue is used to their best advantage, and this has been reflected in the healthy position that Queensland finds itself in today, the best State in Australia for people to live, and recognised throughout the world as the most viable and successful State for prosperity of investment.

These are indisputable facts; they are the result of positive policies by a hard-working Government and the members of that Government, who have worked actively to develop positive and progressive policies, a Government that has been prepared to take these policies to the citizens of Queensland and to actively seek their advice and counsel on what is best for all Queenslanders. As Premier, I have sought to ensure that we are not a George Street Government, that we responsibly report to all Queenslanders and we go about the State to constantly get the advice of the electorate.

This Government is not closeted; we are in the international spotlight because of our development and potential, and because of this we must be responsible not only in Queensland but also in influential areas of the world.

But, as honourable members are no doubt well aware, in an election year, aspersions and slurs on integrity are now, unfortunately, a matter of political life. For the benefit of honourable members and the people of Queensland, I intend to outline the responsible checks that this Government has in its legislation, to ensure accountability in financial matters, and specifically those relating to ministerial expenses.

We have in this State a measure of the Parliament, namely, the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1978, which has been acknowledged, both in Australia and overseas, as leading legislation in the field of accountability of the executive and administrative arms of Government to the Parliament. The whole pattern of the Act is to govern the management and control of the moneys appropriated by Parliament from the public accounts.

Let me explain broadly how the system operates and how, in particular, management and control of expenditure for ministerial expenses is dealt with in that system. The controls taken in the Act commence

only after Parliament has approved the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure of the Government. The Estimates are prepared and introduced into the Legislative Assembly by the Treasurer acting on behalf of the Executive Government, as soon as practicable after the commencement of each financial year. They then become subject to the scrutiny and questioning of every member of the Legislative Assembly during the Budget debate.

The salaries and contingencies expenditure estimated to be necessary to meet the departmental services is outlined, and included in the proposed contingencies expenditure for each ministerial department. This includes the expenditure that it is expected will be incurred in the year concerning the travelling and other expenses of the Minister of the department.

After the Budget debate and adoption of the Estimates, Parliament, by its Act of Appropriation, appropriates public moneys from the public accounts kept by the Treasurer to each department to meet expenditure for the services of the department; again this includes the cost of the travelling and other expenses of the Minister of that department.

All departmental expenditure is therefore subject to the controls prescribed by the Financial Administration and Audit Act. I will now outline the controls provided under this legislation. The scheme of the Act is that the public servant head of a department, acting subject to the constitutional responsibility of the ministerial head, is made responsible for the financial administration of the appropriations for the services under the control of his department and is appointed to be the accountable officer for those appropriations. In operation, the accountable officer cannot incur liability for any expenditure, and this includes expenditure for ministerial expenses, until a number of checks have been complied with.

The expenditure must be necessary for the proper conduct of the services of his department and the relevant requirements of the Financial Administration and Audit Act and the Regulations of Treasurer's Instructions for the operation of the Act have been observed in all respects.

There must be sufficient uncommitted balance available in a parliamentary appropriation or in an approval granted by the Governor in Council pending supplementary appropriation by Parliament. The expenditure must be authorised as prescribed in the legislation.

Nor can the accountable officer make a payment with respect to any liability for expenditure incurred unless such expenditure is available according to law, and is supported by authorised and certified vouchers supported by such documents as may be necessary to properly bear evidence that the amount claimed is properly due and payable.

Dealing with ministerial expenses specifically referred to in Treasurer's Instruction 330, the accountable officer is required—

- to ensure that particulars of that expenditure are recorded in a register; and
- to prepare, certify and render to the Auditor-General not later than 15 August each year, statements in forms 12, 13 and 14 of the Schedule to the Instructions.

In explanation, form 12 is a statement of ministerial expenses relative to travelling in Australia and overseas. Form 13 is a statement of travelling expenses of departmental officers accompanying the Minister whilst travelling in Australia and overseas. Form 14 is a statement of ministerial expenses incurred in Brisbane. For the sake of completeness, I seek the leave of the House to table Treasurer's Instruction 330, and have its two and a half pages incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following document:—

#### *Treasurer's Instructions*

#### PART XV—MISCELLANEOUS INSTRUCTIONS

330. Ministers' Expenses. (1) The attention of accountable officers is drawn to Cabinet Decisions Nos. 27560 of 10th January, 1978, and 27637 of 17th January, 1978, with respect to the matter of overseas travel by Ministers.

(2) The accountable officer of each department that incurs liability for expenditure with respect to the expenses of a Minister shall prepare, certify and render to the Auditor-General not later than 15th August each year, statements in triplicate of expenditure charged to the public accounts during the financial year immediately preceding with respect to—

- (a) the travelling expenses of the Minister and properly authorized persons accompanying the Minister excluding the private secretary and other officers or employees—
  - (i) within Australia;
  - (ii) overseas;
- (b) the travelling expenses of the private secretary and other officers or employees accompanying the Minister—
  - (i) within Australia;
  - (ii) overseas;
- (c) the expenses of the Minister in Brisbane.

Separate statements shall be prepared in forms 12 to 14 of the schedule to these Instructions with respect to each Minister, including acting Ministers, administering a particular portfolio during the financial year.

All amounts of moneys indicated in the statements shall be shown in whole dollars.

In a case where there is no expenditure, a "nil" statement shall be so rendered to the Auditor-General.

(3) For the purpose of this Instruction, the term "private secretary and other officers or employees accompanying the Minister" includes an officer or employee travelling with the Minister in a personal capacity such as a chauffeur, messenger or typist but does not include an officer or employee travelling in a departmental capacity such as an Under Secretary, Assistant Under Secretary or accountant or a member of a Parliamentary Committee accompanying the Minister on a visit to a specific project of relevance to that Committee.

(4) Expenditure shall be indicated in the statements referred to in sub-Instruction (2) under the following headings:—

- (a) Hotel expenses, including accommodation, meals, entertainment and gratuities with respect to the Minister and his guests but not including telephone calls, postage or telegrams included on hotel accounts;
- (b) Fares, including aeroplane, railway and shipping fares, excess baggage charges, and personal accident and travel insurance;

Provided that the cost of air travel by the Minister between Brisbane and his home town shall be included in the statement only with respect to those trips in excess of 60 single trips per annum or such other number of single trips to which the Minister may be entitled as a Member of the Legislative Assembly:

Provided also that with respect to an air charter flight where passengers carried include the Minister, personal staff and/or guests together with senior departmental officers or employees, the cost of that flight shall be apportioned one-half to the Minister and one-half to the department;

- (c) Car hire and other car expenses in the country, interstate or overseas, including railage or freight on an official car, purchase of fuel and oils outside Brisbane, and charges for services of a Police Officer or an officer or employee of another department used as a driver but not including greasing, oil changes, repairs, or purchases of tyres or tubes outside Brisbane;
- (d) Incidental expenses, including portage, gratuities (excepting on hotel accounts), rail conductor's salaries, and entertaining other than indicated on hotel accounts but not including electoral allowance, telephone calls, postage, telegrams, or special purchases such as tape recorders;

- (e) Allowances claimed under Public Service Regulation 79 by the private secretary and other officers or employees accompanying the Minister;
- (f) Expenses of the Minister in Brisbane, including newspapers and periodicals, liquor, cigarettes, cigars, entertainment, car hire, wreaths, and special printing such as Christmas cards but not including postage, telegrams, telephones (office or residence), official printing and stationery or electorate allowance.

(5) Statements shall be based on the year's cash transactions and shall not include expenditure incurred but not paid in that year.

(6) Adjustments of accountable advances for travelling expenses made to the Minister, private secretary or other officers or employees accompanying the Minister, shall be effected where practicable within the financial year in which the advance was made.

In a case where an accountable advance against expenses of travelling has not been adjusted by the end of the financial year in question and—

- (a) that travelling was completed by the end of that year and the actual cost of that travelling has been determined at the time of preparation of a statement referred to in this Instruction and that actual cost is—
- (i) less than that advance, that cost and not the advance shall be included in that statement and apportioned to the appropriate headings of expenditure;
- (ii) greater than that advance, that advance shall be included in that statement under the heading "incidentals" with the noting "includes advance of \$ to be apportioned in the financial year";
- (b) that travelling was not completed by the end of that year but the actual cost with respect to that travelling has been determined at the time of preparation of that statement, the amount of that advance, or in a case where that cost is less than that advance, that cost shall be included in that statement under "incidentals" with a noting "Includes (net) advance travelling expenses of \$ in respect of trip not completed by 30th June to be apportioned in".

(7) Departmental accounting records shall be maintained in a form which provides a clear dissection of expenditure under the headings required for purposes of the statements referred to in this Instruction.

(8) Vouchers for a Minister's expenses shall be signed or initialled by the Minister.

(9) Vouchers for entertainment expenses shall be signed by the Minister or, if the expenditure is for departmental entertainment, by the accountable officer and shall contain particulars of the nature of such expenditure and the occasion of the function.

**Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Honourable members are well aware that it has been customary for a request to be made in the Legislative Assembly during August or September each year for particulars of the travelling expenses of Ministers to be tabled for the information of members. Such request is referred by the Premier to the Auditor-General. The purpose of the particular Treasurer's Instruction 330, therefore, is to facilitate the preparation and certification by the Auditor-General of the statement requested for tabling in the House by the Premier.

The responsibility for reporting to Parliament on the management of parliamentary appropriations for the services of a department has been clearly placed on the accountable officer. Indeed the term "accountable officer" exactly describes the responsibilities of such an officer—he is accountable to Parliament. He is required to give an accounting to Parliament of his management of the appropriations for which he is responsible. This he does by preparing, signing and submitting a departmental appropriation account through the Auditor-General to the Treasurer for submission to Parliament as an attachment to the Treasurer's annual statement.

The Act therefore makes it clear that overall financial responsibility begins and ends with Parliament. Parliament appropriates the moneys for the departmental services, including ministerial expenses, and it receives an accounting for such moneys through the departmental appropriation accounts which are presented to the Legislative Assembly. The reports made by the Auditor-General with respect to those accounts assure the Assembly of the integrity of such financial accounting and reporting.

Let us look briefly at the role of the Auditor-General. He is required to audit the accounts of every department, and where he is of the opinion that a transaction is improper or illegal, or that there has been waste or extravagance, or that value has not been obtained for the moneys expended, or that there is other good and sufficient reason to disallow the transaction, he is required—

- to refer the matter to the accountable officer;
- if the matter is of major significance, to refer the matter also to the Minister concerned and the Treasurer;

- if the matter is of such significance to require inclusion in his report to Parliament, to report accordingly.

I have explained in some detail the system of checks that this Parliament has established to ensure that there is a very proper accountability to the people of Queensland and their elected representatives for the expenditure of all public moneys.

Yet despite this, baseless allegations, unfounded on fact, have been made that the Government has withheld from Parliament information under the Act, placed no restriction on ministerial expenses and not accounted to Parliament for that expenditure. A notice of motion is before this House seeking details of the expenses of Ministers, and I have asked the Auditor-General to prepare such details. When these have been completed he will, as has been the routine of this Government, present them to the Parliament.

Honourable members will be aware of the thoroughness of the Auditor-General and his staff in the matter of accountability. The Government respects that annual service given by this vital department, and it is not prepared to ask this officer and his busy staff to deviate from his practice of thorough scrutiny, to rush figures into this House to satisfy the wild and unproven raving, the slurs and the spurious innuendos of the Opposition. What disturbs me and members of the Government is that this slur is a reflection on the integrity of the Public Service, on the credibility of accountable officers, on the credibility of the Auditor-General and his staff, and a reflection that as members of Parliament we are failing to provide to the people of Queensland the ultimate accountability.

Let me say that Ministers of the Crown are constitutionally charged with responsibilities that cannot be properly delegated to officers of their departments. That is an essential working of the Westminster system. Thus in carrying out those duties expenses must be necessarily incurred. This Government has always provided such information, for it has nothing to be ashamed of. The process has been laid down; it will be complied with as a matter of routine, and it will be seen that the scaremongering campaign of the Opposition to discredit the Government and its Ministers is simply a camouflage for its own inability to provide an alternative Government. It has no policies; it simply survives on wild and baseless innuendos and bluff.

Mr Speaker, when the Auditor-General has completed his examination of the relevant accounts, the documents will be passed to me and they will be tabled in this House.

#### DETAILS IN ESTIMATES DOCUMENT

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.18 a.m.): I feel obliged as Treasurer to speak on behalf of the

\* Government in putting into their true perspective the purpose and nature of the document titled "Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure of the Government of Queensland".

At the outset, could I say that there would not be one of us here in this House today or at any time who has not experienced a strong feeling of frustration in attempting to critically analyse and intelligently comment upon the fundamental and crucial Budget document known as "The Estimates".

I have no doubt that the honourable member's comments arose from the same frustrations that we have all felt and that meaning and intentions have been incorrectly interpreted by the Press. The inference that some people have drawn from a Press article is that the honourable member sees the rather broad headings used in the Estimates as a deliberate device to cover up all sorts of misuse of taxpayers' money and that the various headings should be dissected into the subheadings which would make the document more comprehensible and the various departments more accountable.

I agree that it would be helpful to analysts and commentators if the Budget papers showed a more in-depth breakdown of expenditure provisions. It would also be helpful if the Estimates included explanations of significant variations from the norm. But what would this involve? It would probably require a document up to ten times or more the size of the Estimates as we presently know them. Furthermore, it would result in the presentation, and consideration by Parliament of a document that is quite out of line with its purposes.

The estimates of expenditure in their present form are what they are intended to be—the probable expenditure for the year of the Government of the State, classified under headings of the probable Votes, subdivisions and subdivisional items. The Estimates are the basis on which Parliament grants supply per medium of the Appropriation Act. They are the pivotal point in the system of control of, or accounting for, public expenditure and are the linchpin in the system of departmental accountability to Parliament.

This does not mean that they need to be specific to the point that expenditure on every minute departmental function, service or requirement is prescribed in advance, leaving departments with no flexibility or discretion to take account of change in circumstances, priorities or needs. It should be recognised that once the Estimates are approved by the passing of the Appropriation Act, departments have no discretion for variation of, or interchange between, subdivisional items or Votes without approval in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

The form of the Estimates as used in this State is fundamentally the same as, and probably more informative than, that used

by all other Governments operating under the Westminster system. While it might be considered that this form leaves something to be desired in terms of ease of comprehension, it nevertheless serves its purpose admirably as a summary of expenditure provisions made under general headings where such are to cover general recurrent costs of a nature that are more or less common to all departments, and under specifically denominated headings where it is appropriate to clearly identify provisions of a special nature. In fact, the trend over the years has been towards isolating an increasing number of the special items under specific headings.

It should also be understood that the headings as used in the Estimates are not the be-all and end-all when it comes to departmental expenditure accounting. The general headings used in the Estimates—such as “Postage and Incidentals” and “Fares, Freights, Printing and Stationery”—are broken down for departmental accounting purposes into numerous subheadings, the number, nature and variety of which reflect the function of the particular department and the significance of particular types of expenditure in the department’s overall scheme of things.

This detailed analysis of its general expenditure headings is vital to the department, its accountable officer and Minister in the preparation and control of annual budgets. It is vital to the Treasury in its function of assessing and making recommendations on Budget submissions presented by departments. Without this dissection, accountable officers would not be able to present meaningful annual reports to Parliament on their stewardship for the preceding financial year.

I mention these points to illustrate to honourable members that the financial transactions of Government are not recorded on such a broad basis as the Estimates could lead us to believe. I appreciate, of course, that this does not solve the problem of the member of Parliament or other student of the Budget documents who is endeavouring to come to reasoned conclusions as to the nature and purpose of, and justification for, provisions made in the Estimates. I recognise that there may be a missing link between the great mass of detail that is documented and submitted by departments and examined, item by item, by the Treasury in its budgetary processes and the summarised result of these documentations and deliberations as presented to Parliament in the form of the Estimates. It will never be possible to fully bridge this gap.

Contrary to assertions, there is no “cover up” and there are no “missing millions that simply aren’t accounted for”. To say otherwise reflects on the integrity of senior departmental administrators on whom Parliament has placed responsibility for accounting for expenditure of taxpayers’

money, and on the integrity and competence of the Auditor-General, who has been appointed by Parliament to act on its behalf and report to it any impropriety, misuse or extravagance in the expenditure of public funds.

#### ELECTRIC POWER GENERATION

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy) (11.24 a.m.): During the past few days there have been reports and comments in the news media about the possible lack of power-generating facilities in this State in the near future. These inaccurate and uninformed reports were given further publicity in yesterday’s “Courier-Mail” by a reported statement by the member for Nudgee, who claimed that Queensland would be forced to ration power supplies within three years.

If there was ever any action more aimed at driving industries from this State I have yet to see it, for the whole basis of our attracting industries to Queensland is the assurance that there will be sufficient power supplies to meet their needs. The member for Nudgee would be much better engaged in trying to get his union colleagues in the power industry to stop the strikes and industrial disputes that are wrecking Queensland’s economy than in creating a lack of confidence in this State and its people.

Mr Speaker, I would like to outline to this House, and particularly to the honourable member for Nudgee, the facts relating to our present and future power supplies and the sale of electricity to major consumers.

It has been reported that the Government has sold one-quarter of the State’s current power production at cost. This is a gross distortion of the facts.

At the present time, Comalco Limited is constructing an aluminium smelter at Gladstone for the processing of aluminium in Queensland, so that the maximum benefit from processing the raw materials to aluminium will be returned to this State and to Australia. It will create jobs for the workers of Queensland. Comalco is developing the smelter in two stages with an ultimate electricity demand of 720 megawatts. The second stage of this large project will not be completed until about 1988.

With regard to the State’s power production capacity, we have currently in operation some 3 000 megawatts of generating plant. It is seriously wrong to look only at the current installed capacity. This Government is committed to the construction of capacity scheduled to come on stream according to a well-planned and co-ordinated program to meet the needs of all consumers. This capacity includes the extensions to Gladstone, and the new stations of Wivenhoe and Tarong, which together total some 2 450 megawatts. It will supply the expected

requirements of Comalco and other large industries as well as growth in all other sectors.

I have also seen recent comments about the price Comalco will be required to pay for its power. The price of power to large industries is set to recover all of the electricity supply industry's related costs for the generation, transmission and sale of that power. In other words, because Comalco will be a 24-hours-a-day, large continuous consumer adjacent to the Gladstone Power Station, we are able to deliver the power at 132 000 volts at the most economical generation costs, without the additional costs of transmission distribution and other service costs associated with smaller consumers throughout the State. Because price is directly related to the costs of supply, there can be no suggestion of subsidisation by other consumers.

Because our policies are geared to recovering all related costs, adequate allowance has been made to ensure that electricity prices will account for cost inflation, and the commercial contracts with Comalco and other large consumers provide for this escalation.

It would be most inappropriate to reveal publicly, for the benefit of Comalco competitors in other countries, the details of its commercial arrangements with the Government, but it is plain that uninformed comments about future prices of 0.5c per unit are grossly wrong—idiotic, as a matter of fact! When Comalco takes a supply of electricity, the price then will be determined in accordance with escalation in costs and this price will not be fixed but will continue to reflect actual costs. I have no doubt that while we in Queensland will continue to be able to attract beneficial industries, our electricity pricing will be fair and in fact much higher than figures quoted for political purposes.

I have referred earlier to the large electricity capacity now under construction to meet our anticipated requirements. This Government, through the State Electricity Commission of Queensland, is actively planning new capacity to take us into the next decade, and into the 1990s. In considering proposals for new large industries which promote employment and prosperity in this State, the Government is conscious of the need to ensure sufficient power to meet these requirements. I expect to bring before this House during the first half of 1981 recommendations for further new power-station developments totalling 2 100 megawatts in addition to the 2 450 megawatts now under construction. My only concern is that the industrial climate in Queensland may not allow us in a reasonable and practical way to implement these plans.

The honourable member for Nudgee is grossly misinformed about our future plans and the need to retain the older power-stations. These stations, which represent a considerable capital investment, cannot be cast aside and will be retained for as long

as it is practical and economic to run them. This is all part of the overall electricity planning picture, and uninformed statements recently appearing in the Press do nothing to assist in the highly complex planning task.

I hope that I will not be forced to waste the time of the House in future by refuting uninformed statements made by the member for Nudgee.

#### SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General): I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for Masters of the Supreme Court and for related purposes, and, in connexion therewith, to amend the Supreme Court Act of 1867 as amended.”

Motion agreed to.

#### EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy): I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Explosives Act 1952–1978 in certain particulars, to validate certain regulations made thereunder and for other purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr D'ARCY** (Woodridge) (11.31 a.m.), by leave: Last Thursday, in this Parliament, the Deputy Premier and Leader of the Liberal Party (Dr Edwards) accused me of irresponsibility and political opportunism in suggesting that interest rates were being artificially held down because of the pending election. This personal attack was subsequently reported in the media.

I point out that the personal attack mounted by the Treasurer had no foundation in fact. Rather, it was simply a shallow denial coupled with personal abuse. I would like to answer the personal abuse by supplying the facts that follow.

Recently it was reported in “The Courier-Mail” that leading economic forecasting group Syntec predicted a rise in interest rates of around 2 per cent after the election. Previously the general managers of the Bank of New South Wales and the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney were reported as saying that a 2 per cent increase was realistic but at the moment politically unacceptable. As recently as last Saturday political commentator Wallace Brown stated that Mr Fraser had chosen the 18 October Federal election date partly because he wished to avoid the rise in interest rates which the Federal Treasury saw as being inevitable and was confidently predicting.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are but some of the people who support me in my stance that there will be an increase in interest rates and home loan repayments. I should like to know from the Treasurer just who supports him in his assertion that interest rates will fall. If he has no supporters, and I suspect that that is the case, I should like the people of Queensland to consider whether or not political opportunism might have been the motivating force behind his personal attack on me so as to take attention away from the hardship he intends to inflict on small businessmen and home loan borrowers if his party is still in Government after the election.

#### LEAVE TO CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Mr WARBURTON** (Sandgate) (11.33 a.m.): In view of the Premier's comments today concerning the responsibility of this Parliament, I seek leave to move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders and the Sessional Order be suspended so as to allow me to move Notice of Motion No. 5 standing in my name on the Business Paper.”

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

#### AYES, 21

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

#### NOES, 46

<b>Ahern</b>	Kyburz
<b>Akers</b>	Lane
<b>Armstrong</b>	Lee
<b>Austin</b>	Lester
<b>Bird</b>	Lickiss
<b>Bishop</b>	Lockwood
<b>Bjelke-Petersen</b>	McKechnie
<b>Booth</b>	Miller
<b>Bourke</b>	Moore
<b>Campbell</b>	Porter
<b>Doumany</b>	Row
<b>Edwards</b>	Scott-Young
<b>Elliott</b>	Stephan
<b>Frawley</b>	Sullivan
<b>Glasson</b>	<b>Turner</b>
<b>Goleby</b>	Warner
<b>Greenwood</b>	Wharton
<b>Gunn</b>	White, P. N. D.
<b>Gygar</b>	White, T. A.
<b>Hewitt, N. T. E.</b>	
<b>Hinze</b>	<i>Tellers:</i>
<b>Innes</b>	Neal
<b>Katter</b>	Powell
<b>Kaus</b>	
<b>Kippin</b>	

#### PAIR:

Shaw	Hartwig
------	---------

Resolved in the negative.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

**Mr WARBURTON** (Sandgate) (11.42 a.m.), by leave: This morning in this Parliament the Premier made certain comments to which I take exception. The truth of the matter is that my call has been for the Government to cause to have tabled forthwith in the Parliament the full details of expenses incurred by each Minister and former Minister for the past three financial years. I have already tabled in this Parliament copies of forms 12, 13 and 14, together with a copy of section 330 of the Treasurer's Instructions. I now table a copy of the comparative statement—

**Mr PORTER:** I rise to a point of order. With all due respect, the honourable member purports to be making a personal explanation, which I understand to be a reply to something that has been said against him in this House. But he is proceeding to make a speech and introduce further material. I do suggest that a personal explanation is not the vehicle through which to do this.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Sandgate asked leave to make a personal explanation, and he is very well aware of the requirements of Standing Orders when he seeks to do that. If he wishes to make a personal explanation the House will permit him to do so, but if he continues in the vein in which he commenced to make his explanation, I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I was attempting to explain that the information I had given to this Parliament and the call I had made were in fact truthful, and that the comments made by the Premier this morning were in fact, as I indicated, of concern to me. As I was saying I was simply trying to prove some of the matters to which I referred.

**Mr LICKISS:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 110 dealing with personal explanations when there is no question before the House. It reads—

“By the indulgence of the House a Member may explain matters of a personal nature, although there is no Question before the House; but such matters may not be debated.”

I suggest the honourable member is debating.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I give the honourable member for Sandgate a final warning that he must make a personal explanation, or he will not be permitted to continue.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I will conclude by saying that, as a matter of further explanation, I table this document, which is a comparative statement of expenditure to 31 May 1980 for the Department of Local Government.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.*

**Mr UNDERWOOD** (Ipswich West) (11.46 a.m.): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

(Leave granted.)

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member that it must be a personal explanation.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Last Thursday I was accused by the Minister for Health (Sir William Knox) of making disparaging remarks about the absence of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Dr Edwards) during question-time. The Minister assured me that the Deputy Premier had had to leave for the conference of Premiers in Adelaide, and that was the reason why he was absent.

**Mr LANE:** I rise to a point of order. Could we ask the honourable member to speak into the microphone and raise his voice a little bit? It is very hard to hear what he is saying; he mumbles and he has a weak tone of voice.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I was very surprised to see on the ABC television program "Nationwide" the Treasurer speaking from Townsville and answering questions about the ministerial spending scandal. I ask: Who misled the House? The Minister for Health or—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! This does not conform with the House's requirements for the making of personal explanations. This is not a personal explanation.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I shall just round off now and say that my remarks were correct and in order, and they were not disparaging.

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.48 a.m.): In order to clarify the matter quite clearly, I wish to make a personal explanation about where I was last Thursday. The member for Ipswich West has indicated—

**Mr WRIGHT:** I rise to a point of order. I believe that before any member can make a personal explanation in this House he must seek leave to do so, and I do not believe that that has been done.

**Dr EDWARDS:** I am quite happy to seek the leave of the House, because I believe that what I have to say is important.

(Leave granted.)

**Dr EDWARDS:** I do not know what was said in my absence last Thursday by the Minister for Health, but it is true, as I indicated to the public before I even left here, that I was going to Townsville for a specific purpose and then moving straight from Townsville to the conference of Premiers.

## PETITION

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petition:—

### SPECIAL EDUCATION UNIT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, MACKAY

From Mr Casey (8 146 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will appropriate sufficient funding to provide a new Special Education unit for handicapped children at Mackay.

Petition read and received.

### ERROR IN ANSWER TO QUESTION

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have to advise that I have received the following letter, dated 12 September 1980, from the Minister for Health—

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

"I refer to an Answer given by me in the House on 10th September, 1980, in response to a Question from Mr. G. L. Simpson, M.L.A., Member for Cooroora, concerning the Nambour Hospital in which I stated, on information given to me by my Departmental Officers, that future development at the Nambour Hospital was in the form of an 80 bed extension whereas the additional accommodation approved to date is for a 40 bed extension.

"I ask that the House be informed of this correction.

Yours sincerely,

(W. E. KNOX)  
Minister for Health"

## FORM OF QUESTIONS

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have been concerned for some weeks by a number of questions asked of Ministers of the Crown.

Questions have been asked seeking answers to hypothetical and not factual situations; some questioners are seeking opinions and some questions are asked relating to matters for which Ministers are not officially responsible. Questions of this nature are inadmissible.

There has also been a tendency on occasion to ask about more than one subject-matter in a question. Where this has occurred the question has been edited accordingly, and will continue to be edited accordingly. Questions without notice should be brief and to the point, without quoting lengthy detail from prepared documents or making unnecessary comments. I trust that all honourable members will enter into a spirit of co-operation which will ensure the smoother functioning of question-time.

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

### 1. ESSENTIAL SERVICES LEGISLATION

Mr Casey asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) With reference to page 53 of his Annual Statement, prepared under section 39 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977, wherein he authorised an unforeseen expenditure of \$38,880 for publicity relating to the essential services legislation, which advertising agency was used for this advertising program?

(2) Did he query the reason why this amount was charged to the Premier's Department and not the Department of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, who steered the legislation through the House, or the Liberal Minister for Labour Relations, who is the Minister responsible for industrial matters?

*Answer:—*

(1 & 2) The honourable member for Mackay should direct his question to the Honourable the Premier as it refers to a departmental appropriation account which relates to the appropriations under the control of the Premier's Department.

As I explained to the honourable member last Thursday, each accountable officer appointed under the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1978 is required to prepare a departmental appropriation account giving an accounting of his management of appropriations for which he, subject to his Minister, is responsible, and to submit that account to the Auditor-General. After audit and certification by the Auditor-General, the account is transmitted to me for attachment to my Annual Statement which is presented to Parliament.

I again advise the honourable member that I am not empowered to approve unforeseen expenditure. Such expenditure is approved by the Governor in Council pending supplementary appropriation by Parliament. This procedure is in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1978.

### 2. DOUGLAS/BELGIAN GARDENS WATER SUPPLY PIPELINE

Dr Scott-Young asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) Did the Townsville City Council pay money to a contractor outside the contract price to rectify defects in the Douglas/Belgian Gardens water supply pipeline?

(2) Who was chairman of this water supply committee and is he the same person who is standing as the ALP candidate for the seat of Herbert?

(3) Would the council have been able to use this pipeline while litigation was in progress and did the Townsville City Council capitulate and, unbeknown to the ratepayers, pay a considerable sum of money to the contractor to hush matters up?

*Answer:—*

(1) I am aware that there were certain problems associated with the construction of the Douglas/Belgian Gardens water supply pipeline which were rectified by agreement between the council and the contractor. The cost of this rectification was shared between the council and the contractor, with the contractor paying the major part of the cost.

(2) It is common knowledge that the Chairman of the Water Supply Committee (Alderman E. Lindsay) is standing as the ALP candidate for the seat of Herbert.

(3) When problems occur during a major contract, the solution to these problems frequently is a very complicated one. It is considered in this particular case that the solution arrived at was a reasonable one. Legal process could well have delayed finalisation of construction of the pipeline and resulted in other costs.

### 3. REPORT OF CAIRNS HILLSLOPES PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Mr Tenni asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

When will the Cairns Hillslopes Protection and Reafforestation Committee's report to Cabinet be made public and what part of this report will be acted upon?

*Answer:—*

The report referred to by the honourable member would no doubt be the report of the Cairns Hillslopes Study Committee.

The Cairns Hillslopes Fire Protection and Reafforestation Committee is a quite different committee, which I understand is interested in implementing certain recommendations contained in the report.

Cabinet approved the release of the report of the Cairns Hillslopes Study Committee to interested government departments and local authorities only, and certain matters are under discussion with, and are to be discussed with, the Cairns City and Mulgrave Shire Councils.

I am unable to state when the report will be made public, but I am prepared to make a submission to Cabinet on this subject. Obviously, at this stage of consideration of the report by the authorities particularly involved, I am also unable to state which part of the report will be acted upon.

4. ENTERTAINMENT MACHINES

Mr Innes asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Is it within the power of his department to control all places where more than two pin-ball or other amusement machines are installed for use by young people?

(2) What is the pattern of applications to install these machines in shops and other places over recent months?

(3) Is it a condition that all places where more than two machines are provided must have both male and female toilets separate from toilets provided for other tenants and users?

(4) Does his department police the requirement for the provision of toilets?

Answer:—

(1) Condition 6 of the conditions to be observed in respect of entertainment machines which appears in the Second Schedule of the Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976 provides—

“More than two entertainment machines shall not be provided or conducted in any premises save in accordance with the prior approval of the Under Secretary notwithstanding that permits issued in relation to those machines are in force.”

Before any approval is given by the Under Secretary views are sought from occupants of premises in the immediate vicinity of the premises and from the local authority and the local police.

If any condition required to be observed in the conduct of machines is contravened or not complied with the Under Secretary is authorised to cancel or suspend any permit.

(2) During 1980 applications for the provision and conduct of more than two entertainment machines in any premises were received as follows: January, 11; February, 15; March, 12; April, 14; May, 21; June, 48; July, 44; August, 22.

(3) Since 1 November 1979 it has been a requirement of the Justice Department that male and female toilets, in addition to tenants' toilets, must be available in shops and similar premises where more than two entertainment machines are to be installed.

In respect of sites approved prior to that date, male and female toilets were required to be provided only where more than five entertainment machines were to be installed.

(4) A permit authorising the provision and conduct of more than two entertainment machines into any premises is not issued unless the required toilet facilities are available.

5 & 6. MORETON ISLAND

Mr Innes asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) Has the interdepartmental committee of inquiry which was constituted to report on the Cook report into the future land use of Moreton Island made its final report to Cabinet to date?

(2) If not, has the committee made any report to Cabinet yet? When did it report, and when is the final report expected?

Answer:—

(1) No.

(2) No; not known.

Mr Innes asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) With reference to his answer to my question of 28 August in which he indicated that 13 mining leases on Moreton Island were renewed on 14 January, under whose authority or responsibility were those leases renewed?

(2) Why were the leases renewed?

(3) Why were the leases renewed at that time?

(4) How many, and which, leases had had any mining conducted upon them pursuant to the previous lease?

(5) What were the conditions upon which each of the leases was renewed?

(6) Which of the above leases are wholly outside the area recommended for sand-mining by the Cook report?

(7) Which of the above leases are partially outside the area recommended for sand-mining by the Cook report?

Answer:—

(1) Under the authority of the Minister.

(2 & 3) The lessee had applied for renewal of the mining leases and the Minister was satisfied in each case that the requirements in terms of the Mining Act 1968-1979 had been complied with. In such event it was mandatory that renewal be granted.

(4) From information available, five mining leases had mining conducted on them. These were mining leases Nos. 930, 1119, 1120, 1126 and 1130, Brisbane.

(5) The special conditions attaching to the mining leases renewed are, as is the case with all mining leases, a matter between the lessee and the Government.

(6) The location of each mining lease is charted on the department's official charts, which are available for search.

(7) See (6).

7. TENDERS FOR KERBING AND  
CHANNELLING

Mr P. N. D. White asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) With reference to previous correspondence on this matter, will he outline the system of calling for tenders for kerbing and channelling by the Department of Main Roads?

(2) Is it normal for tenders to be called for and accepted by telephone and then, having received the tender figure by telephone, to ask the tenderer to submit a further tender in writing?

*Answer:—*

(1 & 2) The method of calling tenders or quotations for small contracts of this nature is dependent on the estimated cost of the work. Where this estimated cost is up to \$1,000, verbal telephone quotations are usually obtained, which, for normal business practice, need to be confirmed in writing. For work with an estimated cost between \$1,000 and \$30,000, written quotations closing at a nominated time, are requested. Work with an estimated cost exceeding \$30,000 would require full tender procedures, with a deposit or bond. Kerbing and channelling work does not normally fall into this category.

8. CONTROL OF ALP IN QUEENSLAND

Mr P. N. D. White asked the Premier—

(1) As the Deputy Premier and Treasurer stated in this House on 9 September that the Federal Labor president said the Queensland Labor Party is subject to the ultimate control of the Labor Federal Executive, and that the executive is dominated by members from outside this State, does he agree with this statement?

(2) Would a Labor Government in Queensland be directed to implement policies imposed on it by the southern-dominated Labor Party Federal Executive?

*Answer:—*

(1 & 2) I cannot imagine that there is anyone in this House or any voter in Queensland who is unaware that the Labor Party's basic policy is one of centralism.

9. QUEENSLAND PINE BORER

Mr Shaw asked the Minister for Health—

(1) How many houses in Queensland have been fumigated for the purpose of eradicating Queensland pine borer by enclosing the entire building in plastic sheeting and treating it with methyl bromide?

(2) What is the normal cost of treating a domestic building by this method?

(3) Are there any alternative methods of eradicating Queensland pine borer and, if so, what is the normal cost of these methods?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) This is a matter coming within the jurisdiction of my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources.

10. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SAFETY OF  
SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr Shaw asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What responsibility rests on teachers, the school principal or the Education Department for the care and safety of students in their custody?

(2) During what times are students considered to be in the custody of school staff?

(3) Have the parents of students any right or responsibility to ensure children's safety whilst on school property, travelling to school or on school activities?

(4) If so, what are the parents' rights and responsibilities?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 4) The questions asked by the honourable member are essentially questions of law, but any statement of law must be related to a particular factual situation.

Generally speaking, a teacher and education authorities owe a duty of care for the safety of children from such time as when the children come into their care. The duty will, of course, vary in accordance with circumstances, including the age of the child and any relevant considerations such as a physical or mental incapacity. Generally speaking, a child comes under the care of education authorities at a time when, in accordance with normal practice, he is on school premises with the express or implied approval of the authorities or is engaged in recognised school activities.

Education authorities are generally not responsible for the safety of students while the students are travelling to school as, generally speaking, it is the responsibility of the parent to ensure that students arrive safely at school. While a child is in the care of a teacher, parents would not normally have any responsibility, having delegated that responsibility to the teacher and education authority for the time being.

If the honourable member wishes to pursue the subject, he could refer to any recognised book on the law of torts, as, for instance, one by J. G. Fleming.

### 11. SHOOTING EVENTS, COMMONWEALTH GAMES

**Mr Shaw** asked the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation—

(1) Is he aware that the shooting events for the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane are in danger of being cancelled because no reply has been given to the shooting association to their submissions for assistance in providing the necessary facilities?

(2) Will he take urgent action to ensure that this important problem is overcome and the success of the Games is not endangered?

*Answer:—*

(1 & 2) The Commonwealth Games Foundation, which is the authority responsible for Commonwealth Games facilities, is confident that appropriate facilities will be available in 1982 for the conduct of the Games shooting events. The question of financing and construction of these facilities was raised with me some time ago by the honourable member for Mansfield, Mr W. Kaus, MLA, and since then discussions have taken place between the various parties concerned—the shooting association, the Commonwealth and State Governments and the Brisbane City Council. These discussions are continuing.

At 12 noon,

*In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.*

### SUPPLY

#### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS

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

#### ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1980-81

##### MINES AND ENERGY

##### CHIEF OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF MINES

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy) (12 noon): I move—

“That \$4,272,962 be granted for ‘Department of Mines—Chief Office’.”

If I have learnt anything since 29 July, when I took over the portfolio of Mines and Energy, it is the profound truth of the old saying, “Experience is the best teacher.” Probably like most members of this House, I thought I had a pretty reasonable appreciation of the Queensland mining scene and the economic importance of mineral exploration, mining and mineral processing today and in the future. But in these past few weeks it has been driven home to me that mineral resources development is the backbone of Queensland in 1980 and the basis of our industrial progress and community well-being in the decades ahead.

The rapid growth of the mining sector can be seen in the ex-mine value of mineral production last year—\$1,646m—which was an increase of more than \$400m on the previous year. The relative importance of the mining industry can be gauged by the value of mineral exports including some processed materials. This was a shade under \$2,000m or just 50 per cent of the State's total export earnings of \$3,900m for the year. And when we look at the list of mineral exports, we will notice that coal alone accounted for \$911m or about a quarter of the grand total.

While I am using a few figures to point out the tremendous economic importance of the mining industry, I should mention that direct employment in mining in Queensland today is about 17 400, which is the highest recorded by the Australian Bureau of Statistics since World War II, the comparable figure in 1945 having been 5 400. These direct employment figures tell only part of the story, because it is generally recognised that one mine worker requires the back-up of five or six additional workers in transport and in other industries which provide machinery, timber, explosives and other essential supplies. On this basis, the Queensland mining industry provides jobs for approximately 100 000 people and a living for probably twice that number.

To emphasise these facts is not to turn my back on the important agricultural and pastoral enterprises over which I presided for eight years as Minister for Primary Industries; it is to see our State as it is in 1980 and as it should and will develop into the 21st Century.

Even if our mineral wealth were restricted to certain basic industrial raw materials such as bauxite, copper, lead, zinc, tin, wolfram, nickel, rutile, zircon, ilmenite, limestone, silica and salt, we would have a sound future as a mining community. But when we add the energy ingredient to the mix it becomes obvious that we have a very rich cake indeed. Further, it is obvious that there is virtually no limit to our industrial possibilities and to the constructive contribution that we can make to the stability of our major trading partners.

We are fortunate indeed in having a super abundance of good-quality coals and oil-shale and additional worthwhile supplies of natural gas and uranium. Thus, in the short and the long terms, our energy problem is one not of supply but of how to use our assets to the best advantage.

We state our proven reserves of coal as exceeding 26 000 million tonnes, nearly half of which is estimated to be recoverable by existing mining methods; so Queensland is destined to become one of the great coal-mining and exporting areas of the world, capable of meeting long-term obligations to supply more than 100 million tonnes a year for metallurgical and steam-raising purposes.

The work of the Department of Mines in carrying out a continuing program of coal exploration and assessment has been basic to the expansion of the industry, and as this work continues through the efforts of the Geological Survey Office and the Drilling Branch there is little doubt that recoverable reserves will be stated tens of billions of tonnes over and above the figures I have just quoted.

Important though it is, coal exploration is only part of the department's work, which begins with the general administration and control of exploration areas, mining leases, supervision of the mining industry in relation to safety and health, control of explosives, and oversight of the gas industry, the State Coke Works, Bowen, and the State Treatment Works, Irvinebank.

This Government is conscious of its responsibility for safety in mining operations. With the expansion of underground mining, particularly in the Central Queensland coalfields the Government has moved to provide rescue stations at Moura and Moranbah. Beyond this the existing facility at Ipswich will be upgraded.

Ongoing geological and geophysical investigations, geological mapping and drilling programs by the department provide a basis for intensive specialised exploration by individuals and companies in the fields of petroleum, base metals and other minerals.

Not having been familiar with the department's work, I was quite astounded to learn that the Drilling Branch will have 13 rigs in the field during the current financial year. This will entail about 4 500 working shifts and 60 000 m of drilling in a program estimated to cost some \$3m and embracing coal-seam investigations, deep stratigraphic drilling, ground-water assessment, foundation testing and the testing of special purpose clay deposits in South-eastern Queensland.

Figures on authorities to prospect give some measure of the department's increasing administrative work-load and of its success in producing the kind of basic information and climate which leads exploration groups to take up areas for closer investigation. In 1977 the department received a total of 302 applications for authorities to prospect, increasing to 451 in 1978 and 672 in 1979.

In the first seven months of this year there were no fewer than 720 applications, of which 338 were granted—these included 44 for coal and 12 for petroleum.

Clearly, Mr Hewitt, many years of patient investigation are now paying off in the form of an exploration boom which, inevitably, must lead to more mining, more processing, the build-up of more infrastructure like towns, railways, ports and factories and, of course, more jobs.

It is especially pleasing to note the build-up of commercial exploration for petroleum with the spudding of 18 wells in the first six

months of 1980. This compares with 24 wells during the whole of 1979, which was the best total for five years.

During the 12 months to the end of June 1980, 37 seismic surveys were begun, some of considerable size. This activity is expected to lead to a further increase in drilling once the results have been studied.

While a major oil discovery in Queensland would be welcome, to say the least, it does appear that our large coal deposits will be our mainstay and salvation in a world of high oil prices and tight supply.

The Queensland Electricity Generating Board is assured of a continuous supply of fuel for existing power-stations and the very large units it proposes to commission in the next few years. Unlike some less fortunate countries that have to rely on imported fuels for power generation, we can actually promote industrial expansion on the basis of a reliable electricity supply at stable costs. Indeed this is already happening with the aluminium industry at Gladstone where a \$600m smelter is under construction and at least one more is planned.

Increasingly we will be able, so to speak, to export energy by offering, at enhanced values, materials which have been processed locally to some extent. Our customers will save also on shipping costs and on the cost of energy to process raw material in their own countries.

While coal is our principal fuel for electricity generation, the Government is keen to see also the establishment of a local coal conversion industry which will ensure adequate feedstocks for the production of liquid fuels, especially for transport.

Satisfactory progress is being made in the so-called Imhausen Study, which is a coal-to-oil feasibility study being undertaken jointly by Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Some 18 months ago, Queensland nominated Wandoan-Taroom as its preferred source of coal and location for a conversion plant, and I am now able to report that a sample consignment of coal from that area has given favourable results on testing in West Germany, where the study group is proceeding with design and costing of a conversion plant at Wandoan. Meanwhile, the Australian Management Committee for the study has engaged the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation to report on infrastructure requirements for a conversion plant at Wandoan as well as on comparable sites in Victoria and New South Wales. Provision has been made in the Estimates to cover Queensland's share of the costs of the Imhausen Study, which is expected to be completed about May 1981.

At this point, I should also like to mention that the Queensland Energy Advisory Council, which advises me on all energy matters, has reported considerable progress in implementing the Government's policy on solar energy.

The Department of Works is now proceeding with demonstration hot-water systems and monitoring equipment on Government dwellings at Gordonvale, Woree, Forrest Beach, Bluewater, Tallebudgera and Currumbin and at "Kelsey House", Wolston Park. The performance of these installations will be monitored in association with QEAC on whose recommendation the Government has granted \$50,000 to assist with the running of the Solar Energy Research Centre at the University of Queensland.

Also, provision has been made in the departmental Estimates for energy research funds and the publication of reports on energy matters by QEAC.

I would now like to open the debate on the Estimates of the Energy section of my portfolio. As honourable members are aware, electricity is the life-blood of modern civilisation; without it industry and commerce would come to a standstill and the modern standards of living which electricity has made possible would disappear.

Electricity powers the many secondary, mining and commercial activities on which the State's economy is based. It maintains and increases the productivity of agricultural and rural industries and provides a high standard of comfort in the home.

The Government is firmly committed to the principle that those nations of the world that have the highest consumption of electricity per capita also have the highest living standards. Australia presently ranks ninth in the world in the consumption of electricity per capita, with Queensland being close to this national average.

The extent to which the Government has advanced the development of electricity supply throughout the State is amply demonstrated by the fact that in 1960 only 84 per cent of the State's population (then just over 1.4m people) had a reticulated electricity supply whereas by the end of 1979, when the State's population had reached the 2.2m mark, over 99 per cent had an electricity supply. I think all would agree that, considering the remoteness of some areas of the State and the long distances to be covered in Queensland, that is a magnificent effort.

These figures show only part of the tremendous progress in demand for electricity in Queensland. A further measure of this success is borne out by the per capita consumption of electricity throughout the State, which has risen from 1 229 units in 1960 to about 4 250 units at 30 June 1980. This is an increase of 245 per cent.

Up until 1957, only \$210m had been spent on electrical development in Queensland. Since that time under the progressive policies of the Queensland Government, over \$1,802m has been made available for electrical development. In simple terms, this represents an investment in electrical works in Queensland of about \$820 per person. During this period of rapid growth, the

State's generating capacity has increased from 483 MW to the present figure of 3 049 MW, which is an increase of approximately 530 per cent. Also, since 1957, some 85 000 km of transmission and distribution lines have been constructed taking electricity supply to all corners of the State.

Costs in the electricity supply industry, as in all other industries, are a vital factor. Naturally, it is the price to the final consumer that ultimately indicates an industry's efficiency or otherwise. In this regard, the record of the electricity supply industry is outstanding. Over the past decade the average revenue per unit of electricity sold in Queensland has increased by 95 per cent while, in the same period, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 144 per cent; another indication of excellent management by the people in charge.

To sustain the growth which the electricity supply industry in Queensland has achieved, the supply of capital for new projects is a vital factor. The industry is capital intensive and requires a larger capital investment per unit of revenue produced than most other industries. The 1980-81 capital works program for the electricity supply industry in Queensland is \$337m and this is expected to rise to about \$700m per annum by the mid-1980s. The provision of sufficient funds to finance this expenditure is one of the problems presently confronting the Government and the industry.

The demand for electricity in this State continues to grow faster than the national average. This has eventuated simply because my Government has been instrumental in formulating tariffs which are attracting large manufacturing, mining and processing industries to this State. In fact, because major industries are being attracted to Queensland's favourable tariffs, it is anticipated that over the next decade the demand for electricity in Queensland will increase at an average annual rate of about 10 per cent. This includes major industrial developments presently planned.

To meet the anticipated short-term load growth in Queensland, three major generating stations are presently in the course of construction. The first of these, the Gladstone Power Station, is expected to be completed in late 1981. Four of the station's six 275 MW generating sets are in full operation, with the fifth set due to be operating in December 1980. The sixth and final set is due for commissioning in 1981. The total expenditure on the project to June 1980 was \$514.2m, while the final cost of the station is estimated to be about \$576m. During 1979-80, the station supplied approximately 45 per cent of the State's electricity requirements. Construction of the station has now been in progress for a little over nine years.

The second major generating development being undertaken in the State is the Wivenhoe Pumped Storage Power Station. Over

\$50m has been spent on this project to the end of June 1980 resulting in the completion of the Split-Yard Creek Dam, excavation work for the power-station and associated establishment works. The station, which will have a generating capacity of 500 MW, is scheduled for completion by the end of 1983 and is expected to cost about \$180m.

Pumped storage power-stations serve a specific purpose. They are one of the few means available to store energy produced by conventional methods of electricity generation for later conversion back into electricity.

Such a station requires two reservoirs, one considerably higher in level than the other. Water is pumped from the lower to the upper reservoir when the demand for electricity is low—at night, for instance. The energy for this is provided from the conventional power-stations which would otherwise be operating at low load and therefore at less than peak efficiency. The water is returned to the lower reservoir driving water turbines and generating electricity when demand is high.

The other generating development being constructed in the State is the Tarong Power Station. To meet the increased load growth which is expected in the mid-1980s, my Government recently gave approval to accelerate the construction of Tarong Power Station by some 17 months. This will mean that the first 350 MW generating unit will begin commercial operation in 1984 and it is planned to complete the station to the full 1 400 MW level by late 1986.

This project is one of Queensland's largest industrial developments. Contracts for the boilers and turbo-generators have been awarded to a Japanese manufacturer at prices of \$147m and \$40m respectively. Honourable members will be interested to know that the boiler contract is the largest contract ever awarded by the electricity supply industry in Queensland.

The station, which is estimated to cost over \$850m, will be sited about 16 km southwest of the town of Nanango. During the next few years more than 1 000 people will be involved in the planning and construction of the station and when it is fully operational the station will have a permanent staff of about 300 people.

The generation developments which I have just outlined will cost about \$1,600m on present-day prices and will ensure that there is adequate generating capacity on the State grid to meet the needs of all electricity consumers in Queensland up until 1986.

Because of the anticipated large upswing in load growth in the State after 1986, there must be a corresponding advancement in the timing of new power-stations to follow Tarong Power Station. In this regard, the State Electricity Commission of Queensland has been actively engaged in developing basic planning options for consideration in the determination of new power projects. Long-term energy projections have shown that

construction of two new power-stations must commence soon if the requirements of major consumers are to be met.

The State Electricity Commission of Queensland has therefore invited tenders for the supply of coal from throughout the State for new generating facilities. These tenders are due to close on 18 September 1980.

Investigations are also continuing as part of the long-term program to identify feasible areas for power projects and preparations are being made for the necessary detailed site and fuel investigations.

In the near future I will be taking a recommendation to the Government for the construction of some 2 100 MW of new generating plant. The first of this new plant may be required in production as early as 1986, with the full development required by 1990. To deal with the difficulties in scheduling this rapid construction of new plant, the possible development of two new power-stations in this period will be considered by the Government.

The upsurge in electricity demand in Queensland has been so marked that the time available for construction of new power-stations is less than usually desired. The normal lead time for the construction of large power-stations is approximately eight years, which is considerably more than the lead time necessary for the development of new major industries. My Government and the electricity supply industry are examining this matter extensively to determine the best means of developing the State's power facilities to meet the forecast requirements.

The electricity supply industry's planning must, of course, extend beyond the power developments which I have just mentioned in order to identify possible future developments and, most importantly, to establish what resources will be required. With the present projected demand for electricity in Queensland over the next 25 years, it is estimated that some 8 500 MW of additional generating plant will need to be installed to meet the anticipated growth in electrical demand and to provide for the retirement of several of the existing power-stations which will have reached the end of their useful lives by that period. At present-day cost levels, the anticipated capital expenditure on this necessary additional generating capacity will exceed \$6,000m.

Honourable members will appreciate that the construction of new generating plant at the rate anticipated will place an unusual demand upon Queensland's technical resources and its capacity to provide infrastructure facilities to support new power-stations. Of course, generating stations by themselves do not ensure a supply of electricity. They must be backed up with adequate transmission and distribution lines and by many other essential services. The development of an integrated transmission system supplying the coastal regions of Queensland is progressing to meet load requirements and

the next ten years will see the extension of the 275 kV main transmission grid northward to Townsville and Cairns. The first stage of this project is nearing completion and by 1990, when the overall scheme is completed, the total capital expenditure will exceed \$160m. In the longer term, development of the transmission system will parallel the growth in demand and new generating capacity. Within the next 25 years, the projected 275 kV main transmission will require to be further augmented by an extra-high voltage overlay system stretching from Townsville to Brisbane. Also in this period, medium voltage transmission is expected to extend to isolated supply systems in western Queensland.

Queensland is fortunate in having extensive reserves of steaming coal and it can reasonably be expected that coal will be the major source of fuel for the electricity supply industry for many years to come. In 1979-80, the industry accounted for about 75 per cent of all coal consumed in the State. It is estimated that the coal consumption for the electricity supply industry from now until the turn of the century will be of the order of 300 million tonnes with more than 1 000 million tonnes required to be secured and committed for the lifetime requirements of new power-station projects which will commence production during that period.

During 1979-80, the State Electricity Commission of Queensland finalised arrangements for the supply of 65.59 million tonnes of coal for the Tarong Power Station and 16 million tonnes of coal for Callide and Gladstone Power Stations from the Callide coalfield. Honourable members will be aware that tenders for an initial development of the Curragh coal deposits in Central Queensland closed recently and are in the process of being evaluated. I hope to be able to take a recommendation to the Government on this matter early in 1981. The purpose of this exercise is to produce steaming coal for State electricity generating purposes, with the coking coal fraction produced in conjunction with the steaming coal being available for disposal separately by the developer to minimise the cost of steaming coal to the electricity supply industry.

The interests and the welfare of the man on the land will continue to be one of our primary concerns. In so far as electricity is concerned, the Government has pursued a vigorous policy of rural electrification. Over the years various schemes have assisted in no small way in bringing electricity to all but 1 per cent of the State's population. In 1978, the Government introduced the Rural Electricity Subsidy Scheme in an endeavour to bring supply to the remaining people of Queensland who did not have the facility. Of course, the Government realised at this time that there were some people in the State who were just so remote from a source of electricity supply that it would be neither physically nor economically possible to give them supply. The scheme, which will operate

until June 1985, provides for subsidy up to \$7,500 per property and, of this amount, the Government provides up to \$4,000 per property with the balance, if any, being provided by the electricity board from its operating fund.

The amount of subsidy payable depends on the cost of the extension, but in every case the first \$4,000 of the cost is met from the board's capital works fund, with the remainder being met from Government subsidy, the consumer's capital contribution and the board's operating fund, as the case may be.

In the case of small towns, the Government provides 50 per cent of the capital cost of providing electricity supply. Honourable members will be pleased to know that during 1979-80 the townships of Coen, Hungerford Kynuna and Jimna received a public electricity supply as a direct result of the scheme.

The State Government has allocated subsidy to the extent of \$3.7m for the scheme. On top of this, the industry will provide about \$16m. This will give some idea of what lengths the Queensland Government and the electricity supply industry are prepared to go to see that all Queenslanders, except the impossibly remote, receive a reticulated electricity supply. It is estimated that some 2 200 prospective rural consumers will receive a public electricity supply as a direct result of the Rural Electricity Subsidy Scheme.

I was very pleased to read in the State Electricity Commission of Queensland's latest annual report that the total number of electrical accidents decreased from 336 in the previous year to 322 this year. The main cause of accidents on consumers' premises was lack of maintenance and unauthorised work by amateurs.

The electricity supply industry in Queensland has endeavoured for many years to keep the public continuously aware of the dangers of misusing electrical appliances and equipment, but the problem is that electricity is such a ready servant and its use is so commonplace that people tend to forget about safety. Much of the credit for the drop in accidents mentioned above must go to the industry safety campaign, which is conducted through various avenues. Lectures and film screenings to secondary school students and the public, the issue of safety literature and the testing of new appliances and equipment are a few of the many safety activities conducted by the electricity supply industry.

I have covered very broadly today, in the time permitted—

**Mr Yewdale:** I'll say!

**Mr SULLIVAN:** The honourable member wants to know the full story, doesn't he?

**Mr Yewdale:** It was a very dull maiden speech.

Mr Prest: I think it was a good speech. It enlightened one a lot.

Mr SULLIVAN: I am pleased to hear that the honourable member for Port Curtis thinks it was good, because if the Government had not taken the action that it has in the field of electricity, Gladstone would not be the city that it is today.

Mr Prest: If you did a little bit more, Vic, that coal—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is an increasing tendency in this Chamber for members to refer to Ministers by their Christian name.

An Opposition Member: It is friendly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It might be intended to be friendly, but I do not think that it adds anything to the decorum of the Chamber, and I ask honourable members to desist.

Mr SULLIVAN: I have covered very broadly today, in the time permitted, some of the Government's achievements in the electricity development of this State. In doing so, I would hope that honourable members have also gained a greater insight into the vital part played by the electricity supply industry, which serves as a catalyst in the growth of virtually every sector of our economy. Perhaps I have also left the Committee with some idea of the magnitude of the challenges that confront us in ensuring the orderly and efficient development of the industry in the future. This may be brought home more strikingly by considering that by 1990 the demand for electricity in Queensland is expected to exceed 5 640 MW, compared with approximately 2 240 MW today—in other words, the demand is more than doubling every 10 years.

In outlining what has been achieved by the Mines Department and the State Electricity Commission, which are my ministerial responsibilities, and the plans for the future, I remind the Committee that such things do not just happen, but flow from the work of dedicated officers. As the new Minister for Mines and Energy, I pay a tribute to the dedication of my predecessor, Mr Camm, and the way in which he administered the two departments. I also pay a very high tribute to officers of the Mines Department and the State Electricity Commission at all levels for the magnificent job that they have done. I am very confident that the State's electricity requirements will be met and that the coal-mining industry and other mining industries in Queensland have a great future.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform honourable members that, on the Chief Office Vote, I propose to allow a full discussion on the whole of the ramifications of a department (Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund Account).

For the information of honourable members, I point out that the administrative acts of the department are open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in the Committee of Supply.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (12.36 p.m.): As the Opposition Mines and Energy spokesman, I welcome this opportunity to state my views in relation to mining and energy in this State as I sincerely believe that there is an urgent need to inform the people of this State on the true position in this regard.

Firstly, despite the glowing reports which emanate from the Government with monotonous regularity about the development of the State's mineral and energy resources, the fact is that, because of the policies of the Government in this State, we are not benefiting to the extent that we should from this development.

The National/Liberal Party Government of this State is allowing the exploitation of our rich mineral resources without ensuring that this State and the people in it receive a reasonable return.

I take this opportunity to show the people of this State how I believe the Government of this State is letting our mineral wealth be whittled away without ensuring a reasonable return to the State.

According to the Treasurer's Financial Statement (appendix "C" page 54), the value of mineral production in Queensland increased during 1979-80 by 25 per cent to \$1,735,500,000. Total mining royalties amounted to \$72.8m—a return of 4.19 per cent.

According to the Mines Department annual reports, which are based on a calendar year not a financial year, from 1974 to 1979 inclusive the total value of minerals produced was \$6,829.5m. The total value of royalties the State received was \$263.3m. This represents a return of 3.85 per cent. Total coal production for this period was 148 million tonnes, worth \$3,358.6m—an average price of \$22.69 a tonne. Total royalties received from coal production for this period amounted to \$130.2m—an average return to the State of 87c a tonne. By comparison, during the same period, 1974 to 1979 inclusive, the net profits of one mining company alone totalled \$721.4m.

It is also interesting to note that, while 2 282 tonnes of uranium oxide worth \$133m was produced in this State from 1976 to 1979 inclusive, the State has received only \$1.1m in royalties from the mining of uranium at Mary Kathleen, and that was received only this year.

According to the reply given to a question I directed to the Minister on 26 August last, royalty on uranium is assessed on the basis of 2 per cent of gross proceeds above \$30,000 or five per cent of profits above \$30,000, whichever is the lesser. I would like

to know how the \$1.1m was determined, particularly as Mary Kathleen's profit for the last financial year was \$17m.

I also believe it is time that the method by which uranium royalty is assessed was reviewed, as I can foresee that under the present formula the State may receive little or nothing in royalties from the Ben Lomond uranium mine, which is due to go into production in 1985.

Mr Hewitt, I want to point out that mining royalties the State receives are not clear profit. For example, an examination of the Mines and Energy Estimates that we are debating today shows that in 1979-80 the cost of running the Mines Department was approximately \$11.5m, of which \$2.7m was spent on drilling.

While the mining companies would have us believe that they, and they alone, find the minerals, determine the deposits, develop the mines and run all the risks, the fact is that the State Mines Department contributes significantly in this regard. One has only to peruse the Mines Department annual reports to see the extent to which the mining industry is assisted by this State department. For example, the 1979 annual report shows that as at 31 December 1979, 134 persons were employed in the Drilling Branch, which had 14 drills operating throughout the State. The Minister referred to the Drilling Branch and the number of drilling rigs in operation. Our figures differ slightly because mine are based on the 1979 report. In addition, of course, there is the Queensland Coal Board which, I believe, does a very good job. The Queensland Coal Board's annual report is a most comprehensive document.

The mining industry tends to forget that the raw materials belong to the people of this State, and the people are entitled to participate in their development, certainly to a greater extent than at present. While I firmly believe that a mining company is entitled to a reasonable return on its investment, including exploration and development, I also believe that the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the exploitation of the State's natural resources proceeds with due regard being given to the future and not just the present. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure that the people receive the maximum return from this exploitation.

Another matter on which I wish to comment in the brief time at my disposal concerns authorities to prospect. I believe that at present an authority to prospect gives a company too many rights and enables it to tie up vast areas of land for too long. According to my information, companies are granted authorities to prospect and they are allowed to hold them exclusively without being required to comply with the conditions under which "A to Ps", as they are called, are granted.

I understand that all of the potential gold-bearing areas of the State are locked up under authorities to prospect. Needless to say, the small prospectors are most unhappy with this situation—and rightly so. It is obvious that there is a need for some tightening up in this area and, as far as I am concerned, that is exactly what a Labor Government in this State will do. I believe there is an urgent need for a complete review of the mining industry in this State.

Before I finish with mining I wish to make reference to steaming coal. According to conservative estimates this State has 10 000m tonnes of steaming coal. Last financial year, while we exported 20.9m tonnes of coking coal, we exported only 341 000 tonnes of steaming coal. However, in the not too distant future, because of the world energy position, the demand for steaming coal is going to rocket.

According to the recent world coal study, by 1985 Australia could be exporting 20m tonnes of steaming coal a year and by the year 2000 the amount could be in the vicinity of 200m tonnes a year. Because of our substantial reserves, if we develop and market our steaming coal in a planned, co-ordinated way, it can be to this State what oil is to the Arabs.

I have already shown how little the State is receiving from the exploitation of our coking coal. I do not want to see us make the same mistake with our steaming coal. We have an opportunity now to correct the mistakes of the past. I believe that the Government, through the Queensland Coal Board, should exercise control of the development and sale of the State's steaming coal resources with a view to rationalising production between open-cut and underground mining. I would also like to see sales negotiated on a Government-to-Government basis, instead of the disorganized way in which they are done at present, with company competing against company while the buyers sit back and pick each one off.

While I am on this subject I want to refer to the answer that the Minister gave to a question asked by the member for Toowoomba North last week about my party's mines and energy policy that was launched on the second of this month.

The Minister chose to ignore the fact that our policy statement referred to the future development of steaming coal and not all coal. With due respect to the Minister, the advice that he was given was not correct. If he had taken the time to research his answer properly instead of resorting to cryptic comment—I expected different from him—he would have seen that what we are proposing is in the best long-term interests of this State and the people in it. That is our one and only motivation.

Certainly the coal-mining companies, many of whom are overseas owned and controlled, are interested in developing the most easily

accessible coal. That is why they go for the open-cut coal. It means they make higher profits. As I have already said, one coal-mining company made a profit of \$721.4m in a certain period. Unfortunately the National/Liberal Government of this State chooses to allow exploitation of this State's rich natural resources without proper consideration of the future. It has been doing this for the last 23 years.

In the time I have left, I want to make reference to the State's power system, future development of the system, electricity tariffs and tariff structures.

In reading his prepared statement this morning, the Minister referred to a comment of mine to the Press, which was published yesterday. If the Minister listens very attentively, he might understand what I am driving at. Certainly, if I had the time, I would refer the Minister to the recently released State Electricity Commission annual report because I do not believe that he has analysed what it says.

I preface my remarks by stating that I believe the Government has got the State's power system into one heck of a mess. Because of the Government's policies it is my firm belief that in 1983 and 1985 there will not be sufficient generating capacity to meet the demand.

**Mr Sullivan:** I outlined this morning how there will be, but it seems impossible to get through to you. I have made that observation over the years that you have been here.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** The figures were ascertained from the Minister's predecessor, Mr Camm, in answers to questions I directed to him. I believe that I have the information and I will certainly be making the most of it in the next few weeks.

I would point out that in August last year I warned of a future power shortage. However, the then Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Camm, claimed that there was to be a 2 000 MW increase in the State's generating capacity and that would meet expected demand by 1989. It was in August last year that he said that. As the total generating capacity at that time was approximately 3 000 MW, the additional 2 000 MW referred to by Mr Camm would have taken the figure to 5 000 MW in 1989. That was just on 12 months ago.

However, in October last year in an answer to a question I asked, Mr Camm advised that in 1989 the maximum generating capability would be 7 000 MW. In August it was 5 000 and in October it was 7 000. That is really good planning! We know where we are going, don't we? This figure represents the winter peak generating capability of the State system.

Yet, according to the Queensland Water Resources Commission report on the Burdekin Falls Dam released in March this year, the completion of the Gladstone Power

Station, the Wivenhoe pumped storage hydro scheme and the Tarong Power Station would cater for anticipated load growth until the end of 1989.

That was in March this year. Three different statements have been made by the respective departments—one in August last year, one in October last year and another one in March this year. The Government does not know where it is heading.

To further confuse the position the State Electricity Commission 1979-80 annual report which came out recently states that generating capacity was expected to expand from the present 3 000 MW to around 8 000 MW by 1990—an increase of 5 000 MW. So now we have a fourth figure that is over 150 per cent higher than our current generating capacity.

**Mr Neal** interjected.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** It certainly is confusing, particularly to the poor devil out there who is having to pay increases in electricity tariffs for no apparent reason.

The report said that the present planning program envisaged that recommendations for the construction of some 2 100 MW of new generating plant would be submitted by 1981, and that preliminary plans had been prepared for a 1 000 MW pumped storage hydro power-station to come on stream in the 1990s. I will be looking very carefully at what the Minister had to say earlier. I think he mentioned a figure of 8 500 MW. The SEC annual report referred to a figure of 8 000 MW by 1990, but the Minister says that it has now gone up by another 500 MW since this report was published.

As I have said, I believe the State's power system is in serious trouble. Why? I believe the main contributing factor is the Government's policy of enticing industries into the State by offering them large blocks of power at prices which are less than the cost of production and distribution. In my book, this is bad business. It is no good the Government's saying this is not happening, because it is. One has only to analyse the annual reports of the Queensland Electricity Generating Board to see the comparison between the prices paid by the electricity distribution boards and those paid by some other large consumers. There is a marked difference.

While the price of electricity to the domestic consumer has increased by 50 per cent since the reorganisation of the industry in July 1977, large blocks of power have been sold to large industrial consumers at prices which are significantly lower than the prices paid for bulk electricity by the electricity distribution boards.

The result of the Government's policy is that the State is committing itself to building more and more power-stations without having the funds to pay for them and, it

appears, without allowing the required time to construct them. The Minister admitted earlier that the Government has had to pressure-cook some power-station construction.

Let me explain the situation with which we are confronted. At the present time the total generating capacity of the State is 3 041 MW. Capacity under construction includes 550 MW at Gladstone, 500 MW at Wivenhoe and 1 400 MW at Tarong—a total of 2 450 MW.

As the State Electricity Commission report states, plans for the construction of an additional 2 100 MW will be submitted by 1981. I say that is too late; the Government is running out of time. This will bring the total generating capacity up to 7 591 MW, which is 400 MW below the 8 000 MW mentioned in the SEC report. Although the report makes reference to a 1 000 MW pumped storage hydro station in the 1990s, I firmly believe that, because of the likely shortage of power in 1983 and 1985, and because of the time required to plan and construct coal-fired power-stations—the Minister mentioned a period of eight years here earlier—there is every likelihood of a decision being made (after the State election) to proceed with the Rocksberg pumped storage hydro scheme on the Caboolture River. I predict that the Rocksberg scheme will proceed, not the Burdekin River hydro scheme, because of the Federal Government's decision in respect of the Burdekin River Dam. They are to build only stage 1, not stage 2 which would be required for the 500 MW hydro scheme up there.

However, I want to place on record that I believe that in planning future State power generating capacity serious consideration should be given to constructing a coal-fired power-station in North Queensland, possibly at Collinsville, to give that area of the State greater security of power supply. In this regard, I would draw attention to the contents of the SEC annual report (pages 13 and 24) in which reference is made to the extent to which power supply to North Queensland is vulnerable.

I must also express my concern at the Government's decision to speed up the construction of the Tarong Power Station by 15 months. That sort of thing just cannot be done. While such a decision, of course, ties in with my previous comments, I am apprehensive about such a move, having regard to the problems encountered at the Gladstone Power Station. There is, too, the additional cost of such a move.

The position facing the State's power system has without a doubt been brought about by the huge blocks of power that will have to be supplied to aluminium smelting companies in the near future. I also appreciate that Comalco contributed to the problem by not proceeding with its Gladstone smelter as initially planned. However, the Government

must accept full responsibility for the financial problems facing the industry. As I have said, we cannot go on building large power-stations to supply cheap power to large industrial consumers and expecting domestic consumers and small industry to foot the bill.

Unfortunately, I have only 20 minutes in which to speak about mines and energy in this State. In conclusion, I refer to an article that appeared in the Press last Wednesday, 10 September, and also this morning concerning the proposal to enlarge Gladstone Harbour. I also refer to the decision on Hay Point. I am concerned, as everybody else should be, at the report which virtually means that the Utah Development Co. is blackmailing this Government by threatening not to allow the German Creek and Oaky Creek coal-mines to export their coal through the Hay Point facility, which has excess capacity.

**Mr KATTER (Flinders) (12.56 p.m.):** I wish to raise firstly the problems of energy in this State with respect to transportation. One of the problems that desperately needs to be overcome in this State is the lack of buffer petrol and oil stocks for vehicular transport in Queensland. I regret to say that the problem has not been overcome, and I plead with the Minister and his department to give immediate attention to it. Israel carries a minimum of three months' supply of oil so that it cannot be held to ransom by the oil-producing countries, by trade union irresponsibility and by big multinational corporations withholding stocks to suit the price mechanism. All of these matters are reasons which, in my opinion, compel the Government to look immediately—I do not mean next year—at providing some sort of a buffer stock.

There are various ways in which this can be done. One way that has been suggested long and often is simply licensing petrol or oil distributors in the State and ensuring that they keep at each of the major oil ports in Queensland some three months' supply of oil. One company in Townsville already does that, and it is very much to its credit. It was rather interesting that during the recent shortages of oil in North Queensland this company was able to seize a large portion of trade from the other companies that were not holding buffer stocks and could not supply their usual customers. I think that first point is vitally important. It will be too late to do anything about this matter when the Middle East countries withhold oil, when some refinery workers decide to strike, or when a number of multinational corporations put their heads together and withhold stocks and force up the price to unrealistically high levels. This problem requires an immediate solution.

The second problem is the actual supply of oil from its source. Here I am talking about alternatives to Middle East oil upon which we are so dependent at present. I, and I am sure everybody else in this Chamber, would like to see a lot more drilling

for oil in this State. There has been very extensive drilling but we have not come up with a lot of oil reserves. I think it is fairly safe to say—it is said in geological circles—that Australia is not an oil rich country, nor are we likely to be so in the future. So we have to look at alternatives.

We in Queensland are extremely lucky to have alternatives. We have both the Rundle and Julia Creek shale oil reserves, either of which could supply almost all of Australia's needs on a daily basis, and collectively could supply far more than we require in Australia. So we are extremely lucky in having these two very large shale oil deposits in Queensland. Many people have been sceptical about the Julia Creek leases.

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

**Mr KATTER:** I have already mentioned the subjects of transportation energy and buffer stocks. As a secondary stage in the energy supply for this nation, not only Queensland, I mentioned the Julia Creek and Rundle oil-shale deposits. I also bring to the attention not only of the Minister but also of his departmental officials the lack of attention being given to Julia Creek oil-shale. If anybody in this Chamber has any doubt about the viability of shale oil, three weeks ago President Carter signed documents for some \$88 billion to be provided for development of the Utah and Colorado oil-shale deposits. One of the major companies involved there, Tosca, in fact tried desperately to get a leg in to the Julia Creek leases. When it failed to do that, it took the Utah and Colorado leases only as a second choice to the Julia Creek leases.

Over the next 15 years the United States Government will provide \$88 billion for development of these particular deposits. I am constantly told that the Julia Creek leases will not be developed because of their distance from the coast. Utah and Colorado are some 300 miles from the west coast of the United States, in much the same way as Julia Creek is some 350 miles and 400 miles respectively from the Gulf of Carpentaria and the east coast of Australia.

I do not intend to waste the time of the Committee in talking about the far distant future. However, I believe that in the distant future we are looking at hydrogen as an energy source, certainly to power motor vehicles. Such hydrogen, in the normal set of circumstances, would be produced by the use of electricity. The coal deposits in the Galilee Basin, which are unlikely to be developed as ordinary coal leases, provide an excellent opportunity for development for the production of energy.

The State Government can do a lot to introduce electric cars for commuter systems in big cities. If electric cars are about to come on the scene in this State, I plead with the Minister to try to influence manufacturers to produce a four-wheel-drive electric vehicle, which would be absolutely

invaluable on station properties where watering facilities and boundary fences have to be checked regularly. The cost of operating four-wheel-drive vehicles on station properties and transporting fuel to them has become prohibitive. Most country stations are now connected to the electricity grid. So I plead with the Minister to approach manufacturers and get them to produce an electric four-wheel-drive vehicle, which would be of vital importance to station properties.

We heard the Opposition spokesman speak at great length about electricity. I have to admit that when he spoke about North Queensland, he made one valid point. For the people of North Queensland to be 400 miles from their source of electricity at Gladstone is simply not good enough. To bring electricity to the North by two or three overhead cables which can be cut by a good storm—heaven only knows there are plenty of those in North Queensland—is totally unacceptable to the people of North Queensland. As the electricity authorities state themselves, taking electricity over such a vast distance is extremely inefficient. The power should be generated in North Queensland.

As I have done time and time again in this Chamber, I plead with the Government to halt the stupid venture of building the Burdekin Dam at the mouth of the Burdekin River where it will have no height whatsoever above sea level. The country is currently short of energy and in the future we may be starved of energy in one form or another. Building a dam of this magnitude almost at sea level so that it cannot be utilised for the production of hydro-electricity must be regarded as the absolute height of folly. Future generations will curse us for the mistake that we have made.

Excellent sites are available on the upper Burdekin, and the site at Hell's Gate, near Greenvale, is one of the ideal sites. It is about 1300 feet above sea level and would produce 800 GW hours of electricity. For the benefit of those honourable members who are not familiar with the term, I point out that 11 000 GW hours of electricity are produced for the whole of Queensland at present. So almost one tenth of the total electricity needs of the State could be provided by one dam with a tunnel into the Herbert River. No more money would be required than will be expended on the dam on the lower reaches of the Burdekin River. I do not wish to go into the reasons that have led the Government into making this terrible mistake in North Queensland, but I state to the Committee—I have done it before; I will do it again and again—that a terrible mistake has occurred.

Of course, the original Bradfield scheme becomes very acceptable now, because the Great Dividing Range gives a natural pumped-storage site. The water can be pumped to

the top of the Great Dividing Range in the evening and lowered down the other side the next day. The great Australian dream of taking the water from the areas of high rainfall in the coastal belt between Cairns and Townsville and diverting it to parched inland areas with a 12-inch or 13-inch rainfall, all the way to Lake Eyre, could become a reality. That dream will go completely out the window because of the act of criminal stupidity that is about to occur in North Queensland.

Something else that needs to be done now—not in the future, but at this moment—is the installation of a big turbine in the Collinsville Power Station. At present, a lousy 120 MW are being produced from a vast undertaking that is quite capable of handling a 275 MW generator. The water is already there; the cables to take the power away are already there. Everything that is needed is there. It remains only for the Government to act. We are told that the existing turbines at Collinsville are too small and too inefficient and, therefore, the power-station should be closed. The existing turbines are between 17 and 20 years old, so their life is almost finished. Those 30 MW units should be removed and replaced immediately by a 275 MW unit. It should not be thought that the people of North Queensland are second-class citizens who will be content with a power line running from Gladstone. We do not want to be at the end of a 400-mile long piece of wire, which is the present situation in North Queensland.

Queensland is a vast State and many people live in isolated areas. About 5 000 persons live in the Gulf of Carpentaria region, and 2 000 of them do not have electricity and will not get electricity either in my lifetime or in my children's lifetime. Something must be done for them, and the necessary technology now exists with the invention by the Little brothers of their tracking device, which is very simple, reliable and cheap. I pay a great tribute to the task force at the University of Queensland led by Dr Sheridan which has done such valuable work in comparing the various types of solar energy devices. The technology is available to put \$11,000 items on stations and isolated railway fettling camps that will, at least in theory, produce electricity with virtually no cost input other than the cost of replacing batteries. I plead with QERAC, which is the body in this State set up to put money into areas of technological breakthrough of this type, to come good with \$20,000 when a proposal is put before it to finance the construction of a prototype for isolated stations. It appears that it will be possible to produce units for about \$11,000. At present, it costs \$5,000 for a 240V AC plant. By saving \$1,500 a year for electricity, a person would recoup in four years the total cost of the solar energy device. He would then have an electricity supply similar to that enjoyed by the people of Brisbane.

I could not conclude my speech without stating very emphatically to the Committee the situation that now obtains in authority-to-prospect areas in Queensland. Every genuine miner on the Charters Towers field has been locked out of a field with the highest known gold reserves in the State. Because of blanket authorities to prospect, they cannot be mined or touched.

Mr Vaughan: Your Government issued them.

Mr KATTER: The honourable member is totally correct.

Each year, half of those authorities to prospect are to come down. On the face of it, the system is a fairly reasonable one. Unfortunately, people are queuing up for authorities to prospect. As one authority comes down, another is automatically taken up in its place. The result is that a genuine miner who knows the whereabouts of reserves and wants to spend money on opening them up cannot do so. The authorities to prospect go on in perpetuity.

I speak as someone who was engaged in almost full-time mining for five or six years. On the Yamamillah Range, north of Mary Kathleen, authorities to prospect blanketed the whole of that very valuable range. I can remember when gossanous capping up to almost 500 feet occurred on one peak on the range. Gossanous capping of that magnitude is one of the most valuable things that a person can find. It is like finding a huge gold nugget on the surface. The peak is a huge one; it could be seen from nearly 15 miles away. Yet the people who held the authority to prospect did not even know it existed. They had held the authority to prospect for three or four years. Those of us who were trying to get into the area to do something with it were locked off that range.

One of the biggest mining companies in Australia and probably in the world worked the kalsilite deposits on the side of that range. It went backwards and forwards over them a great number of times, but it did not know that the deposits contained 0.001 per cent copper, which potentially is one of the biggest finds in the world. The company had not even found out that the deposits contained that quantity of copper.

I see a definite place for authorities to prospect in the scheme of things. However, when an authority to prospect has a year to run the holder should lose half that authority and, furthermore, provision should be made for a cooling-off period in which a miner could come in and take up the lease. If he does not work that lease, he should be kicked off. At least let us have a period in which the area could be left open to enable people to come in and take up the mining leases and work them. Even a week would do, but I would plead with the Minister to consider a period of two months.

Such a cooling-off period would allow people to take up the leases and work them instead of going through the ridiculous procedure of taking geochem samples, which is a very airy-fairy method of finding minerals.

I conclude by pleading with the Minister to look not only at the immediate problems concerning the supply of energy, particularly in North Queensland, but also at authorities to prospect. I plead with him to support the Premier in his moves to establish a State bank. Its establishment would enable us to stay out of the hands of the multinationals.

**Mr INNES (Sherwood)** (2.29 p.m.): I rise to speak specifically about an aspect of the Mines portfolio that has been contentious.

**Mr Vaughan:** I'll bet you're going to talk about Moreton Island.

**Mr INNES:** It has been contentious for approximately five years. I refer to the matter of Moreton Island. So it would seem that, given enough time, even the Opposition members realise what is of importance.

Everybody recognises the importance to Queensland of mining. The great majority of mining ventures in Queensland, some of which involve vast interference with the surface of the State, proceed without any objection from significant groups or even minority groups. The great coal-fields, the proposed oil-shale venture and the operations at Mt Isa and Mt Morgan have proceeded and are proceeding without any great controversy and significant objection.

The area of mining that seems to attract the most controversy is, of course, sand-mining. All persons interested in mining should understand and realise that there are special reasons why this should be so. They must firstly bear in mind that many people involved in the so-called "conservation movement" and many others including those involved in mining and other extractive operations, devote part of their lives to outdoor recreation and in some part to conservation. The special reason why sand-mining has so frequently come into contention is that everybody in Queensland—people in the inland as well as in the towns and cities—look to the coast for their recreation. When the summer heat is at its height the coast is the place people think of, and it is obviously the place where people wish to go for pure recreation. The coast has areas of beauty and attraction and obviously they are areas that people like to see preserved from any significant exploitation.

The strongest mining controversies in Queensland have taken place over sand-mining. I refer to Fraser Island, Cooloola and the current issue, which has been running for some time, concerning Moreton Island. That must have some significance. The great mining ventures of this State, as opposed to these smaller mining operations that are

lower employers and more ephemeral, have proceeded without any significant controversy. Because of these reasons, sand-mining, from time to time, comes into special focus.

**Mr Davis:** You support sand-mining on Moreton Island?

**Mr INNES:** I will elaborate further on that. The honourable member knows perfectly well what I support about Moreton Island.

I rose today to ask questions about the issues relating to Moreton Island and to point out just what those issues represent in terms of accountable Government and representative democracy. I have here the Heath report.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs** interjected.

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

**Mr INNES:** That report represents \$200,000 of public money invested after a controversy had erupted over the future use of Moreton Island. To recapitulate briefly, there were mining leases on Moreton Island. After certain problems with land deals on bay islands the Government rightly decided to put all islands into local authority areas. The town plan for the city of Brisbane drawn up after that action took place was prepared on the basis of existing leases, and it zoned the whole island for extractive industries. There was such an outcry and so many objections that the council had to rethink its policy, revise the zoning and declare it open space.

The objections did not come from the traditional environmental groups alone. They came from a myriad of groups, very largely from the fishing and boating fraternity who, very often, are not involved in any other type of conservation. They seek outdoor and other natural recreations.

As a result, the Government rightly and properly commissioned an inquiry which was incorporated in this document, the Heath report, which represents the expenditure of \$200,000 of public money. I exhort the Government not to consider this expenditure to be window-dressing or simply a solemn movement within a charade.

Consistent with the Government's undertaking, and the Premier's undertaking, an inquiry was held into two of the strategies posed as recommended strategies in the report. A full public inquiry took place. I believe it was the first time in the history of Queensland that such a thorough-going environmental impact study was commissioned, and the first time that the recommendations of such an environmental inquiry were subjected to further public inquiry. I do not know the precise cost of that inquiry, but nine months elapsed from its commissioning until the report was presented. It

occupied almost three months in hearings—at least there were certainly several weeks of hearings. The cost to the Government could not have been less than \$100,000.

Between \$350,000 and \$500,000 of public money has gone into what can be described as an investigation and a public inquiry into the future land use of Moreton Island. The Cook report is a result of that inquiry. Nobody can suggest that the people who were appointed to that inquiry were in any sense conservationists, or greenies, by tradition or allegiance. They were highly respected members of the Public Service of this State. This committee of inquiry reported—I think it was in March 1977—and up to 2 $\frac{3}{4}$  years later we have no final decision.

In that period, the issue of Moreton Island has been raised on many occasions. We have been informed that the recommendations of the Cook Report have been submitted to an inter-departmental committee. No doubt this is because the Cook report did not make recommendations that were acceptable to many of the Government departments. We know that because, in the Cook report itself, the submissions from various Government departments conflicted and were mutually inconsistent, and no doubt that incompatibility, or that difference in viewpoint between Government departments, led to the establishment of the inter-departmental committee. Today I was told by the Minister that that committee has not yet reported to Cabinet on either an interim or a final basis.

It is my personal view that the Government was wrong to ask an inter-departmental committee to re-examine the recommendations of the Cook report. It is my view—and it happens to be the view of my party—that the umpires spoke in the Cook report and that all people should accept their recommendations; otherwise, the sum of \$300,000 could be suggested to be in the nature of a solemn and expensive farce.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Put something forward on the floor of the Parliament. We might even support you.

**Mr INNES:** I have said today that I am prepared to support the recommendations of the Cook report, which is in accordance with neither what I would personally like to see nor what the people at the other extreme point of view would have. It satisfied neither the conservationists totally nor the mining interests. It was a compromise, but it was a compromise on a rational basis, and one that was accepted by the conservationists at that time as a rational and reasonable compromise having in mind the maximum protection of the environment of Moreton Island together with the extraction of some of the winnable minerals. It was clearly not acceptable to the mining interests. We know that the mining interests lobbied—and it is their right to seek to pursue their

interests—to reopen and to extend the extent and the location of mining on Moreton Island.

If we were asked to move in the direction of the environmentalists because things were overlooked, we would throw the whole base of the inquiry open and the miners could get in for their chop, too. I am prepared to accept the decision of the Cook inquiry into Moreton Island.

I have not let the matter lie at the publication of this report. I have informally questioned, both inside and outside the party room, the responsible Minister and my own Cabinet members as to the future, the position and the situation of Moreton Island.

What can be disclosed is that in the 1979 amendments to the Mining Act, members from both sides of the Chamber raised their concern for Moreton Island. There was reflected in that debate a difference in attitude—a difference between no mining and limited mining in terms of the Cook report—but the fact is that people were concerned and the people who represented the most directly affected areas—the south-east corner and, in particular, Brisbane and its outlying suburbs—clearly raised their concern and their objection to extensive mining.

The Minister of the day reiterated some of the history. He rightly said that the Government ought to be commended for this; that it had commissioned the Heath report. He rightly mentioned, and was to be commended for saying so, that the Government set up the public inquiry under Neville Cook. He went on to say that the Government had appointed the inter-departmental committee comprising the departments that would be affected by mining, and then, in May 1979, he said—

“I could easily take a recommendation to Cabinet saying, ‘Let’s cancel those leases.’”

He said he would not cancel those leases at that time but would continue to negotiate with and talk to the mining companies.

The Cook and Heath reports had proposed practical things that could happen if mining was to be either eliminated or reduced. Among those things were negotiations for the resumption of the parts of the leases which were covered by the prohibition and a refusal to grant any pending or future applications for mining leases. That appeared in the Heath report, and was reiterated in the Cook report. The evidence before the inquiries and the reports themselves mirror the fact that it was seen that there were occasions when the Government could lawfully move to implement any recommendations with regard to the restriction of mining on the island.

At this stage I would like to briefly interpolate. Again with regard to sand-mining in particular, a practice has grown

up which I think is, to some extent, inconsistent with the policy with regard to other minerals, and absolutely inconsistent with the whole rationale and philosophy behind the Mining Act. There seems to be a belief that companies can acquire a shelf full of leases which they can use at any time over a period, which can be up to 20, 30, 40 or 50 years, without performing any working conditions and subject only to the vicissitudes of the economy. If it happens to be not a good year, you don't mine! That runs against the whole philosophy behind the Mining Act of Queensland and other mining Acts of its type— "If you don't want to use it, you leave it available for somebody else who does."

**Mr Vaughan:** They are all the time asking for exemption, and getting it.

**Mr INNES:** That is so, and I do not approve of that practice. It is contrary to the philosophy of the Act. A legitimate occasion arose last year when many of the leases on Moreton Island, which had had no work carried out on them and no substantial investment or expenditure by mining companies made on them, could have been terminated. In fact, several members of this Assembly and members of the public were mindful of that, and I know that in the party room, directly or indirectly, I asked questions to find out what the situation was with regard to those leases, and what the situation was with regard to the inter-departmental committee.

**Mr Vaughan:** You probably got the same answer that I got.

**Mr INNES:** I want to refer to direct evidence, something that cannot be controverted. There can always be a suggestion that conversations in corridors did not take place or that conversations in the party room should not be disclosed, but in October 1979 people interested in Moreton Island quite deliberately approached members of Parliament, and those members of Parliament contacted the responsible Minister. I will cite two of his replies. On 26 October 1979 the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police wrote to Dr Scott-Young, who was representing a committee called the Moreton Island Protection Committee. It read—

"Dear Dr Scott-Young,

"I refer to your personal representation on behalf of the Moreton Island Protection Committee concerning mining leases on Moreton Island and future land use of the island.

"While the original terms of a number of mining leases have expired or will expire in 1979, renewal applications have been lodged in all cases and are under consideration."

As far as I can make out, that was a completely correct statement of fact. The next and ultimate paragraph is the interesting one. It reads—

"No decisions will be made on renewal applications until the report of the inter-departmental committee set up to advise the Government on the future development of Moreton Island is available."

That was the statement and the assurance that I was given last year, and that is why I did not pursue the matter. I knew that the inter-departmental committee had not reported, and, as the Minister advised us today, it has not reported to this date.

That assurance, which had been given to me informally, was given in writing, and that letter is available. That letter was sent on by Dr Scott-Young, in the pursuit of his parliamentary duties, to the persons who had inquired from him. Exactly the same phraseology was used in a letter to one Mr Melzer, who is, I think, the chairman, or certainly an office bearer, of the Moreton Island Protection Committee.

The question that has to be asked is: Do assurances and communications from Ministers of the Crown or from departments of Government carry any weight? Have they the force of an assurance which the average reasonable man in the Queensland street would expect when asking something carefully and deliberately on a formal occasion? One would think that assurances of that type should require even more solemnity when they are asked of elected representatives and responsible Ministers of the Crown. But what do we find? As members of this Committee would know, I have asked a series of questions on this matter because I frankly could not believe my ears when certain matters were revealed. At the request of interested parties, I did ask questions in this Chamber. It had been revealed in the Press that somebody had investigated the records of the Mines Department, and it appeared that mining leases had been renewed on Moreton Island. In answers to questions I asked on 28 August 1980 I was told that on 14 January 1980 those applications for renewal of leases that had expired in 1979—variously between February and November of that year—were approved. As far as I can find out by questions, no decision of Cabinet preceded that action by that Minister to renew those leases. I think the law requires that the Governor in Council has to approve the first grant of a lease, but that renewals are subject to the executive action of the Minister for Mines.

(Time expired.)

**Mr PREST** (Port Curtis) (2.48 p.m.): The Mines and Energy Estimates are very close to me because power supply is very necessary to the development that is taking place within close proximity to the city of Gladstone and to the mining in the area. I share the concern expressed by the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) that in the mid-'80s

or thereabouts the generating authority will be scratching to meet the electricity needs of Queensland consumers. The requirements of Queensland Alumina, GAL, which is Comalco, QCL and Alcan will take all the power generated at the Gladstone Power Station.

On top of that, the Rundle shale-oil project will start operations late next year and will then require some power. Although an agreement was entered into with the Government, the power requirements of that project are now double those that were stated some months ago. The people from ESSO state that at the peak of operations 1 600 MW a day will be required. When the Gladstone Power Station is fully developed it will produce 1 650 MW a day.

The coke plant to be built by Lend Lease will treat some nine million tonnes of coal to produce six million tonnes of coke per year. That project will also require a great amount of power. The first stage of the coke plant will come into operation in the vicinity of 1983, and through 1985 to 1989 the project will develop and have an increasing need for power.

These projects must be assured a continuity of power supply and many things can cause a disruption to that. Because some of the major disruptions to power supply are brought about by industrial agitation and discontent, the Minister will be able to help to solve any problems that arise. There are many reasons for industrial unrest. Although it is not always the employees' fault, the Press always places the blame on the workers for going on strike and denying power to industry and the public.

There are many background reasons to industrial disputes. I was greatly concerned when I read a letter from the construction inspectors at the Gladstone Power Station. The letter of 2 May 1980, a copy of which was handed to me, was addressed to the General Manager of the QEGB, Mr McKay, and it stated—

"We, the Construction Inspectors of the Gladstone Power Station Site, wish to express our dissatisfaction at the delay in implementing the findings of the Cullen Egan Dell work evaluation report.

"On 14th September, 1978, you sent, to each of the Inspectors, a letter on the subject of work evaluation. The Board had previously appointed Cullen Egan Dell to do job evaluations and recommendations. You advised that it was your

'intention that it be completed in time for the next review of the organization in the middle of 1979'.

"The letter also advised that the project would be managed by Mr. D. R. McGregor, but would be

'directed by John Egan of Cullen Egan Dell, and co-ordinated by yourself, with

assistance from the Regional Managers'.  
"Eventually on 7th September, 1979 you sent a second letter stating that

"The first stage of this project, involving some 540 positions in the Board was recently completed, and recommendations submitted to the August Board meeting'.

"Four months later, as a result of our growing frustration and unrest, Mr. Michael Gould was sent up as the Board's representative to pacify us.

"He verbally advised us that the results of Cullen Egan Dell were known to him and would be implemented when the Board met in six weeks i.e. end February. He further advised verbally that the Inspector's positions would be graded between Grade 3 and Grade 7. Another point he made was that the new Inspector positions advertised for Tarong Project at up to Grade 5, already took into account the Cullen Egan Dell evaluations.

"On 25th February, 1980, Mr Gould replied in writing to the questions raised during his visit; and regarding the Cullen Egan Dell, recommendation, still gave no indication that it would not be implemented at the end of the month.

"Mr V. Baker visited the site on 26th February, 1980, and told us that the Cullen Egan Dell recommendation would not be implemented for at least two months, if then, and could not say on what authority Mr Gould had spoken.

"It is now the 2nd May, 1980 (two months later), and we are still awaiting results.

"It cannot be denied that this affair has become a protracted exercise. The long delays and repeated postponements of this matter are causing frustration and demoralization—thus destroying our job incentive.

"We cannot accept as an excuse, that the Board is awaiting for

'rationalization of gradings and classifications within the Industry'.

"There is no equivalent to Q.E.G.B. Power Development Department, and in particular Construction Inspectors in any of the Regional Boards, so there is not reason that implementation should be withheld.

"Having regard for the high level of direction, management and co-ordination of this project, it is even more demoralizing to find that they have been procrastinating all this time.

"We feel that the Board is being less than fair about the way it is handling this project and would like to point out that during all this time, gradings have been frozen.

"The results and recommendations of part 1 of this project, available last August, were based on Units 1-4 at Gladstone;

and are consequently out of date, as higher standards of technology are being employed on Units 5 & 6.

"Therefore, we feel that the Cullen Egan Dell recommendations regarding Construction Inspectors must be implemented immediately and back-dated to a minimum of September, 1978, when gradings were frozen. Also a new assessment based on current technology should be made forthwith.

"This information has been forwarded to Mr Jim Bonding of A.A.E.S.D.A."

That was signed by the inspectors.

Mr McKay wrote back setting out some explanations—not very good ones—as to why the recommendations had not been implemented. That is one of the things going on within the industry and workers are becoming frustrated. They are being fobbed off after the work-value cases have been heard. With the new technology in power-stations, men have heavier responsibilities. They should have higher gradings and should be paid under their classifications for the responsibilities of the work that they are carrying out. So when strikes are brought about by the tactics employed—

**Mr Vaughan:** Frustration.

**Mr PREST:** Frustration, and the tactics that are employed by the QEGB. Quite clearly strikes are not always the fault of the workers; they often occur because of the way in which the management treats the workers.

**Mr Vaughan:** They have been told about their industrial relations.

**Mr PREST:** That is true; they know. I hope that the new Minister for Mines and Energy will keep that in mind and stop the board using the tactics that are being used at present. The Opposition is interested in production in the industry. We want to see harmony in the industry. We do not want the tactics used by the board to have a harsh effect on the ordinary consumers of this State.

**Mr Davis:** You want to see a bit of leadership from Mr Sullivan?

**Mr PREST:** I am sure that he is not in the job to do nothing. He will do a very responsible job, and I am sure that he will reap the benefits in the long term.

**Mr Frawley** interjected.

**Mr PREST:** I went over there with Mr Sullivan. I know that is where he is going to end up, and I wish him well.

Another problem that will arise from the great development in the Gladstone areas is pollution from emissions. One of the worst polluters in the area now is the State's largest power-station. It was really amusing to

read in last Saturday's Press, "Joh"—that is the Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen—"not aware city fall-out illegal." That is the fall-out from the power-station. If we go through the files back to 1978, we see the great problems that have been caused by the emission from the stacks at the power-station.

In September 1978 we were told that the stack emission problem would be cleaned up by 1982. That is still a couple of years away. When the Minister was Minister for Primary Industries, he should have been aware of and concerned about the emission's causing problems for the papaw growers in the Yarwun/Targinnie area. He would have known about it, so I sincerely hope that at the earliest opportunity he will give some relief to the growers in that area.

The Premier's news and information officer, Mr Peter MacDonald, was reported in the Press as saying that the Premier did not know anything about the pollution. The report stated that the Premier was apparently unaware of the fact that the Gladstone Power Station was contravening the State Clean Air Act. Peter MacDonald said he was not aware that the Premier had been told of the contravention. What a joke! It is as big a joke as the Clean Air Act is in Gladstone.

From the children attending the Catholic high school, the Premier had received approximately 20 letters asking him what he was going to do about the pollution. Furthermore, while Mr Camm was Minister for Mines and Energy the Premier sat next to him in this Chamber during both question-time and debates. So for Mr MacDonald to say that the Premier was not aware of the fact that the power-station was not meeting the requirements is absolute hog-wash. The report shows that Allen Callaghan is sadly missed. I am sure that he would not have made such a statement as the one that was reported.

However, after some four or five years, the QEGB is making a last-ditch attempt to bring the Gladstone Power Station stack emission into line with the provisions of the State Clean Air Act. Alternatively, it will have to face up to spending another \$20m next year to rectify the problem.

The power-station resident engineer, Mr Peter Marks, had announced that equipment ordered from Germany at a cost of \$350,000 should be installed by October. He said it was hoped that the sulphur trioxide injection equipment that was recently airlifted to Australia would reduce fly-ash emission, which, the QEGB admits, does not comply with the State legislation. The engineer said that by January it would be known whether the new equipment had been successful. He added that, if it failed, the installation of extra dust-collection equipment, costing \$20m, would have to go ahead. He told the children attending the high school the nature of the problem. He said that

the precipitators were designed to handle coal of a certain quality and that the authorities changed in mid-stream to a cheaper quality coal. The result is that in long term, after five or six years of experiments, the authorities will have to pay an additional \$20m.

**Mr Vaughan:** The whole power-station is an experiment.

**Mr PREST:** That is so. Nevertheless, I hope that the Minister gives top priority to having the stack at the Gladstone Power Station comply with the Clean Air Act. If the State Government does not comply with the Act, how can it expect industries that cause pollution to an even greater extent than the Gladstone Power Station to do so?

**Mr POWELL (Isis) (3.4 p.m.):** The Estimates presently before the Committee are those of one of the most important departments of the Government. It is the department that controls the resources of the State and the distribution of power throughout it.

Firstly I congratulate the Minister on his elevation to his present portfolio. I am sure that he brings with him a great deal of experience in, and understanding of, the problems faced by the people of Queensland.

Queensland is certainly blessed with mining resources. We should develop them as quickly as possible for the benefit of the State. We should institute even more policies to develop our mining resources so that the whole State benefits. Some people believe that we should develop resources that benefit only a few people or no-one. We have tremendous coal reserves and we should be doing everything possible to get them out of the ground while there is a world demand for them—while they will sell. Without doubt fuel is a finite resource and, as the honourable member for Flinders said, we are lucky to have oil-shale and coal deposits.

I repeat that we should be doing everything possible to develop our coal resources. We should be encouraging overseas companies with finance to develop them. Because Queensland is a far-flung State we should do all that we can to encourage people to live in areas that have a climate that is not considered to be particularly pleasant. It is fair to say that most people prefer to live where the climate is equable. I understand that because I live in such a place. We should be doing everything possible to encourage people to live in developing areas, even if it means we have to give them free, air-conditioned housing and other amenities to make their life more amenable. I do not believe that another Government should scuttle our efforts to get people to these areas by taxing them on the incentives that we are offering. It is clear that people living in the Sydney-Melbourne-Canberra

triangle think it is rather extravagant that we should offer free, air-conditioned houses and other incentives to attract people to the more remote areas of Queensland. I invite them to get off their tails and live there themselves to experience the harshness of the climate. The Queensland Government is encouraging people to live in such places, but another Government is trying to scuttle our efforts. It has no right to do that.

In dealing with the electricity facet of the Estimates before us, I turn to the Auditor-General's report on the operating revenue accounts for the year ended 30 June 1979, and note with interest that a resulting net surplus for the year was transferred to Accumulated Funds. The Queensland Electricity Generating Board had a surplus of \$1,079,121; the South East Queensland Electricity Board had a surplus of \$26,164,560, and the South West Queensland Board had a surplus of \$4,283,432. It must be realised, of course, that \$3,792,000 was put in as a rebate tariff equalisation. The Wide Bay-Burnett Board had a profit of \$2,356,255. I agree it is desirable that public utilities should run at a profit. However, I believe that the people of Queensland are paying too much for their electricity. A Government instrumentality, such as the State Electricity Commission, should not be making large profits. It is perfectly reasonable that such an organisation should balance its books. It should not run at a loss, but the accounting system should be arranged far more equitably so that the people get their electricity at a cheaper rate.

Since about 1975 a great call has been made for the use of alternative sources of energy so that energy can be conserved. One of the ways of conserving energy in Queensland is the greater use of solar energy. Consequently, a good deal of work has been done in regard to design and the best use of solar energy. One of the ways to save energy is the use of solar hot-water systems. It is common sense that people should be encouraged to use solar hot-water systems and so lessen the amount of power being used.

But what is the policy of the State Electricity Commission? If a person installs a solar hot-water system and connects it straight to his existing hot-water system, there is no change and the person remains on tariff F. However, there is a small proviso that the existing thermostat remain open so that the system turns on occasionally, and the commission is happy that that power should be charged at tariff F, which is less than tariff A.

If, however, the solar hot-water system is so efficient that the thermostat does not open, the commission applies a penalty of \$2.40 a month simply because the owner is not using electricity. I am blessed if I can understand that and I hope that the Minister can explain it to me. If a person avoids the use of electricity, he should be congratulated. Some incentive should be given to people to use

solar energy. At the moment, there is no incentive; in fact, a penalty is being placed upon those who do.

That is bad enough, but consider this: If a person installs a solar hot-water system and removes his existing electric hot-water system entirely, which is completely feasible in many parts of Queensland which have a lot of sun, and the solar hot-water system has an electric element that acts as a booster if there is a prolonged period of dull weather, the user is charged tariff A, which means he is paying a high rate for his electricity.

The rationale is that the element in the solar hot-water system is a high recovery one which uses a vast amount of electricity at a peak period. I contest that, and so would anybody else who has had anything to do with solar hot-water systems. The element in most solar hot-water systems sold in Queensland is rated at 1.8 kW, which is exactly the same size as the element in a non-solar hot-water system.

The Minister is new in his portfolio and is no doubt enthusiastic. He should be looking very closely at this matter, which is one instance of where the people of Queensland are being encouraged not to use alternative sources of energy. I believe that they should be.

Another matter that disturbs me is the system under which different tariffs are charged. There should be some relativity between electricity charges regardless of whether a person is the least user or the largest. I do not believe that it is sensible to say that if a person uses a small amount his rate per unit should be higher than that of a person who uses a larger amount. That does not apply to petrol. Because I travel 50 000 km a year, it does not mean that I get my petrol cheaper than the person who drives 5 000 km a year. I believe that electricity is another type of power source that we are using, and therefore a tariff of a universal type should be charged. In my view, at the present moment the small user is being charged too much for electricity, and that inequality should be rectified.

In the Budget debate I raised the question of the costing of the Tarong Power Station. Not too many people noticed that I raised that point, but I was speaking of the Estimates of the Water Resources Commission which totalled \$16.1m. A total of 45 per cent of the entire Vote has been allocated for the Boondoomba Dam and the Tarong water supply. Because I believe there is some sort of funny accounting going on as far as the preparation for the Tarong Power Station is concerned, I started doing a bit of delving. In the 1976-77 Budget an amount of \$3.8m was provided for the Bundaberg Isis irrigation scheme and \$2.8m in one area and \$11.3m in another for the Wivenhoe Dam. In 1977-78 \$6.31m was provided for the Bundaberg irrigation scheme, with \$8.8m being provided for the Wivenhoe Dam in two separate Votes, those of the Irrigation

and Water Supply Commission and the Co-ordinator-General. In 1978-79 we found the Boondoomba Dam sneaking into the Water Resources Vote, not electricity, with \$545,000. The Bundaberg scheme received \$6.54m out of the Water Resources Vote and the Wivenhoe Dam received \$17.3m out of another Vote entirely. In 1979-80 Boondoomba received \$3m and Bundaberg Isis \$4.8m, again from the Water Resources Vote that is being used for the electricity project at the Wivenhoe Dam. We know what the figures are for 1980-81.

**Mr Davis:** What are you trying to prove?

**Mr POWELL:** What I am trying to prove is that in all previous electricity undertakings where a water supply has been required, the finance has come out of electricity funds. But in this case it appears that the money required to build the dam and the water pipeline for the Tarong Power Station is being taken from the Water Resources Commission. I am speaking up on behalf of the people of my electorate who are desperately short of water and need the 45 per cent of the Water Resources Commission Vote that is being used for electricity undertaking.

**Mr Davis:** Why did you throw Wivenhoe in?

**Mr POWELL:** Because it is being used for hydroelectricity.

**Mr Davis:** It is a separate account.

**Mr POWELL:** Under electricity—that is the point I have been making. If the honourable member had been listening to me, he would have understood the rationale of the argument.

Finally, I have contacted the Minister again about electricity tariffs charged to caravan parks. The answer came back indicating that because a caravan park was a commercial undertaking the tariff charged should be at a commercial rate. But the point the State Electricity Commission is avoiding is that in this State many people live in caravan parks, and if indeed they lived in houses they would pay for their electricity at the applicable rate. However, because they live in a caravan park they have to pay a higher rate under the tariff charged by the caravan park proprietor.

On the figures I received, the caravan park proprietor does not make a profit on the electricity distributed throughout his caravan park. In fact, people who live in caravan parks are being penalised. Once again I ask the Minister to look rationally at the cost of electricity to individual consumers. Because of the big profits being made by these authorities, I believe that there should be a more rational equalisation of tariffs so that everybody in this State receives cheaper electricity.

**Mrs KIPPIN** (Mourilyan) (3.20 p.m.): In speaking on these Estimates, I wish to offer my congratulations to the new Minister in this portfolio. I wish him well in his future endeavours to develop the mining industry in this State.

I was particularly pleased to read in this morning's "Courier-Mail" that the Government did not succumb to pressure by the Utah mining development company, or Central Queensland Coal Associates, and grant permission to Utah to export steaming coal. If the reports about the Utah-suggested deal are correct, it could be that Utah is taking advantage of a situation and is trying out the new Minister. Under the original mining agreement between Utah and the Government, any steaming coal removed as overburden from coking coal deposits was to be reserved by the Government for the purpose of electricity generation. The steaming coal from the Blackwater mine tops in fact provides cheap fuel for the Gladstone Power House, and we are looking for a similar situation with the overburden from the rest of Utah's leases.

The Government must resist most strongly any pressure for the export of substantial quantities of steaming coal. Because more and more of our mineral resources will be refined in Queensland as time passes, I have no doubt that there will be increasingly heavy demands for electricity generation in the years to come. Any suggestion by Utah that it would be prepared to allow other companies to use its loading facilities at Hay Point, provided the Government allowed it to export its steaming coal, is, in my opinion, impertinent, to say the least. Such standover tactics certainly contribute to the unfavourable reputation which the general public has of multinational mining companies.

**Mr Davis:** That is why you allow them to do it.

**Mrs KIPPIN:** We have not allowed them to do it this time, and that is the important thing. However, I do not think that we should blame Utah for trying. The important point is that the Government must be ever-mindful of the development potential of our State and not succumb to pressure in order to obtain short-term benefits.

**Mr Vaughan:** Utah is holding the State to ransom.

**Mrs KIPPIN:** Utah is not holding the State to ransom, because the decision has been made.

**Mr Vaughan:** They promised the capacity at Hay Point 12 months ago.

**Mrs KIPPIN:** Yes, they did promise the capacity at Hay Point 12 months ago. I think they have tried to pull a swiftie here, but they have been blocked. I hope that in the future they will realise that the Government means what it says.

Let us look at the situation if Utah has reached, or is reaching, the situation where it has to remove steaming coal as overburden and this steaming coal cannot be utilised in existing power-stations. That is quite possible, because a number of the leases are a considerable distance from existing power-stations, and we all know how high transport costs are. Transport costs could prevent some of this steaming coal from being used in our present powerhouses. If this is the case, I believe that the Government should consider constructing a new powerhouse in the vicinity of those reserves. Of course, this is part of the agreement. Utah must in fact give 12 months' notice if it intends to mine steaming coal. If the Government requires the steaming coal, then it should give Utah 12 months' notice as well. This matter was very carefully set out.

The steaming coal in Central Queensland will be needed for the generation of electricity in years to come. If the Government is not in a position to construct a new power-station, because we pride ourselves on supporting the free-enterprise system I believe that we should call tenders for the construction of a new power-station, or we should allow free enterprise to develop such a power-station, which could supply electricity into the State grid. I am pleased to hear Opposition members say that they would support the development of a free-enterprise power-station in Queensland. The Government could purchase this electricity for the same price as the generating board supplies electricity to the regional distributing boards.

**Mr Vaughan:** I would like to be able to buy it for the same price as Comalco.

**Mrs KIPPIN:** Comalco gets it at cost of production from the generating board and that is what this company would be selling electricity at.

The construction of a powerhouse would be an attractive proposition to Utah because it would enable that company to plough some of its massive profits, which have brought it under considerable attack, back into further development in Queensland. I personally would like to see that. If that were to happen, of course, the Government would continue to maintain control over the distribution of electricity in the State. I certainly do not deny a company its profits, but I do not believe that it is unreasonable for the Queensland Government to require companies making large profits to plough a reasonable amount of those profits back into exploration and further development of some of our more remote areas.

As a Northerner, I would like to see Utah make a more concerted move to mine the coal deposits at Laura. If these deposits are a workable proposition, then the Queensland Government should require the commencement of mining as soon as possible. To have the Cape York Peninsula opened up by a major development such as this would be to the advantage of the whole

of Australia. In fact, mining is about the only way that I can see that the Cape York Peninsula can be opened up in the foreseeable future. The Cape York Peninsula is an area of tremendous strategic importance, not only for defence but also for quarantine. Much better surveillance of that area is needed, and although it has improved in the last couple of years it is just impossible without better means of transport to improve it any further. Unless there is an economic development to assist, the provision of better transport facilities is just beyond the resources of the State Government at present.

My electorate of Mourilyan has an extremely large tin-mining area, so I am particularly pleased that tin prices have remained high this year. That economic situation has considerably improved the prospects of continued employment for many people in the Mt Garnet and Herberton districts. At times over the last five to six years employees on the tin dredges in the Mt Garnet area have been concerned that they may lose their jobs because the tin dredges may have found it uneconomic to continue. However, the improved tin prices have removed that threat.

The prices have also stimulated a tremendous increase in mining activity amongst small mines. This increased activity has placed a tremendous strain on the resources of the Herberton Shire Council, and I know that the council has been looking for additional finance to help develop the roads to the small mines in the area. In the 1979-80 financial year the Mines Department made a grant to the Herberton Shire Council of \$4,600. Of that sum \$2,400 was spent on the Silver Valley Road. In fact, the Mines Department allocated a total of \$6,120 to the Herberton mining district, and that was most appreciated. I hope that these allocations will be increased in the coming year.

I have to thank the mines inspectors in the district for the early inspections that they conducted of the mining roads around Herberton and through to Mt Garnet. I know that they have recommended that a considerable amount of money be allocated to the shire. We are looking to the shire to carry out these road-works this year. The added incoming finance will help the shire to employ its work-force permanently. It will be a very happy arrangement to have mining roads maintained by the shire council through an allocation from the Mines Department.

I notice in the tables of Government expenditure that \$35,000 was allocated last financial year for grants and loans to prospectors. That includes moneys that may be allocated for road-works and bridgeworks in mining areas. The tables also show that only \$20,000 of that was expended. I find that very disappointing, because I could have made good use of the additional \$15,000 if no other honourable member had wanted it.

I appreciate that last year some of the successful tenderers for road-works did not even begin work on their contracts, and it is probable that the department did not have time to reallocate the money. I hope that a closer watch will be kept on such contracts in the current financial year. Of course, it is not entirely the responsibility of the Mines Department to keep an eye on that. It is the responsibility of local people to see whether or not contracts have been started, and the shire council has a similar responsibility.

I also note in the Estimates of expenditure from Trust and Special Funds that \$10,000 was approved for advances for developing new and existing mines. It appears that that was not spent, either. I should like to see the Mines Department take a more sympathetic approach to small miners. They are the men who keep the tin industry going during bad times. Some of the mines in the Herberton district have been worked for well over 100 years. In fact, this is Herberton's centenary year.

**Mr Davis:** Are you going to the celebrations?

**Mrs KIPPIN:** Yes, I have been to the centenary celebrations, and they were very good.

When prices are good, small miners could use financial assistance to purchase more machinery. This would enable them to take advantage of the demand for tin. A good price—and prices are good at the moment—would allow small miners to repay the loans if they could only get increased production under way. I hope that in the coming year more assistance will be given to small miners who are trying to improve the efficiency of their mines. In most instances, a small Government loan would put the battlers on their feet.

I was particularly pleased at the improved management of the Irvinebank Battery in the last year. It has made considerable losses over the years, and there was some talk—I do not think it was generated from Government sources; I know it was Labor Party propaganda at the last election—that the Irvinebank Battery would be closed. The use of the battery in the last couple of years has vindicated its continued operation.

**Mr Vaughan:** They should improve the road to the battery.

**Mrs KIPPIN:** The honourable member should speak to the honourable member for Cook about that. It is in his electorate. The Irvinebank Battery reduced its operating loss to \$30,000 in the last year, which is a considerable improvement.

Reference has been made to mining lease applications made on the Wild River. I mentioned that in my speech last week in the Budget debate, but I believe that it bears repeating in this debate. The Government has to enforce and make very plain its policy on mining in areas such as that.

The Herberton/Mt Garnet area is a large one. It has tin deposits scattered through it. It is quite a favourable area, and over the years a considerable number of people have applied for miners' homestead perpetual leases because of the climate and the district. These people have absolutely no connection with the mining industry and have made no contribution to it, but more and more objections are now coming from them to mining in the mining district.

The Government should state in no uncertain terms that in a mining district mining takes precedence over the comforts of holders of miners' homestead perpetual leases. I have no doubt that the Minister will state that. After all, it is only because the district is a mining district that these people have been able to obtain cheap leases over land. Furthermore, they have not had to compete for those leases. That is one of the privileges enjoyed by people who are associated with the mining industry and live in a mining district. It is of concern not only to the dredging companies in the Herberton district but also to a number of miners in the district that the number of objections to mining lease applications in the area is increasing.

**Mr Vaughan:** How does that tie in with the decision taken early this year to freehold MHPLs?

**Mrs KIPPIN:** If the Opposition spokesman on mining thinks back to that legislation, he will remember that the freeholding was to be done only on mining fields that were no longer active or in towns where the special miners' homestead perpetual leases were not necessary. People living in towns such as Mt Isa no longer face an uncertainty of employment and therefore do not need the benefit of MHPLs. The earlier decision to freehold MHPLs at the Minister's discretion does not have any effect on the Herberton mining district.

I am very pleased to see the Mines Department and the Herberton Shire Council co-operating in the subdivision of an area for the purpose of providing additional housing blocks in Herberton. For a number of years the council objected to the granting of further housing blocks in the district because it was uncertain about where the development should take place and concerned about the haphazard applications for land. The Mines Department has subdivided a certain area and this will put a considerable number of blocks in Herberton onto the housing market. In time these blocks will be necessary, as a considerable increase has taken place in mining activities around Herberton. In fact, a number of companies are looking for areas in which to erect houses for their employees.

The Minister referred to the rural electrification scheme. No-one who lives in rural Queensland would fail to recognise the benefits flowing from the scheme. However, as generous as the subsidies and grants from

the Government and the distributing boards have been, the cost of connection of electricity, even under the scheme, has in a number of instances been prohibitive. Two schemes are to go ahead in my area. However, the landholders involved in those schemes are faced with connection costs of as high as \$20,000. Such a cost imposes a great strain on the average property owner in my area.

The Herberton Shire Council has obtained loan funds to enable the landholders to participate in the scheme. The Government, through one of its instrumentalities, the council and the local people have co-operated to extend electricity into country areas that previously had no chance whatever of getting it. It is one of the best co-operative moves that I have ever seen.

I hope that in the coming year the Duchess phosphate mine will be reopened. It is unfortunate that it was closed down approximately three years ago, much to the disgust of many northern farmers. The Duchess phosphate fines, that is, the residue from the phosphate rock, have been used by agriculturists in North Queensland for a couple of years. Our DPI research station has carried out extensive trials to ascertain the best use of Duchess phosphate.

(Time expired.)

**Mr UNDERWOOD** (Ipswich West) (3.41 p.m.): As I sit in these opulent surroundings, and think of the renovations taking place in the old parliamentary building at exorbitant cost and as I think of Ministers driving round in their black cars on superluxurious expense accounts, I wonder how Government members, particularly those in Cabinet, appreciate the problems facing the ordinary citizens, particularly those on low incomes, when they have to pay their electricity and gas bills. Frankly I do not believe that they can appreciate their problems. They do not know how hard it is, nor do they understand the social and financial problems facing families, particularly single-parent families, in these days of extraordinarily high bills.

As well as high electricity and gas accounts, the people have to meet ever-mounting costs relating to our so-called free education. They also face higher food and petrol bills. I think of hire-purchase agreement costs, how firms like Waltons continue to rip off the poor people in the State, the high interest rates and rents and the never-ending increases in commodity prices. While the ordinary people are in such a plight, gigantic companies enter into secret agreements with the Government—agreements that the Government is not even game to announce or reveal to the light of day—on the purchase of electricity. Some of them are getting electricity at less than cost while the ordinary consumer pays ever-increasing electric light and gas bills. These agreements must cease so that all electricity users in Queensland will meet their fair share of energy costs. The housewife or the lone parent has to meet a back-breaking burden

in the way of electricity tariffs so that unnamed companies and gigantic international companies can make super profits after buying electricity at an undisclosed price. These practices must cease.

The price of electricity for the domestic consumer has increased 50 per cent since the reorganisation of the industry in July 1977. It would be interesting to know what increases have been imposed under the secret deals with these large companies but, as I said, the Government is not game to reveal the details. Large blocks of power have been sold to these companies at significantly low prices and, I believe, even at less than the cost of production—at lower than the bulk price paid by the distribution boards.

To my mind these secret deals are responsible for the extraordinary increase in electricity charges. We have been told that wages, salaries and fuel costs have caused the increases, but I believe that is not so. As from 1 July 1980, electricity bills increased by 13.2 per cent. It was announced that the increase would be 12 per cent, but an examination of the figures showed an increase of 13.2 per cent in South-east Queensland and roughly 8 per cent in the rest of the State. This increase meant at least an additional \$7 a quarter to the average householder.

Since the reorganisation of the electricity industry in July 1977, charges have risen three times—in April 1978, July 1979 and July 1980. In those three years, the average domestic quarterly bill moved from \$44 to \$66, an increase of 50 per cent. Imagine what those increases in electricity charges mean to the people who are living from week to week or even day to day in, for instance, Ipswich where many families eat bread and jam for tea. They are not few in number, and their ranks are growing.

The increases were announced as being 15 per cent, 10 per cent and 12 per cent. However, the increases were 18 per cent in 1978-79, 13 per cent in 1979-80 and 13.2 per cent this year, which is nearer to 14 per cent than 12 per cent as we were told through the media.

The reason given for those increases were: increased wages and salaries, increased fuel costs, increased capital charges incurred on power-station projects, introduction of the 37½ hour week and the elimination of award anomalies. The following information shows that the reasons are trumped up and baseless. In its first year of operation—1977-78—SEQEB made a profit of \$17.2m. That would buy a lot of bread and jam.

**Mr Moore:** Who eats bread and jam these days?

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** A lot of people. It shows how out of touch he is with his electorate. He should get out and have a look. He should go round at tea-time. It is all right for him to sit there and laugh.

**Mr Moore:** It was bread and dripping in my day, and it was good tucker, too.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** People in my electorate cannot afford dripping.

Following the increases in April 1978, the profits soared to \$26.2m. Into the bargain, SEQEB funded 100 per cent of its capital works. Another interesting fact is that, in its first year of operation, the Queensland Electricity Generating Board's salaries and wage costs amounted to \$41.6m. In 1978-79, these costs fell to \$37.9m, which is \$3.7m less. Fuel, coal and oil costs increased from \$69.3m in 1977-78 to \$75.2m in 1978-79, an increase of 8.46 per cent.

Generating capacity at the same time increased by 9.4 per cent. The Gladstone Power Station, which generates more than 50 per cent of the State's power, burns coal which costs less than half the price of the coal burnt at the older and less efficient power-stations, such as those at Swanbank and Brisbane. In the 10-year period 1968-78, generating capacity increased by 115 per cent, while the number of persons employed increased by only 25 per cent.

The Government supplies power under secret agreements to large industrial customers, whom it will not name, at less than cost. This costs other electricity consumers at least \$5m a year. The average retail price of electricity in Queensland is the second highest in Australia.

Other figures in the electricity industry show that, for 1977-78, coal consumption was 4 540 046 t, and for 1978-79, 4 520 481 t, a decrease of 0.43 per cent. At the same time, electricity produced in 1977-78 was 8 886 GW/h and in 1978-79 it was 9 312 GW/h, an increase of 4.79 per cent.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Miller):** Order! I point out to the honourable member that the Minister was very keen to have as many members as possible speak in this debate. He has, however, asked for 10 minutes in which to reply to the members who have already spoken. I would remind the honourable member that he has the opportunity to take his full time if he wishes; it is entirely up to him whether or not he allows the Minister to reply.

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy) (3.50 p.m.):** I thank honourable members for their contributions during the debate on the Estimates of those departments which come under my administration—the Department of Mines, the State Electricity Commission and the Coal Board. As this is the first time I have been responsible for these Estimates, I have given as many members as possible the opportunity to speak. I wanted to do this because matters relating to the administration of certain departments concerned some members and there were certain aspects with which they did not agree.

Several members made sincere suggestions, and as the new Minister I believe it was good for me to be here and listen to the various points of view. The senior officers

from my departments were also here listening to those points of view and they have provided me with a considerable number of comments in response to the points raised. I do not propose to endeavour to cover them all. Several members want specific detailed answers on some points but I do not have the time to respond to them in detail. If the seven members who have spoken contact me, I will give them detailed answers to the points they raised.

I think I should answer some of the points raised by the honourable member for Nudgee, the Opposition spokesman on mines and energy. He criticised the electricity supply industry, but I do not intend to answer his criticisms. I think the matters he raised were sufficiently covered in my ministerial statement this morning. I refer him to that statement, and we will not enter into any further arguments.

**Mr Vaughan:** That was my reply to your statement.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** That saves the honourable member writing to me.

**Mr Vaughan:** I have no intention of writing to you. I will be proved right in time.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr SULLIVAN:** In relation to mining, the honourable member expressed some concern about how we arrive at royalties. I point out that freight rates and other indirect income which the State receives need to be taken into consideration.

**Mr Vaughan:** What's our freight rate on uranium?

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I listened to the honourable member. Does he want me to answer or not? He has always been like this.

**Mr Vaughan** interjected.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I remind the honourable member for Nudgee that persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I can be just as emphatic and tough as Ronnie Camm used to be with the honourable member. If he wants it that way, he can let me know.

When arriving at a figure on which the royalty was to be calculated, it was agreed by the Government that Mary Kathleen would be allowed to deduct costs incurred in keeping its mine in moth-balls until it became operative again.

In relation to steaming coal, the Government has no intention of virtually nationalising the steaming coal industry by dictating mining methods. It is in the lessee's long-term interests to ensure that the maximum possible amount of coal is extracted. Open-

cut coal-mining allows about 90 per cent of coal to be extracted compared with about 50 per cent—

**Mr Vaughan** interjected.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I now warn the honourable member for Nudgee under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Any restriction on open-cut mining at this stage would slow the development of new mines which are required to assist in meeting the world's energy requirements.

I now turn to authorities to prospect. They are granted only to persons who can satisfy the requirement of being able to carry out the terms of the authority in regard to expenditure and large-scale prospecting activity. They are granted for one or two years, and during their term detailed reports on prospecting carried out and money expended must be submitted. This matter is closely watched by the department, and if reports are not satisfactory the authority is cancelled and the security deposit forfeited. In the interests of small miners, there are several areas in the State where authorities to prospect are not granted, and these areas are being added to as the need becomes apparent. Those were the matters raised by the honourable member for Nudgee, who is the Labor Party spokesman on the Mines and Energy portfolio.

As I have mentioned, I will be referring to matters that other honourable members raised. I thank them for their co-operation. I thank the member for Ipswich West for agreeing to speak for only 10 minutes in order to give me time to wind up the debate.

Those are the Estimates of the Mines Department for the year under review. I certainly look forward to working with Government members and the department to ensure that the electricity industry is developed in order to meet requirements. I believe that mining in this State has a wonderful future in the decade or so that lies ahead.

At 3.56 p.m.,

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Miller): Order! By agreement, under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 11 September, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Mines and Energy.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

Mines and Energy—

§

Chief Office, Department of	
Mines .. .. .	4,272,962
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund Account .. .. .	60,664,284

## INDUSTRY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

CHIEF OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. N. E. LEE** (Yeronga—Minister for Industry and Administrative Services) (3.57 p.m.): I move—

“That \$6,426,525 be granted for ‘Department of Commercial and Industrial Development—Chief Office.’”

## Introduction

With great pleasure, I present the Estimates for the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development and invite constructive criticism of them. This has been another year of progress for us, and I have every confidence the Committee will endorse the department’s policies which have helped Queensland to maintain its pre-eminent growth position among Australian States.

I have no doubt the Committee will also wish to record its appreciation of the efforts of the department’s officers under the direction of Mr John Bensted, who, of course, is one of our most capable public servants.

During the 1979-80 financial year we led the rest of Australia in various fields. For one thing, our export earnings grew at a faster rate than the Australian average; for another, retail sales growth was higher in Queensland than the national average. We were also slightly better off regarding prices. The Consumer Price Index showed our annual rate of increase from 1978-79 to 1979-80 was 9.7 per cent against 10.1 per cent for Australia as a whole.

It was a less happy story as far as industrial disputes were concerned. In the first eight months of 1978-79 we lost 217 600 working days through disputes. In the first eight months of 1979-80 we lost 276 900. Since then we have had strikes at the Central Queensland coalfields and at Queensland power-stations. All strikes—but particularly these—lead to lost revenue and industrial disruption. They also dim Australia’s reputation as a reliable trading partner and discourage potential investment in the country. These facts must cause dismay because they can, and do, result in lost job opportunities.

During 1979-80 economic activity in Australia as a whole did not make the same progress as in the previous year. In Queensland, capital investment was uneven, growing faster in some sectors than in others. In round figures, the value of new fixed capital expenditure by all industry groups totalled over \$1 billion for the first nine months of 1979-80.

Manufacturing, which again improved its performance, contributed \$181m, or 18 per cent of this amount, and mining \$160m or 16 per cent. Compared with other Australian States, we traded to a much greater extent on overseas markets. The value of Queensland exports for the 11 months to May 1980 was 33 per cent higher than for

the same period of 1978-79. The 11-month total was almost \$4 billion compared with nearly \$3 billion and represented 23 per cent of the Australian total—an excellent performance considering we have only 15 per cent of the Australian population.

One effect of success in the export field is an improvement in the local employment situation. At June 30 this year, 920 100 people were employed in Queensland, and this was an increase of 2.8 per cent over the figure for the same time last year. Employment opportunities, in fact, grew at a faster rate than the population, which increased by 1.5 per cent to 2 213 000 during 1979 to make our State the fastest growing in Australia. But because our labour force rose by 3.1 per cent to over 987 000, unemployment again increased during the last quarter of 1979-80.

The investment being undertaken in big mining and resource-processing development is now creating a demand for goods, services and labour. This is expected to lead to further increases in the level of activity in our manufacturing sector. However, one cause for concern in this field is the shortage of skilled manpower. Another is the need to contain cost pressures. As long as we can contain these problems, industry growth within Queensland this decade is confidently expected to be strong as a result of the substantial levels of investment in mining, resource-processing and energy projects.

Development of these long-term investments will provide continuing support for expansion in our manufacturing industry. Continued investment in new plant and equipment by manufacturing industry occurred during 1979-80, the biggest projects announced being in the area of resource and raw materials processing. In many cases this involved expenditure for expansion of existing operations. I had the pleasure of opening the department’s second interstate branch office in Melbourne last March. It joins our Sydney branch in providing information and advice to industrialists planning to expand operations to Queensland. It is planned that these branch offices will expand their activities to include visits to all major population centres in New South Wales and Victoria.

## Industrial Estates

The demand for sites on our Crown industrial estates is stronger than ever, and the 152 applications made during the year showed a near 50 per cent increase on the 1978-79 figure of 103 and a 110 per cent rise on 1977-78.

Last week I went to Ingham to open our 46th estate. Estates now cover an area of 4 718 ha on which we have so far spent nearly \$30m in acquisition and development costs. All but seven of the estates are in decentralised areas, in accordance with Government policy. There are 466 firms currently located on the Brisbane metropolitan estates and 293 in provincial areas.

We are at present negotiating with 100 other firms, of which 80 want to move on decentralised estates.

Several estates are completely full, and the department holds 2 594 ha in hand for future development in 20 areas. It has so far spent \$5,529,198 on these in acquisition and associated costs. The industrial estates create many new job opportunities for Queenslanders, and I would suggest we bear this in mind when debating the Estimates.

During the year the department received an increased number of inquiries concerning assistance, particularly regarding the supply of departmental factory buildings. Expenditure on the factory building scheme totalled \$11m at the end of 1979-80. During the current financial year the department will spend \$3.7m to complete contracts for 10 factory buildings and construct a further nine.

The department now owns 62 factory buildings, with seven others under construction. The scheme, which is attracting a record number of applications, has been a major factor in encouraging manufacturers to locate here and also providing opportunities for some of our own industries to expand their operations. It is in line with our policy of offering financial inducements to industry, such as offering land on the estates for a special lease of 30 years attracting a concessional annual rental for the first 10 years.

While I am talking about our industrial estates, I would like to single out something regarding the Lytton Industrial Estate that the local member seems to have misunderstood.

In June last year, the Brisbane City Council applied for an area of land on Gibson Island to be made available to it on which to build a waste-water treatment plant. It is the last available riverfront industrial site under my department's control, but rather than dismiss the council's application out of hand I arranged for a committee made up of representatives of my department, the Department of Harbours and Marine, the Department of Local Government and the Brisbane City Council to examine the situation and investigate the Gibson Island site and possible alternatives. The committee eventually recommended, with the city council's representative dissenting, that the Gibson Island site was so significant from an industrial point of view that it should not be made available for a waste-water treatment plant.

That could have been the end of the matter as it affected the department, because the State Government was not obliged to provide the council with a site. But, in order to be as helpful as possible, I offered the council an alternative area suitable for its needs and purpose on the Lytton Industrial Estate. That was in May. The council has still not replied. Since then a council alderman has publicly claimed that

the Government was forcing it to build its plant on the Lytton Estate and a local protest meeting was held on this basis. The claim, of course, was not true. It seems that the council does not want the Lytton site, and that ends the matter there as far as my department is concerned. However, the member for Lytton wrote to me on 10 September asking that consideration be given to provision of a site on Whyte Island. I will be happy to support this proposal.

#### State Stores

Managed by Mr Keith Chandler, State Stores performs a valuable service in bringing together the purchasing of items in common demand by most Government departments. It ensures that these are acquired on the most favourable basis, and with this in mind has significantly expanded the range of commodities covered by period contracts.

During the year, 64 additional period contracts were let, and following the large number of period contracts arranged during the last 12 months, which allowed departments to order more items direct from the contractors, the number of orders placed by State Stores has decreased by 11 per cent. It placed orders worth \$60m during the year, in addition to the annual value of period contracts, which were estimated at \$93m. The number of quotations and tenders invited increased by 15 per cent.

A new addition to the "Contingencies" Vote for 1980-81 is the subsidy for conveyance of goods to Gulf areas. Since 1923 various shipping contracts for conveying goods to these areas have been administered by the Treasury. This will now be looked after by State Stores. The purpose of the contract is to ensure that there are transport services in the Cape York Peninsula and Gulf areas, so that Government services such as providing education and maintaining law and order can be fully discharged, and also that isolated Aboriginal communities for which the State also has a responsibility can be serviced.

#### State Migration

During the year 10 006 migrants came to Queensland. They included 2 156 from the United Kingdom, 208 of whom received assisted passages. Some of the latter were skilled personnel and were nominated by the State Migration Office to meet specific vacancies which could not be filled here, or were recruited by employers. The newcomers also included professional staff for State Government departments, universities, colleges of advanced education and industry generally.

The \$653,349 budget this year includes \$120,000 for the Good Neighbour Council of Queensland and represents its complete funding. This body has more than 300 contact workers in all parts of the State who get in touch with new arrivals and help them with any problems that arise.

During the year I opened a series of seminars at Yungaba Migrant Hostel organised with the co-operation of the Commonwealth Education Department to enlighten professional people on the languages and cultures of their client groups.

#### Government Motor Garage

Deliveries of new vehicles to departments totalled 2 174 during the year—63 per cent more than the previous year. Used departmental vehicles continue to be in demand when offered for sale at auction at Zillmere, and it sold 1 174 this way. This year the garage has made provision for an extra \$200,000 to cover the likely additional cost of petrol, and a further \$6,500 is required for servicing various components.

**Mr Davis:** How many four-cylinder cars were in that order?

**Mr LEE:** We had 25 per cent of four-cylinder cars.

#### Government Printing Office

The acquisition of new, sophisticated plant and equipment has enabled it to provide an improved printing service to Parliament and Government departments. But the human element remains vital, and I ask members to join me in complimenting the Government Printer (Mr Sid Hampson) and his staff on the excellent service that they provide. Even when Parliament sits late at night, "Hansard" pulls containing a report of the proceedings are available the next morning.

Included in the new plant is computerised equipment which will play its part in the overall training program. This is being undertaken to further educate and provide opportunities for employees in preparation for the relocation of the Government Printing Office in South Brisbane. Detailed planning and specifications for the new building have been under way for some time. It is expected that tenders for actual construction will be called before the end of this financial year.

The Government Printing Office will cost \$8,669,989 to run this year—a rise of \$123,745. Wages and salaries will cost \$552,107 extra, but the cost of paper, type, fuel and other items will drop by \$484,830. This is owing to the transfer to State Stores of the responsibility for the supply of cut and wrapped paper.

#### Small Business

Inquiries increased by 27 per cent during the year, bringing the total handled since the section was established in 1977 to more than 3,800. This rise, following a 40 per cent increase last year, reflects my efforts to make the public aware of the free service offered by the department, particularly in urging operators to seek expert advice from our councillors before getting into trouble.

#### Government Advertising Office

Its prime task is to assist Government departments and instrumentalities to prepare and place advertisements in Australia and overseas. It placed 8,500 advertisements during the year.

#### Conclusion

It would be remiss of me not to make some reference to the various back-up services offered by the department which are greatly appreciated by the public. These include its series of handbooks designed to assist small business operators, and resource material to technical and further education colleges, particularly in the small business education program operated with Education Department support.

We continued our annual grant to the Queensland branch of the Inventors Association and another to the Queensland Division of the Industrial Design Council of Australia to enable it to provide its specialist services to industry in this State.

An amount of \$130,478 has been approved to carry out a number of investigations, including preparation of a study by the Department of Economics at the University of Queensland, on the economic impact of the establishment of an ethyl alcohol industry. We increased our special grant to the Assistance to Industries Fund to \$105,000, and continued to pay freight subsidies to decentralised manufacturers located away from major ports to enable them to obtain export orders, and also to industries moving plant and equipment to decentralised areas to establish or expand a project.

In the publicity field, we continued to publish the bimonthly "Industry Magazine", which publicises Queensland industry to the world; funded a film, "Prelude to Greatness," which promotes our State and its people (and it has already been seen on general release), and had great success with a revamping of the "Queensland-made" campaign which is aimed mainly at increasing awareness of the wide range of goods made here to boost demand and improve local job opportunities as we "make it great in the Sunshine State."

**Mr HANSEN (Maryborough)** (4.21 p.m.): The Department of Commercial and Industrial Development is important to Queensland because of the assistance it can give to the industries that are already established here and those that might come to Queensland.

Allocations have been increased in two areas. Firstly, I do not agree with those people who claim that the Minister should become a member of Actors Equity. He referred to the promotion of industry and I note that the allocation has been increased from \$370,430 last year to \$636,463 for the coming year. I am not certain of all the areas of promotion covered or whether that amount includes the costs of running the new

Melbourne office. But if that expenditure helps to entice industry to Queensland, the Labor Party is in favour of it.

The Minister mentioned also that \$18,000 was allocated last year for assistance to industries. However, \$85,858 was spent and the allocation for the coming year is \$105,000.

Last year, \$100,000 was allocated for freight subsidy to industry. Of that amount, \$32,015 was spent and the allocation for this year has been cut back to \$75,000. Perhaps industry did not take advantage of the assistance that could have been made available as freight subsidy. Therefore the allocation has been reduced.

The Minister mentioned the manpower study to be conducted next year. That is an important study and it should have been done before now. He mentioned migrants—mostly British—having been brought to Queensland as tradesmen where young Queenslanders have not been given the opportunity to learn those trades. It is a short-sighted arrangement. I know that the Minister is not responsible for it; the manufacturers are responsible and I give the Minister full credit for the encouragement that has been given to manufacturers to employ more apprentices.

I see no mention this year of assistance for further investigation into the use of solar energy. The honourable member for Isis mentioned, in his speech during the debate on the previous Estimates, the need for the further use of solar energy. Last year \$50,000 was allocated for investigation but no allocation is shown for this year. Perhaps it has been transferred to another department.

No allocation has been made for the new Government Printing Office. This has been wanted for a long time. Together with the Minister, I pay tribute to the Government Printer for the work he has carried out in a totally inadequate building. The Minister said that he wants to keep employment there, but I believe that at the same time we have to keep pace with modern printing methods. One thing that has struck me is the difference between this Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament in the printing of "Hansard". In the Commonwealth Parliament a member is able to check the proofs of his speech about 20 minutes after he has finished it. He gives the corrected proofs back to the "Hansard" reporters and at 10 o'clock the following morning he receives not only a pull of his speech but pulls of the speeches of every other member. It is important that we read the speeches of other members, and I would like to see that sort of service provided to the members of this Assembly.

To touch on a parochial subject for a moment, I saw no allocation from special funding—perhaps this is the Treasurer's fault and not the Minister's—for the provision of sewerage to the Moonaboola Industrial Estate near Maryborough, despite repeated requests

by me and a member of the Maryborough City Council since the estate was included in the city area. Because of the nature of the land we are very fortunate to have had a long dry spell so that the waste from the industrial estate has not caused the problems that might occur in a wet season. I would ask the Minister to look at the allocation of funds for the provision of sewerage to the Moonaboola Estate. I know that he will receive full co-operation from the Maryborough City Council in that regard.

The Minister touched on decentralisation in his speech. On the 10th of this month the Minister opened the 46th Crown estate at Ingham. In fact, I believe he referred to that a moment ago. I note that in one of his Press releases—for which I thank him—to mark the occasion it was stated—

"Mr Lee, who was opening his department's 46th Crown industrial estate here, said for the benefit of anyone under the mistaken impression that decentralisation of industry was the policy of just one political party only seven of these were in the Brisbane metropolitan area.

"He said the department had spent \$30 million acquiring and developing land for the estates, of which more than half . . . \$19m, had been spent outside Brisbane."

That means that almost half had been spent in Brisbane. We have a pretty big State, and I would suggest that possibly that is not a very good comparison, even if it was more than half.

The department's annual report refers to its involvement in resource investigations. I believe such investigations are very necessary, and provide a considerable amount of data for people considering the setting up of industries in the various regions of the State. I believe such investigations should be conducted on a regional rather than a parochial basis. I instance the vast amounts of money that are to be spent in the development of the oil-from-coal process, chemical studies and the like.

The Minister mentioned small business, and I found myself agreeing with him that his department is best suited to assist small business. The department has moved part of the way already. I believe that the problems of small business are vastly different from those of big business. Finance is not always available to people in small business. In many cases they are family industries, and the members involved in the running of the business do not have too much time to study financial obligations and the like. The publications mentioned by the Minister, "Assistance to Small Business" and "Running a Small Business" are very good ones. I believe they are accepted by small business. The conducting of courses through colleges of technical and further education is of particular benefit, and I would like to see that continued. Of course, I am not too sure whether the Minister is still responsible for small business. It has been taken out of his hands.

Mr Yewdale: He couldn't handle it.

Mr HANSEN: I think he has the people in the department who could handle it. I believe that responsibility for small business should have remained with his department.

I noted in his remarks that the Minister did take to task the president of the National Party, when he said that the National Party was not the only party involved in decentralisation in Queensland. Queensland has been referred to as the most decentralised State in Australia. I suppose that this is based on the fact that a lower percentage of Queensland's population lives in the capital city than applies in other States. However, when we look at the structure of Queensland we see that in earlier years the development was resource based. In some respects, we were fortunate that that happened. I can recall that Walkers Limited, which has been in Maryborough for nearly 100 years—

Mr Moore: We grew sugar-cane right up the coast and we had to have a port at certain locations along the coast.

Mr HANSEN: There had to be a port close to the Gympie goldfields. Walkers set up an engineering works in Maryborough, and it has been carried on. However, I think we have to look at this matter of decentralisation in a different light. I believe that in the south-east corner of Queensland we are fast developing the equivalent of the Newcastle - Sydney - Wollongong complex, which is a heavily industrialised and populated area. The New South Wales Government has acted to encourage industry to move to other areas of the State. It has provided incentives to industry to establish factories outside that area. Queensland should heed what has happened in New South Wales. Because of what is happening in the Moreton and Gold Coast regions, the Government should provide greater incentives to industry to establish factories outside those areas. It is quite obvious that the present incentives for decentralisation in Queensland are not sufficient to allow us to come to grips with the population drifts and rural unemployment.

On page 15 of today's "Telegraph" an article talks about reducing Queensland industry to a branch office level. To some extent, this has already happened to industry in provincial centres through amalgamation and centralised administration. There is a need to look at what has happened already in this State. We must also keep in mind the need to discourage interstate and overseas take-overs. I notice that the three political leaders have commented on this matter. The Premier has mentioned that the administration of the companies engaged in exploiting our great wealth is moving out of the State. He suggested that Queenslanders should invest their dollars by the thousands in Queensland industry.

This is happening in the administration of companies. As I say, it has already happened within this State. It is not insignificant to note that some of the people who earlier this year were protesting about southern take-overs have themselves been involved in amalgamation and centralised control. It means that our administrators are moving south. The young people who would move into these positions are finding that they have to go south to take the positions, or the positions are filled by young people down there. This is one of the problems with technology. Once upon a time, the local office of an insurance company used to send out the yearly notice for the renewal of a policy. Now, the Melbourne office of the company sends out a computerised form and everything is dealt with down south. I hasten to add that that does not happen with the State Government Insurance Office in Queensland. All of this technological advance is adding in some way to the problems that we are facing. I suggest that the Minister should take note of this matter in his manpower survey, because it is a problem.

Young executives are moving up to Brisbane to manage the affairs of the Queensland branches of companies. It is also happening in the provincial cities: the managements of various industries in decentralised areas of the State are moving into a central office. The people to be trained to take those positions would have to come from those areas. The Labor Party acknowledges that more must be done to assist decentralisation. We encourage the establishment of industry in regions where population growth has been static or has decreased.

Some of the assistance mentioned by the Minister could be improved. He mentioned freight concessions, but obviously the incentives are not great enough or not sufficient notice has been taken of them. The allocation for that purpose was \$100,000 and at the end of 12 months only a small proportion of that sum has been expended. I believe that we should set up preferential interest rates and extended terms for establishment loans. The Labor Party agrees with the granting of an establishment fund of up to \$12,000 for feasibility studies into the establishment of industry in decentralised areas and meeting one-third of the initial cost, with the full payment of the grant being made when the industry moved into a decentralised area. To avoid all industry being crowded into the south-east corner of the State, the assistance must be given discriminately. We do not want an area such as the Newcastle/Sydney/Wollongong area.

We should encourage the initial stages of the manufacture and processing of goods at or near the point of production. I notice the Minister's department has been conferring with the Department of Primary Industries in this regard. The honourable member for Isis has seen semi-trailer loads of beans being transported to Geelong to be processed. That does not make sense to me.

I do not know what the loss must be—perhaps they are “might-have-beans” by the time they get there.

I know that in the Premier's electorate the duboisia tree is cultivated. Some people contract to pick the leaves of that tree. The leaves are transported to France and distilled for medicinal purposes. I do not know what the full use of that product is but I know it is in the field of eye treatment.

**Mr Moore:** You are talking about duboisia.

**Mr HANSEN:** Yes. Our natural resources should be processed here. Specialists in a certain product should be asked what can be done to encourage the establishment of that industry here.

I know that on the Minister's recent overseas tour he investigated, amongst other things, the machinery for the Government Printing Office, and I know that he talked to people in specialist fields. If an investigation is conducted into the resources of an area, then we know what can be offered to people who specialise in different fields. Perhaps some offer could be made to those people to encourage them to establish industry in Queensland.

**Mr Lee:** My trip overseas gave me a a greater understanding of the problems of those in the Government Printing Office.

**Mr HANSEN:** I thank the Minister for that comment. Even without going overseas, to me the conditions at the printing office look bad.

**Mr Lee:** Not only will there be new plant but also there will be a retraining program.

**Mr HANSEN:** I am pleased to hear the Minister say that because I think people who are already in an industry should be retained to encourage them to stay in that industry. That sort of thing should be encouraged. It should be tackled on a national basis with co-operation between the Commonwealth and State Ministers.

I believe that much more can be done by way of decentralisation rather than simply showing that more is being spent in country areas than in Brisbane. I remind the Minister that Brisbane is a very small part of the State.

I know that pay-roll tax exemption is of great assistance in the three eastern States where such an incentive has been given. In the other two eastern States, incentives have been given by way of what might be described as discriminate incentives in the form of pay-roll tax exemption to industries in country areas. The problems of freight, and even of making a telephone call, faced by people in country areas must be considered. Incentives can be given, and the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development is the one to handle such matters.

**Mr POWELL (Isis) (4.41 p.m.):** The Estimates of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development are before honourable members today, and there is no doubt that that department has given development in Queensland a tremendous impetus. One of the reasons for the State's advancing as quickly as it has is the wise policies instituted by the department. Due credit must be given to Mr Bensted, the permanent head of the department, for the way in which he has spearheaded the advance, but credit must also be given to the Minister for being able to work closely with his departmental heads. It is true of any organisation that where the boss works closely with the people below him in the order of priority, one sees positive action from that organisation. I am sure that we see action from the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development because of the way in which the Minister and his departmental heads work together with one aim.

I must also congratulate the department on its recent advertising campaign “We make it great in the Sunshine State”. The television commercial has captured the imagination not only of Queenslanders but also of people Australia-wide. As the final part of the commercial, one sees the Minister, with his grin, opening his coat. Because of that commercial, people are beginning to understand that we do make things in Queensland.

**Mr Moore:** If they made a garden fork, maybe I could wrap it round my neck.

**Mr POWELL:** I suggest to the honourable member for Windsor that that might be a good idea.

The days have gone when Queensland was regarded as an importing State, with very little being made here. If one looks at the report of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development that was tabled in Parliament recently, one notices that all manner of things are made on industrial estates throughout Queensland—not only industrial estates that come under the administration of the department but also other industrial estates. For example, there are two industrial estates in my electorate, the Bunda Industrial Estate at Bundaberg, with 24 industries, and the one at Hervey Bay, with three industries. Of course, there are numerous other industries at Hervey Bay manufacturing many items, and the position is similar in Bundaberg. Queensland is becoming a State in which components are made for many articles, and they are being made here as cheaply and more efficiently than in other parts of Australia.

The honourable member for Maryborough, who preceded me in the debate, made a plea for decentralised industry. That is the policy of the Queensland Government, and I am pleased to see that he has the good sense to agree that that is a positive policy.

He mentioned freight rates and incentives through freight rates, and he is quite correct in bringing that to the attention of the Committee. There is a freight rate disadvantage to people who produce goods in decentralised parts of Queensland. Generally speaking, there are people who believe that one decentralises by expanding up the coast. It should be remembered that there are areas in the west and north-west of the State in which decentralisation also is needed. It is not taking place at present because of the very high freight component in any products made there. There certainly is a freight rate advantage in transporting goods from wherever they are manufactured to Brisbane or wherever the consumer is. However, no freight advantage can be gained in transporting the materials to decentralised places. It is a one-way traffic. I suggest that the Minister and his department look closely at the prospect of getting the Railway Department to have a double freight rate advantage for industries in country areas.

I turn now to the use of sea transport. Adjacent to the Hervey Bay industrial estate is the port of Urangan and Bundaberg has the port of Bundaberg. The advantage enjoyed by Bundaberg, of course, is that its port is administered by a harbour board. Bundaberg is chiefly a sugar port, but it can also handle general cargo.

The port of Urangan, on the other hand, is administered directly by the Department of Harbours and Marine. Quite frankly, I believe that Urangan will never achieve its aim unless a harbour board is set up at Urangan to administer the port. It has the potential for development. I hope that the Minister will assist us in our endeavours to have the Department of Harbours and Marine acknowledge its potential as a port. Urangan should have its own harbour board so that it will not continue to be downgraded as it is at present by the Department of Harbours and Marine.

The industrial estate at Hervey Bay lends itself to boat-building. The building of displacement-type boats in Queensland is becoming more important. Anyone who visited the boat show in the last week or so will have noticed—I hope, with pride—the number of very good-quality boats that are constructed in Queensland. The Hervey Bay industrial estate lends itself to the construction of that type of boat. The only disadvantages it suffers are the freight disadvantage about which both the honourable member for Maryborough and I have spoken, and inadequate slipway facilities adjacent to the creek that flows beside the industrial estate.

The industrial estate contains one boat-builder, who is doing an excellent job. I should like to see the construction of fibreglass boats carried out on the estate. It is fairly obvious that, because of increasing fuel costs, recreation boating is leaning more and more towards sail craft. For safety reasons,

boats need to have displacement-type hulls. Therefore, the field is wide open in Queensland, provided boat-building industries are given an incentive to establish themselves on the industrial estates. Naturally I speak in favour of the ones in my electorate, because in it a need exists for that type of decentralisation.

It is interesting to note that of the country industrial estates the one in Bundaberg is the third largest. It contains a very large number of industries and is exceeded only by the estates at Rockhampton and Cairns. This is attributable to the fact that the Bundaberg and District Development Board has been a very active group. It has worked closely with the department and has a happy liaison with industry.

**Mr Lee:** Good representation, too.

**Mr POWELL:** I am sure it is good representation. However, the board has worked closely with the department, with the result that the industrial estate in Bundaberg is one of the major success stories in industrial estates.

The Minister referred to employment figures. It is fairly usual for people in this place to dwell on unemployment figures. In fact, the unemployment level is exploded into a very large issue. Of course, to those who are unemployed it is a most important issue. However, on the other side of the coin, Queensland has a greater increase in the number of people in employment than any other State. That is positive news and we will continue to get similar news provided the Government is able to continue its policy.

**Mr Lee:** The unions are responsible for a lot of strikes.

**Mr POWELL:** That is an important matter, too.

While looking at the employment situation in Queensland we must acknowledge that, thanks to the Government's encouragement of industry, more jobs are available this year than ever before and a greater percentage of the people are now employed.

In the encouragement of small business, which came under this department until the establishment of the Small Business Corporation, the department had a proud record. The seminars conducted by the department in country areas have been extremely worth while. On behalf of the small businessmen of Childers, I thank the Minister and his department for having officers go to Childers to discuss problems facing the small businessmen. They could not have received greater co-operation or better advice than they received from the department. I hope that the Small Business Corporation will continue in the same vein, because the department's record over the years has been a proud, important and effective one.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** A record number of small businesses have gone broke in Queensland.

**Mr POWELL:** Possibly that is because they did not take the advice given by the department.

The Minister referred to the Good Neighbour Council. That organisation is not widely recognised in Queensland. People tend to consider it to be a fairly nebulous association. I am pleased to note that like me, the Minister is proud of the council's activities. Anyone who has had anything to do with the Good Neighbour Council knows that it does a lot of work to assimilate migrants into the community. The Government would be well advised to continue funding the council. Assimilation is needed. There is no sense in people coming here from other countries merely to form little enclaves within the State.

I do not believe that migrants should ignore or shrug off their customs and languages, but if they come to live in Australia surely it is good enough for them to learn about our culture and to understand and use our language. The Good Neighbour Council does tremendous work towards that end. The Government is spending money wisely in supporting the council.

The Minister is also responsible for the State Stores Board, which is another organisation that is not generally well recognised in the State. It is responsible for the purchase of Government vehicles. Much has been said about the types and size of vehicles purchased. Because of the publicity devoted to increased petrol prices the general public has swung towards the purchase of smaller four-cylinder vehicles from larger six and eight-cylinder ones. I understand that the increase in the sale of four-cylinder cars has levelled out and that people are swinging back to the six and eight-cylinder cars. I am very interested in the experiment that the Minister instituted through his department to determine costs. While a four-cylinder car is cheaper to run so far as petrol is concerned, I am of the impression that, in the long run, it is more expensive overall to run.

**Mr Lee:** The petrol cost is only part of the story.

**Mr POWELL:** That is right.

I have the impression that the ultimate cost of running a four-cylinder car, taking into account wear and tear and the cost of the parts that have to be put into it continually, far outweighs the saving in petrol costs.

**Mr Moore:** When it is over 40 000 km, or two years, what a load of rot!

**Mr POWELL:** Apparently the honourable member for Windsor believes that he knows more about it than anyone else. He is partially right when he says that a 40 000 km span is not necessarily a good test. Any vehicle that starts breaking down and

requiring parts, especially mechanical parts, before 40 000 km is not worth buying in the first place.

The majority of people keep their cars longer than two years or 40 000 km. Admittedly, the vehicles that are used by the Government are sold at 40 000 km but, during the time they are used, they receive indifferent treatment. After a time, we will be able to find a trend. I am thankful that the Minister is making sure that the figures will be kept and will be presented to Parliament in due course so that we will have some indication of the vehicles that will be more economical in the long run.

Once again I congratulate the Minister on the way in which he administers his department and his officers. I thank them for their courtesy and friendliness to me during my time in Parliament. The way they treat people is an example to all other departments and has no doubt contributed to the success of that department.

**Mr P. N. D. WHITE** (Southport) (4.56 p.m.): I echo the remarks of the honourable member for Isis. I express my appreciation for the assistance given to me by this most helpful and efficient department headed, as the honourable member for Peak Downs would say, by that most excellent Minister. The Minister and his officers have my congratulations for a job well done over the past year and, I have no doubt, one that will be well done in the coming year.

I should like to speak particularly about the department's role in the decentralisation of industry. If we are to realise our great potential, we cannot approach the 1980s without putting a great deal of effort into the decentralisation of our primary, secondary and tertiary industries.

The department plays a role in decentralisation by the implementation of its very excellent program of Crown industrial estates. Some 46 estates have been provided throughout Queensland. It is a program of which the State and the department can be very rightly proud.

In addition to providing the estates, the department encourages manufacturing industries to set up in some of the more remote parts of Queensland. Where manufacturing industries establish on these Crown estates—and they are given reasonable and favourable conditions to do so—it follows that the people will stay in those areas because of the jobs that have been created, and service industries build up around the manufacturing sector. That is what we want to see.

It is not only a matter of establishing manufacturing and service industries in various parts of the State; it is also a matter of maintaining some sort of balance throughout the State and assisting the rural industries in the more remote areas. Once manufacturing and service industries are established, services improve and the roads are

improved because of the increased number of people in the area. The flow-on effect to the rural industries is a very significant one.

While that program has been very good, I wish to make a couple of comments that are critical but, I hope, constructive. Originally the estates were designed to give encouragement to the decentralisation of manufacturing industry in this State. Judging by the estates in my own area, I would say that some marginal decisions have been made in the past as to whether an industry was a manufacturing industry. In all fairness to the original manufacturing industries that set up, in some cases industries which were not strictly manufacturing industries were allowed in. That in itself is probably not significantly bad, but the problem is that we are starting to intrude into what should really be the province of private enterprise. If Crown estates are for the encouragement of manufacturing industry, then surely we as a Government should not be intruding into the provision of facilities for the service industries which will spring up around a manufacturing industry.

I would ask the Minister to take particular note of a tendency for non-manufacturing industries to spring up in these estates. I do not believe there are many places where private industry cannot provide the land and facilities for the service industries which support manufacturing industries. But if there are areas where private enterprise cannot or will not provide the facilities for the non-manufacturing sector then obviously the Government's job is to create the atmosphere for and to help the establishment of these service industries. But in areas where private enterprise is quite capable of providing the facilities I would urge the Minister to get the Government out of a field in which it is not properly engaged.

My other criticism should be examined by the Minister to see whether in fact it is accurate, and that is that there perhaps is a tendency in some well-established areas to provide too many industrial estates. Again, once the initiative has been taken and a manufacturing industry is well on the way, I do not believe it is the Government's role to provide more estates than are necessary to get industry on its feet in that area. Perhaps there are some areas where it is time the Government stopped buying land and developing estates if private industry in those areas is quite capable of taking on the job itself. We get no thanks as a Government which professes to be strongly private enterprise—which this Government is—if we intrude into areas where private enterprise is quite capable of doing the job itself.

**Mr Davis:** What would you suggest about a railway line to the Gold Coast?

**Mr P. N. D. WHITE:** I would be the first to applaud a railway line from the Gold Coast, but the fact is that at the moment the economics of the situation will preclude that for some little time. But what

we want to see, and I think I would include the honourable member for Brisbane Central in this, is the electrification of the line to Beenleigh as soon as possible, and as soon as possible after that we should build and electrify a line from Beenleigh to the Gold Coast.

**Mr Burns:** Your Government has decided not to electrify from Kingston to Beenleigh because of the Bethania curves. That is not even allocated in the electrification scheme.

**Mr P. N. D. WHITE:** I am quite happy to take that comment. The fact is that the Beenleigh-Brisbane line is not suitable for an electric train which travels at even a reasonable speed. I agree with the honourable member for Lytton. If the time ever comes for the electrification of that line, I would urge the Government to look at acquiring land in order to straighten the line so that fast electric trains can use it. I do not believe it is any good doing the job in a half-hearted fashion.

I now want to say a few words about the importance of light industry on the Gold Coast. Light industry is the third biggest provider of employment on the Gold Coast after tourism and the building industry. That is why it is so important to provide a broader base for employment on the Gold Coast. I am quite sure that for various reasons it will continue to grow. The first is that the initial impetus for light industry on the coast has been provided by the Crown estates, the second of which is now complete and rapidly filling. But I say to the Minister that perhaps it is time for the industrial estates on the coast to be phased out after the current program is completed, and the job left to private enterprise. A lot of industrial land is being developed, and at the moment there is difficulty in selling that land. Manufacturing industry can get into Crown estates under favourable conditions, and that is good. However, I think the time has come when we have to have another look at that situation.

One of the other reasons why there will be growth of light industry on the Gold Coast is the very stable and highly trained work-force available for any new industry that is established there. There is adequate housing, it is a pleasant place in which to live, wage demands are reasonable and, even without the railway that was mentioned before, there is reasonable access to Brisbane. Of course, there will be better access to the new port of Brisbane; so manufacturing industry on the coast has a bright future.

I can only applaud this, because there must be some other outlet for those students who are leaving school every year. In a few months another 300 or 400 students will leave school and seek employment. The broader the employment base in that area, the better it will be to try to combat what must be our No. 1 problem in this country, and that is

unemployment. Light industry and this department will play a part in trying to combat that problem.

In conclusion, I congratulate the department, its officers and the Minister for a job well done in the last 12 months. In the next 12 months they will tackle the job with enthusiasm, and they will be just as successful.

**Mr BURNS (Lytton) (5.7 p.m.):** After 23 years of National/Liberal Government in this State and hearing, before each election, that they are wedded to free enterprise and competition, I sometimes wonder why "competition" is a dirty word in Queensland amongst Government members today. I wonder why we do not get competition in our airline services. I wonder why all the banks charge the same interest rates. I wonder why the Liberals did nothing for years about the petrol companies that were ripping off the little retailers. I wonder why the Ministers of the Crown in this State went down to the port authority and decided to set up a monopoly there. I wonder why they decided not to allow another cement company to come into this State to compete against the monopoly that is here.

I wonder why this National/Liberal Government introduced legislation to ensure that people could not cut the price of bread and that pensioners could not purchase bread at a cheaper price than that charged by some of the major donors to the National Party's premises. I wonder why it forced up the minimum price of milk. I wonder why it acted against the friendly societies in order to keep a monopoly for the organisation of the member for Redcliffe. I wonder why it has set up a centralised hospital catering service and done away with the opportunity for smaller people to provide facilities to hospitals. I wonder why it has done nothing about the home builders and the small subcontractors who have been sent broke over the years, with little or no action being taken to protect them. It is no good this Government at election-time talking about competition and free enterprise if it does not do anything about it in the three years between elections; if it does not act to support the argument that it uses at election-time that it is different from the dreaded socialists.

The member for Stafford and others ask questions from time to time about statutory authorities. We have more statutory authorities than any other State in Australia. There has been more legislation to restrict the rights of the individual introduced in this State since this Government has been in power than there was in the last five or 10 years of the last Labor Government. I can even remember the legislation that was designed to send inspectors into houses to look under the bed for fowls because people might have a few fowls that would lay a few eggs and thus compete against some of

the friends of this Government. That was free enterprise legislation of the National/Liberal Government.

We are overgoverned. We have too much legislation. Under this Government initiative has disappeared. If a person wants to build a home or set up a business, he has to go to half a dozen departments and fill out half a dozen sets of forms. Under a National/Liberal Government in Queensland, we have more bureaucracy and red tape than under the socialist regimes in many countries around the world.

The Minister speaks about the "Buy Queensland Made" campaign. The other day I was given an inspection of the Redbank Railway Workshops. The poles that support the electric wires for the electric trains are sent to New South Wales to be galvanised. The electric fields for the motors of the diesel-electric engines are sent to Bathurst. The Minister talks about "Buy Queensland Made". That is the Government's own railway department.

**Mr Lee:** If you would keep your people working instead of striking, more things would be done here.

**Mr BURNS:** I do not believe there is that much trouble with Queensland workers going on strike. The last long strike in this State was caused by a Government of the same political colour as the Minister, one that is supposedly interested in so-called tax reductions. That Government fought the miners over taxes on their houses. That is what caused the longest strike in this State's recent history. Who caused that strike? It was the Liberal Party Treasurer.

**Mr Moore:** You choked on that because you didn't believe it yourself.

**Mr BURNS:** Of course I choked on it, because the Government says it is interested in cutting taxes whereas in fact it is the highest taxing Government in the history of this nation.

Let us return to apprenticeships and employment. I asked the officials at the Redbank Railway Workshops for some employment details. In 1970, 72 apprentices were employed. In 1979, only 29 were employed. That is a decrease from 72 to 29. Let us see what happens to apprentices when they leave. Of the 24 fitters, 15 were given jobs, none were offered jobs as labourers and the rest had to leave. Of the carriage-makers, six were employed and three were offered jobs as labourers. Because of the stupidity of staff ceilings imposed by the Government, we are employing young apprentices at the Redbank Railway Workshops—only a limited number—and when they finish the lads are told that they cannot be employed as electricians or as tool-makers, but they are offered jobs as labourers. The Minister for Industry and Administrative Services has the hide to say

that private enterprise is not doing its part. He ought to have a look at what Government departments are doing.

On 8 September the Minister responsible for business affairs stated in the Press that as part of a work-promotion program he wanted more trees planted. He surely has not read the report of the Forestry Department. That report states that in 1975-76 the department employed 1252. In 1976-77 that was reduced to 983. In 1977-78 it was reduced again to 904. In 1978-79 the department reduced it to 842. Those figures are quoted from the front page of the report of that department. While the Minister is issuing his public relation handouts and saying that he wants more people employed, his ministerial colleagues who sit beside him in Cabinet have reduced forestry employment by one-third in the last four years. Don't talk to me about industrial development!

I thank the Minister for his help in regard to Whyte Island and the Lytton Industrial Estate. At that industrial estate the Australian Wool Corporation, which is a body that the Liberal and National Party people who pretend to support the wool industry should be interested in, was concerned at the excessive double handling of wool in Brisbane. The corporation asked for a wool village to be set up on the Lytton Industrial Estate. Such a village would have handled all of the wool received in Brisbane. Currently it is received at five centres—Archerfield, Teneriffe, Albion, Hedley Park and Hamilton. The corporation wanted it to be collected into one area because once it comes into those reception areas it then has to be sent to BWWD for dumping and then brought back to the centres and shipped.

The shipping goes something like this: the wool for Russia goes to Patricks; wool for export to Japan goes to BWWD; for the United Kingdom and Europe, the wool is put on a train and sent to Sydney. At a wool village on the Lytton Industrial Estate, the wool could be received on the one site, tested, auctioned, dumped, containerised and shipped. But the Minister said no. The reason he refused was that it is not an industrial or manufacturing activity. But at the industrial estate at Rockhampton, COD, another rural enterprise and not a manufacturing activity, is given land. The facts of life are that the Minister has refused to set up what I thought would be a tourist attraction. A wool village associated with the wool industry would have saved a massive sum of money for Queensland and Australian wool growers. What is the real reason for the refusal?

If we are talking about business enterprise and business activities, let us look at the interstate railway at the Acacia Ridge terminal. When goods come from Europe, they come to Sydney and are transported to the interstate terminal at Acacia Ridge. Containers are lifted off the New South Wales train, put onto the Queensland train

and transported to Hamilton, where BWWD—remember Mr Baillie, because his name crops up all the way through this story—unloads and unpacks it. The goods are then sent to many of the manufacturing firms and business firms that are on the estate beside the railway yard. They are not allowed to take the containers off themselves and unpack it there. It has to go over to Baillie's terminal at Hamilton and then come out again. All the big industrial estates are in outlying areas—Acacia Ridge, Wacol, Darra, Rocklea—and the cost for the double handling is \$83 a container. That is the cost of transporting it backwards and forwards across the city. The terminal at Acacia Ridge could be designated an inland terminal. At least, the Federal Government's mainline upgrading program could be used to build an interstate railway line to the port, with all the facilities down there. The saving to industry would be tremendous.

Let me speak about the port. Mr Baillie's name has been mentioned twice already because he makes money out of the decision not to have a wool village at Lytton and out of the decision not to do anything about the Acacia Ridge terminal. He also does very well out of decisions made by the Port of Brisbane Authority. The Port of Melbourne Authority suggested that a terminal such as No. 1 terminal at the Port of Brisbane could handle 40 000 containers, or their equivalent, a year without backing up any shipping.

Let me say to the Minister that the reason why United Kingdom and European shippers do not ship through the Port of Brisbane is the long delays that occur at the old container terminal at Hamilton, which is run by BWWD. They will not allow ships to sit out in Moreton Bay at \$15,000 to \$25,000 a day, depending on the size of the vessel. With the present high fuel costs, they want them to go along at a slow pace at sea and turn round quickly in harbour. Therefore, they always bypass Brisbane. It has been cheaper for them to put a container on the train and send it to Brisbane from Sydney than to bring the ship in here and experience problems in the port.

In setting up the new port, we should be concerned with the economics of a quick turn-round in the port. In the first place, the Brisbane Port Authority recommended that Baillie not get the terminal. All honourable members know the shabby story surrounding that, because at that time the Minister—

**Mr Lee:** You are on the wrong Estimates.

**Mr BURNS:** I am speaking about business. If the Minister thinks that the business of this community is not associated with exports when exports are referred to in reports of his own department, if he does not think that the city of Brisbane is affected by the cost of goods coming through the port, if he thinks, as a so-called Minister responsible for the expansion of business in

the community, that I am wrong in speaking about the cost of transport and the cost of shipping, I do not think he should be the Minister in charge of business. If that is not part of business, I do not know what is.

**Mr Blake:** He would probably agree that a monopoly in the port of Brisbane will put up the price to the consumer.

**Mr BURNS:** Of course he will. Everybody knows that. Every shipper would say that. If one goes to the shippers, they are not prepared to say anything because Baillie has the backing of Mr Lee, Sir William Knox and Mr Bjelke-Petersen. I do not know who is funding those campaigns these days, but Mr Baillie certainly is able to use a public-funded \$47m port at Fisherman Islands for his own advantage and to create a monopoly.

Even when the second container terminal came up for lease, when there was to be competition and promotion associated with the interstate traffic to the port, again the National Liberal Cabinet, which allegedly believes in free enterprise, overrode the recommendation of the Port of Brisbane Authority for free enterprise and competition.

Speaking of free enterprise and competition, I should like to quote briefly from Mr Baillie's letter of 1 November. He said—

“The resultant position would bring into focus very quickly, competition: no possibility of monopoly, and the position for other free enterprise operators to bid for No. 1 berth . . .”

That was when he was suggesting that the No. 2 berth should be his. Now that he has No. 1, he wants No. 2 as well, to do away with any competition.

As the Minister believes I cannot talk about the Port of Brisbane Authority when debating his Estimates, let me talk about the money that the Government is pouring into BPA. I used to think that BPA was a Queensland company. And the Minister's department has lent it some money, hasn't it? A million dollars, I think it is. As I understand it, the major shareholders in BPA are Mount Isa Mines, which is an overseas-controlled company; Comalco, another overseas-controlled company; and Craig Mostyn, a New South Wales company. Those companies are the major shareholders, owning more than half the shares, or a controlling interest, in BPA. A couple of other people might have secret interests in the company, and I would like to know who they are.

The plain fact of the matter is that BPA is able to tell people that, if this Government is returned at the next State election, it will have a monopoly over commuter airline services in the State. The Minister cannot deny that that statement has been made and is well known in the airline industry.

Under this so-called free-enterprise Government, the number of commuter airline operators has been whittled down. All that are left are Noosa Air, Island Air, an operator who provides an Aztec service to Warwick three days a week—I cannot remember his name—and Hannaberry's at Caloundra. They are the last of the commuter operators. They have been told that there will be a monopoly in the commuter airline industry and that it will be held by BPA.

From October BPA will take over the Twin Otter services out of Mackay. In November Ansett will hand over the North Queensland Fokker Friendship services to BPA. The result will be that BPA will control all of the commuter aircraft services in North Queensland.

Six weeks ago, Ansett reduced the 25 services a week to Maryborough, plus specials, to 15 services. From October TAA is alleged to be doing the same thing. Island Air, which has been operating out of Hervey Bay, has been told that it will be pushed out of business by BPA.

If anyone is interested in learning how the National Party looked after BPA, he should go back to the argument about western airline services and read the letter that was published in the “Western Times”. It referred specifically to the Premier and to Mr Glasson, Mr Turner, Mr Bertoni and Mr Katter. The letter was from Mr Tomkins to Mr Syd Williams of BPA, wishing him well and announcing the Government's support of the Metro service proposed for Western Queensland. However, the Government backed down quickly when it found that the people in the West did not want that service. There it is; it is printed in the “Western Times” for everyone to see.

All the Western Queensland members supported the proposal. I tell the Minister here and now that the money that his department is pumping into BPA, which used to be Queensland owned and which we were proud to claim as a Queensland company but is now foreign owned, will be used after the election campaign to set up another monopoly—provided, of course, Queenslanders are unfortunate enough to have this Government returned.

On the subject of businesses and monopolies—the Government should do something about the shortage of aviation gas for airline pilots who fly their own planes in Western Queensland. Does the Minister realise that at a large number of airports the pilots cannot obtain 100 octane aircraft fuel? It is available only from the Shell Company.

Let me mention a few prices. In Maryborough and some other places, BP is charging 54.1c a litre, or approximately 12c a litre more than in Brisbane and Maroochydore. I cannot see that that action can be justified. BP is ripping the people off. It is time that the Queensland Government made

some submissions to the Federal Government concerning the use of motor vehicle gasoline in aircraft. I realise, of course, that it could not be used in all types of aircraft.

In the time remaining to me I come back to my original submission. In every election campaign I am told that I am a "dreaded socialist" and that all members on the Government side of the Chamber are interested in free enterprise and competition. I have yet to have a member of the Government show me a piece of legislation that has been introduced in the eight years that I have been in this Parliament that represents free enterprise and competition. I have yet to see any piece of legislation introduced in the last eight years that has done anything substantial for free enterprise and competition.

I am reminded of the 464 separate statutory authorities that exist in Queensland. I am reminded of milk supply Acts, regulations concerning cane prices and other legislative measures introduced since 1957.

The Government professes to believe in free enterprise and competition. Would I be able under a Liberal Government to freely establish a new cane farm? Would I be able to establish my own sugar mill? Surely I should be able to do that under a free-enterprise Government! Would I be able to compete against the local newsagent? Would I be able to reduce the price of bread, as Jack the Slasher wanted to do but was prevented by this Government from doing? Would I be able to set up my own milk pasteurisation plant in competition with QUE? Would I be able to establish a cement factory in competition with the Government's friends, the Queensland Cement and Lime Company? Most certainly I wouldn't! What the National and Liberal Parties in Queensland say is that they believe in free enterprise. However, all they do is socialise the losses and personalise the profits.

In my own area I think of the Meat Industry Authority, and the way the board operates. I await the day when those who profess to support free enterprise and competition will act. I see the honourable member for Redcliffe and think of what he did to the friendly societies in this State and the restrictions he placed on them. I remember what he did to try to get the hospital pharmacies that were giving free medicine to people through the State hospital system taken over so that he and his friends in the chemist shops could sell medicine to those people.

**Mr T. A. White:** That is a lot of rubbish, and you know it.

**Mr BURNS:** The honourable member for Redcliffe did that, and he knows it. He was the chairman of the committee which recommended to the Government that the pharmacies in the State hospital system be abolished. But even the present Government would not cop that; the Government free

enterprise people would not cop that proposal from him. He came in here only to push his own barrow and to look after his own business. He is absent from the Chamber two or three days a week while he is up at Maroochydore or looking after his five pharmacies. The honourable member, his colleague the honourable member for Lockyer, and the member for Mt Isa (who now has a pharmacy in Brisbane and is ignoring Mt Isa), are typical of the Government type of businessmen who are more interested in feathering their own nest than adhering to the principles that they are supposed to espouse.

The people who have done best under this Government are not the ordinary people who have supported it through and through, but those like Mr Baillie who have donated a few bob to the Premier's fund or to the election funds of the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services and the Minister for Health.

**Mr LEE:** I rise to a point of order. That is incorrect. Neither Mr Baillie nor anyone else has donated to my election campaign. The statement is offensive and untrue. I wish to have it withdrawn completely.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Gunn):** Order! I ask the honourable member to accept the Minister's denial.

**Mr BURNS:** In accordance with the forms of the Assembly, I have to accept the denial. I accept the Minister's denial. That is as much as he will get. He will get a withdrawal like I will jump over the moon.

There must be some reason for Baillie's being able to get what he gets from this Government. I make no bones about the fact that he has been able to manipulate session after session of Cabinet. Somewhere along the line he has been able to put his hand in someone's pocket.

(Time expired.)

**Mr AKERS (Pine Rivers) (5.27 p.m.):** We have just heard a diatribe from the honourable member for Lytton. Not once did he expound any of the policies that his party stands for. The whole of his speech was devoted to trying to express support for private enterprise. One has only to look through the policies of the ALP to see how totally devoid they are of any support for private enterprise.

**Mr Austin:** The honourable member for Lytton talked about our board set-up but Labor's policy is for about 100 more.

**Mr AKERS:** At least 100 more.

Everything in Labor's policy stands for more and more socialism. If we look through Labor's handbook we see that that applies to every portfolio. Even Labor's transport spokesman (Mr Davis)—

**Mr Davis:** I am not the spokesman on transport. The member for Lytton is.

**Mr AKERS:** Well! The member for Lytton who is Labor spokesman on transport was talking to us about private enterprise. Let us see what Labor's policy is on transport: it visualises a total door-to-door delivery service. That would do away with all private enterprise in the transport industry.

**Mr BURNS:** I rise to a point of order. I must demand a withdrawal. That statement is offensive to me and I ask that it be withdrawn. It is not true.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Pine Rivers to accept the denial.

**Mr AKERS:** I will accept the honourable member's denial but I certainly will not withdraw it.

If the statement is offensive to the honourable member he should not be in the Labor Party. That is his party's policy and he is bound by it. As a former Federal president or secretary of the ALP he knows better than anyone how he is bound by his party's policy. He knows that he signed a document to say that he will comply with it. He knows precisely what Labor's policy means, which is total denial of private enterprise in public transport for a start.

The diatribe, the cries, the bleats and so forth that we heard—and the member for Lytton is even crying himself now—supposedly in support of private enterprise were just so much political humbug.

I am speaking today in support of the Minister in the introduction of his Estimates. I am very proud to do so because the Government, through the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, has an excellent history of supporting private enterprise.

It is unfortunate, however, that the Parliament is being treated shabbily and cruelly during this year's debate on financial matters. It is really a farce. Earlier today, the Estimates for Mines and Energy, totalling \$64,937,246, were passed by the Committee in 2½ hours. It took only 2¾ hours to pass the Estimates for such a major portfolio that is of vast importance to Queensland. On previous occasions, at least a full physical day—not a pseudo half-day—has been allowed to debate the Estimates of a department. In addition, 17 days are usually set down to discuss Estimates but this year we are to be allowed five. The debate on the Treasurer's Financial Statement was limited to two days. This year we will be allowed only 4¾ hours to debate the Estimates for Industry and Administrative Services.

**Mr Lee:** I am not shirking my duty.

**Mr AKERS:** No, the Minister is not shirking his duty. At least we will be able to debate his Estimates to some extent. The Estimates of other portfolios will not be debated. The Estimates for this portfolio were discussed last year and I shall speak more about that later.

As I said, we are being given 4¾ hours to debate Estimates involving the expenditure of over \$43m. The portfolio includes the extremely important Department of Commercial and Industrial Development that is doing so much for Queensland as well as the vital but probably less glamorous Government Motor Garage, State Stores, Government Printing Office, Immigration and advertising. The 82 members of this Parliament are to be given only 4¾ hours to debate those subjects.

Be that as it may, the Minister has established himself as a proved private enterprise man in both this portfolio and the Works and Housing portfolio. During his three-year tenure of the Works and Housing portfolio, the ratio of day labour to contract work improved from something like 70:30 to 30:70, or just the reverse. The result was nearly a 50 per cent gain in the amount of building per dollar constructed by that department. In this Parliament he has continued the excellent job that was done by his predecessor who is now Minister for Labour Relations. Both of those Liberal Ministers have a very proud record in giving real support to private enterprise.

Recently I was privileged to be at a meeting in the Minister's office attended by several big business people. We viewed a promotional audio-visual display covering a very wide range of facilities in Queensland. It was excellent, and I understand that it will be displayed to visiting business people from all over the world who are interested in trade, investment and tourism. I am sure it will create a lasting impression on those people, because it created such an impression on the hard-nosed Queenslanders and very experienced business people who were present. They were very impressed by the wide range of material that was presented and its method of presentation.

Last year I supported the Estimates for Industry and Administrative Services. I set out many of the advantages I saw in the industrial land at Strathpine. Because of the importance of that district, I intend to repeat part of what I said. There is a complete infrastructure available in the area, an adequate water supply, an efficient sewerage system, safe stormwater drainage, a railway operation providing both freight and passenger services, a good bus service and high standard roads. Something like 2 000 acres are available for industrial development—

**Mr Austin:** Acres or hectares?

**Mr AKERS:** 400 ha are available now in a fully developed state. Large firms such as Namco Industries (Qld) Australia Pty. Ltd., Cable Makers and Reed Corrugated Containers are already established. I have had representatives from architectural firms and businesses in Sydney and Melbourne say that it is one of the best industrial estates anywhere. In addition to the available infrastructure, something like 40 000 people live in

the immediate vicinity as a potential market and work-force. Certainly there are sufficient people in the area with the training and education to provide the necessary management staff. And this is in an area that covers only Bald Hills, Kallangur and through to Albany Creek—perhaps a five to six mile radius. There is a planned expansion in the area of at least 50 per cent over the next five years which will boost the population to 60 000. That will mean an additional 20 000 people will shortly be living in the area, not many fewer than the population of Maryborough. As part of my efforts to promote the area, the Minister will, at my request, be coming out to inspect the industrial estate next Thursday. He will be opening a further stage of the estate. While he is there I will maintain the pressure I have been applying to his department in an attempt to get it to promote this area as well as the Narangba Industrial Estate. I do not mean to promote it in the sense of constructing buildings as is done on Crown industrial estates, because that is not possible; I mean the sort of promotion that is needed to persuade businesses that do not qualify for admission to Crown industrial estates to come to the area.

**Mr Davis:** What about Bill Bowden's estate at Strathpine? That's all right, too?

**Mr AKERS:** Mr Bowden's industrial estate at Strathpine is excellent. I take some pride in the fact that he has been made to do a lot of it—perhaps against his will. It is an excellent industrial estate, better than any I know of, at least anywhere in Queensland.

I join the Minister in his praise of the Government Printing Office. To read a speech mumbled and jumbled in here by, say, the honourable members for Brisbane Central, Murrumba or Ipswich West, and then read it the next morning in a very clear, precise and grammatically correct form is really amazing. Of course, the "Hansard" reporters have the worst of the job to try to understand what members are saying, but the fact that we get it back here in an accurate printed form early the next morning never ceases to amaze me. I certainly praise the employees of the Government Printing Office for working under the conditions they do, and I look forward to them working in new premises shortly.

One other part of the Minister's portfolio I would like to briefly touch on is the Good Neighbour Council, because I believe this organisation is doing an excellent job. This year the Government is providing \$120,000 so that the council can continue the good work it has done in the past. It is a pity that the Federal Government has discontinued its funding, but I am very glad to see the State Government assisting the council in its work of integrating and assimilating migrants into the work-force and the community generally. It is making the system work very well. I support the Estimates.

**Mr FOURAS** (South Brisbane) (5.39 p.m.): I want to begin my contribution to the debate on the Minister's Estimates by commenting on his responsibility for migration. I note that a grant of \$120,000 has been made to the Good Neighbour Council. That was equivalent to the amount that was expended in 1979-80. I would like to argue that these funds should not be available, and I shall give my reasons for saying that.

For many years, the Good Neighbour Councils were mainly involved in welcoming migrants to Australia and assisting with their assimilation into the community. It was not until the 1960s that their functions were significantly changed from co-ordination to the direct provision of long-term services for migrants in Australia, including welfare services in special cases. This coincided with a general change in Government policy from assimilation to integration. I believe that the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services still does not understand something that happened 20 years ago. He does not understand the difference between assimilation and integration.

In the late 1960s and the early 1970s some councils attempted to decentralise their operations. A number of regional offices were established. I believe that that was a very positive step. However, by 1975 uncertainty about the councils' role prompted the Federal Government, in consultation with the councils, to draw up a new statement of functions, which included additional responsibility for providing advocacy and preserving and fostering ethnic cultures. We find that in the past the bulk of the work of the Good Neighbour Councils involved activities which had little direct benefit for migrants, such as servicing the councils themselves, liaison with other organisations, organisation of volunteers and running conferences and seminars. I believe that direct services to migrants, such as welfare counselling, tended to be provided locally through regional offices and the volunteer system rather than by the major offices in the cities.

I believe that all Good Neighbour Councils subscribed to the same basic aims and philosophy, that is, the integration of migrants into the Australian community and the cultivation of good neighbourly relations with migrants. The methods of achieving these aims varied widely from council to council, and included such diverse activities as research, provision of direct welfare services, encouragement to migrants to take out Australian citizenship, organisation of volunteers to contact new arrivals, and the marshalling of interpreting and translating resources. While the Good Neighbour Councils fulfilled a useful purpose in the early days, they became largely irrelevant to the needs of migrants, with the exception of some services provided in the regional offices.

Many of the functions engaged in by the Good Neighbour Councils—for example, the welcoming function—had become largely irrelevant to the needs of migrants. Others, such as the organisation of the home-tutor scheme, had become too large and complex for the councils to administer successfully. Many of the functions traditionally engaged in by the Good Neighbour Councils, such as interpreting and translating, welfare and counselling, and support for migrant cultural activities, have gradually been taken over by other organisations. That is my criticism and the criticism of ethnic communities throughout Australia of the role of the Good Neighbour Councils.

I believe that the Good Neighbour Councils were unable to take into account the growing capacity and desire of ethnic organisations to provide their own services. Support for ethnic cultures can be provided much more appropriately by the ethnic groups themselves.

The Galbally report strongly recommended that the funding of Good Neighbour Councils be stopped. Queensland went out on a limb and continued to provide out of its own resources a substantial amount of money for this function. I believe that the Government is attempting to duplicate the services that will be provided under the Galbally report, which Mr Fraser has lauded right around Australia and which I believe is what the migrants want. Most ethnic communities prefer helping themselves to receiving help from a single organisation. Ethnic groups desire to provide their own services. They have been dissatisfied with the funding of one organisation to try to do this work. When the Galbally report recommended that Good Neighbour Councils be phased out, the Queensland Government should have moved into the mainstream of providing the resources to ethnic communities to enable them to provide the services instead of trying to duplicate the services.

As the Minister responsible for immigration in this State, Mr Lee has made statements that are repugnant to the average migrant in Queensland and the average migrant in the rest of Australia. The Minister is terribly lucky that he is in Queensland. The ethnic Press in other States would have crucified him for the statements he has made. I wish to quote from Press release No. 94, dated 18 June 1980—

“We must guard against the risk that the creation of ethnic groups could result in some migrants becoming fully dependent upon them, speaking their native tongue all the time and no English and making no attempt to learn of Australia’s customs and traditions or share in its benefits and responsibilities.”

Apart from that statement being repugnant, it is very, very badly phrased by somebody who wants the English language to be paramount. The Minister went on to say that there was a place for the new groups, but he

hoped newcomers would be absorbed in our society. I wonder what he means by “absorbed”. He also said—

“Multi-lingualism would divide us as it had divided some other countries.”

I wonder if the Minister is referring to Canada, where French and English are spoken. That is not what migrants in our society want. They want English to be the major language. But how could a person who is brought out here by his grandchildren learn to speak English? What threat is the Minister making to him when he says that he does not want a multilingual society? I believe that for the Minister to behave this way is absolute nonsense. To claim that we ought to have a multicultural society while at the same time rejecting multilingualism is to say that all we have to gain from other cultures is a few recipes, a few exotic dances and factory fodder. That would reduce the multicultural society that migrants want to dances of Zorba the Greek, pizza pies and cheap labour.

It is very, very dangerous to argue in the terms that the Minister used when expressing concern about a divided society. The Minister argues, I believe, that multilingualism leads to a society with divided loyalties. If we force migrants to give up their languages, we will deny them the dignity that they desire so much and take away from them the realisation that they have something to offer that is worthy of contribution, thereby forcing them defensively in upon themselves. It is only by such short-sighted policies that we would create in Australia isolated ghettos and create exactly the situation of hate and suspicion about which the Minister is worried.

It is time that Liberal members on the other side of the Chamber spoke very, very strongly to the Deputy Premier (Dr Edwards) to remove this portfolio from the current Minister. In a previous address on this issue in this Parliament I called the Minister the “Yeronga Ocker”. I believe that is a very apt title, because it is “Ockerism” that he is trying to sell. I am concerned that some elements in the community would accept his statements at face value and say that we want people to become Australians. Of course we do. People of migrant stock, such as myself, want to be Australians; but they are Australian/Greek or Australian/Italian and the last part cannot be got rid of.

We should not speak against multilingualism or against children being bilingual—against children learning about their ancestral culture. The Minister must accept that language is the purveyor of culture. If my children do not become bilingual by learning to speak Greek, then they will lose their cultural heritage. All the statements made by the Minister threaten that concept. This society can only become enriched by allowing multilingual programs to be aired. We should do all we can to aid them. Queensland

should follow the example set by South Australia by introducing second languages at primary level.

No country in the world other than Australia is monolingualistic. We are the last bastion of monolingualism. If children could learn a second language at primary school it would break down prejudices and discrimination both in the school-room and in the school yard. They would learn to accept and understand each other's cultures and we would get rid of hate and suspicion. It is about time that the "Yeronga Ocker" from the other side of the Chamber was removed from the immigration portfolio, which he so poorly understands. It is about time that he listened to the migrant communities in this State. I can inform the Minister that when I sent to the Queensland Ethnic Council a copy of a previous speech that I made in this Chamber, it sent it on to Liberal Ministers and said that it agreed wholeheartedly with the concepts that I was expressing and that it was about time he was brought into line and told to express views that were consistent with the aspirations of migrants in society. We want to be able to speak Australian; we want to be Australian citizens. However, I say to the Minister: do not threaten migrants in this country by saying that you will not accept multilingualism. I am afraid that the Minister does not understand what he is talking about. He should take on a responsibility other than migration, because he is sadly astray in his understanding of the wishes of migrant communities.

I turn now to another aspect of the Minister's responsibilities, that is, as spokesman for industry. I am concerned—and I have expressed my concern before in this Chamber—that a chill has hit the economy of the Sunshine State in the field of manufacturing industry. Although Queensland has 15 per cent of the labour force in Australia, it has about about 9 per cent of the manufacturing work-force. It appears that Queensland manufacturing industry is continually losing out to southern interests. In the last 18 months or so there have been two take-overs of manufacturing industries in my electorate that have seriously affected employment prospects. One was the take-over of Malleys by Simpson. As a result of that, Simpson took to Adelaide much of the work that was being done in Brisbane and, consequently, 300 jobs at Malleys were lost. Another factory in my electorate that was taken over was Paterson Reid & Bruce, and in no time 150 jobs were lost.

Although the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services berates Ralph Nader for his concern with transnationals and says that he ought to be here to see what is happening and what magnificent development the mining industry is responsible for in the State, he shows no concern about what is happening to manufacturing industry in Queensland. I wonder what will happen in 1981 when the Gemini model is phased out by General Motors-Holden's. It is quite

possible that GMH will then move its production to southern States. I should like the Minister to tell me in his reply whether he has considered that prospect and whether he has had discussions with GMH about long-term measures that it is taking and what promises it is giving about employment opportunities in its plant in this State.

When one looks at what is taking place in industry in Queensland, it is appalling that the Minister skites about some 278 tradesmen being assisted to find jobs in Queensland. There is a danger of our being very short in tradesmen's skills, but the Government is taking no action. When tens of thousands of young people are unemployed and very keen to get job training, the apprenticeship system is in complete disarray. We import 20 per cent of our skilled tradesmen from overseas, and recently the Metal Trades Industry Association put submissions to the Federal Government requesting that it be allowed to import skilled tradesmen from places such as Korea. My concern about that is not an expression of racism. It is appalling that the short-term profit motive of manufacturing industry is such that it finds it much more convenient to recruit trained people overseas and bring them here than to train Australian youngsters for jobs at a time when there is such massive youth unemployment.

It is about time that we had a look at the apprenticeship system. It may be necessary to have a group apprenticeship scheme, under which an industry takes on apprentices and then leases them out to particular groups in the community. The time is overdue to do something about job training, because as the Minister for Labour Relations (Mr Campbell) said recently, there will be shocking shortages of skilled labour in Australia in the very near future. As I said earlier, it is time that the Queensland Government stopped skiting about the capital-intensive mining investment in this State and did something about the labour-intensive manufacturing industries. It is time the Government stopped talking about millions of dollars worth of investment and did something to help manufacturing industries, create jobs and train apprentices. It is time the Government did something to stop the Queensland manufacturing industry becoming the most chilly in Australia.

The Minister should do something positive about the large companies that come to Queensland from other States, make false promises, take over our companies, strip them of their assets, sell them out and then take their newly acquired industry back down South. That practice is regarded as rationalisation, but it does not help Queensland at all.

The Government skites about the number of people who come to Queensland and about our increase in population. Queensland has good weather that attracts retired people. However, a large number of younger people leave Queensland because they cannot obtain

jobs in this State. I know of migrants who are returning to their home countries because it is easier for them to obtain jobs in those countries than it is in Queensland. I know of people who are leaving Queensland, and Brisbane in particular, to go to Sydney, where more job opportunities exist. The Government, through its propaganda machine, claims that Queensland is the Sunshine State and is booming. Of course it is booming. Queensland has the greatest natural wealth of any State. The trouble is that the Government is not doing enough with that wealth. It certainly is not doing anything about creating long-term security for the thousands of workers employed in the manufacturing industry.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** The only jobs the Minister is interested in are those of the jockeys who ride his horses every week-end.

**Mr FOURAS:** The Minister shows better judgment in the purchase of horses than on issues affecting migrants. He knows a lot more about horses than he does about the feelings of migrants.

In conclusion, I ask the Minister to be more understanding of the responsibilities attaching to his position of State migration Minister. He should stop talking in terms of absorbing migrants into the Australian way of life and of making them behave like ordinary Australians. If I might ape the Premier, "Goodness gracious me!" What is an ordinary Australian? What is ordinary Australian culture? Could the Minister define those terms? How is ordinariness defined? How are people expected to behave like "ordinary" Australians? How can people be absorbed into the Australian culture when it cannot even be defined? How can people change overnight into these so-called "ordinary" Australians? They cannot. Australia can become a multi-cultural society only by each of us giving to society the best aspects of our culture. That would enrich us and make us more diverse. Eventually, after a lengthy period, we will have a truly Australian culture.

**Mr GOLEBY (Redlands) (5.58 p.m.):** Contrary to the comments made by the previous speaker, the Minister who has presented these Estimates has dedicated himself to the many aspects of his portfolio, just as he did when he was Minister for Works. Those of us who received his recent Press releases would see the number of new industrial estates that have been opened up and are being opened up. The number speaks for itself.

Queensland is rapidly becoming a State in which industrial development is really taking on. The majority of small towns throughout this decentralised State of Queensland have industrial estates that were sponsored by the Minister's department. Their creation goes a long way towards the implementation of decentralisation.

It is most important to small towns to retain their work-force. The establishment of industrial estates in country areas means that young people who are brought up in those towns are, as they grow older, able to obtain work and not be forced to move away to the cities. This helps to bring stability to the towns throughout Queensland.

Recently I visited Yandina and was very interested in the new industrial estate that has been established in the town. The Buderim ginger factory will be moving into that area in the near future. The ginger industry is becoming one of the most important industries on the near North Coast. In fact, it is the only industry of its type in Australia.

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

**Mr GOLEBY:** Before the dinner recess I pointed out to the Chamber how important the small industrial estates are to the community life throughout Queensland. Naturally I am very concerned about my electorate. In the past six years the population of the area has doubled and 40 000 people now reside in the Redlands electorate, which has the second fastest growth rate in Australia.

Needless to say, the development of our industrial estate is needed urgently. An area of 50 acres of good land, situated in the centre of the shire, close to power, sewerage and a road network, has been set aside. The Minister, who has inspected the site with me, concedes that the location is good. I ask him to expedite matters so that the estate may be established. One small operator has started excavation work. He was allowed to move in because he will require very little water. The Minister's department is responsible for extending the water main. I urge the Minister to make funds available for the water supply so that the rest of the estate can be developed and the many people who have inquired about industrial land will have somewhere to go.

Although a large population surrounds this area, it has no residential population on its doorstep. The Redland Shire Council planning is such that it does not propose to allow residential development close to the estate. That is good planning. Land cannot be held for ever awaiting the development of an estate. I urge the Minister to do something this year so that people who are anxious to commence industrial enterprises may do so.

**Mr Davis:** How many have you got lined up?

**Mr GOLEBY:** Many businesses in the area have grown too big for the small establishments available to them. They want much larger areas. The honourable member for Brisbane Central should know that this area of 50 acres will accommodate quite a number of industrial sites.

It is essential that tradesmen are available to take part in industry. The shortage of apprentices is a matter of concern to me,

as it is to many other honourable members and to industry generally. Although this matter is not directly tied to the Minister's department, I believe this is an appropriate time to point out that top priority must be given to training apprentices. As I have said on other occasions, too many small businessmen are not encouraged by the present system to take on apprentices. Because apprentices are so costly, small employers cannot afford to take them on. This is so particularly in the first two years of training, with its associated block-release training, and to a small businessman it is not an attractive proposition to take on an apprentice. I hope that wisdom prevails and that options are available to vary apprenticeship training.

If apprenticeship training were to revert to the old system of one or two days' training a week, I would not object. Many young men seeking trade employment would welcome an opportunity to get an apprenticeship and then do their studies in whatever way was acceptable to the employer. Small employers feel strongly that this must be done. If it is not done, a tremendous shortage of tradesmen will result. We are attracting tradesmen from overseas to fill the gap, but we cannot continue doing that for ever. Young Queenslanders have a right to be trained in the calling of their choice rather than to be stood aside because it is uneconomic in the present climate for small businessmen to train tradesmen.

Queensland has attracted a large number of people from the southern States. As other honourable members have said, Queensland is on the march and the advantages here are many. Queensland has a tremendous number of natural resources, such as minerals, and development in the mining industry has taken place rapidly.

The opportunity to obtain employment is better in Queensland than in any other State. It could be argued that the unemployment figures do not bear out that statement, but new jobs created in this State over the past five years run at 11.78 per cent compared with the remainder of Australia at 6.23 per cent. The major problem in Queensland is that we are not creating jobs in line with the massive migration from the southern States.

**Mr Davis:** What a load of rubbish!

**Mr GOLEBY:** The member should check the figures in the Parliamentary Library. That is where I obtained them. He does not want to believe them. He should not question figures obtained from the Parliamentary Library.

Another area of concern is the take-over of some industries in this State. I refer firstly to the poultry industry and what has happened in that industry in recent months as a follow through from an earlier take-over of Provincial Traders Limited. When PTL was taken over it affected both sides of the employment aspect, particularly those

persons who relied on it for employment in the processing works, apart from the producers. PTL was taken over by Inghams and, although we were given assurances that there would be no retrenchments and that things would carry on as normal—in fact, it was mooted that because there were larger markets to fill, production would be increased—no sooner was the take-over effected than a small group was retrenched, then a larger group was retrenched and, recently, another group of 150 was retrenched. Something must be done to protect the jobs of Queenslanders.

The Weston group and Amatil are dominating the poultry industry and many of the southern processors have fallen to them. They are now looking to Queensland and, before long, the poultry industry will be controlled by those three large companies—Weston, Amatil, and Inghams. In the process, many of the small operations have been put out of business, and the end product is that many people have lost their jobs.

**Mr Davis:** It is all right to say that the Government should do something about it. What is your answer?

**Mr GOLEBY:** Legislation should prevail. When there is a take-over assurances must be given that the jobs will be retained. Inghams gave such an assurance but it was worthless. When they were questioned they said that the jobs would be there, that things would continue as usual and that they expected to expand. But, as I said, there were retrenchments a short time later.

I now turn to other industries associated with the electorate that I represent. Last year the strawberry industry was in considerable trouble because of imports. People lost their jobs and growers did not get good returns. Now there is a possible shortage of strawberries and all of this year's crop will be processed.

The pendulum swung the other way in the passion-fruit industry. It has problems which have been brought about largely by imports in previous years. The consumer bodies and many of the large international companies—the multi-nationals—were allowed to stock up, and now they do not want the local product. Although not much passion-fruit pulp is being imported at the moment, stocks are sufficient for the needs of the companies. Here again, I know that this is not a State ministerial responsibility; it is the responsibility of the Tariff Board, but something must be done in this area to protect our local industries and the people who work in them.

Before I close, I would like to re-emphasise the urgent need for an industrial estate within the electorate of Redlands. As I said earlier, the land, amenities and facilities are there; all that is required is finance from this Government to construct it, and I make an urgent appeal that such finance be allocated from the department's Vote this year.

**Mr UNDERWOOD** (Ipswich West) (7.26 p.m.): In opening the debate this afternoon the Minister gave the Government and himself a pat on the back for their efforts in providing employment for Queenslanders and southerners who are moving to Queensland. The facts are that in the Ipswich area—an important area of Queensland—the opposite is occurring.

Let us look at the Minister's responsibilities. He is responsible for industry and its expansion, attraction, decentralisation, investment, promotion, publicity, research, marketing services, technical advice, financial assistance, Crown industrial estates and small business counselling. I suggest to the Minister that his department's efforts toward those aims have been an abject failure in the Ipswich area. Unemployment, particularly among young people, is soaring. Apprenticeships are declining, whereas in other places in Queensland they are on the increase. We have a chronic unemployment problem, and every day young people, particularly those with poor passes at school, come to me for assistance to obtain some sort of a job. In the past such youngsters have been able to obtain unskilled jobs, but now they are thrown on the trash-heap of our industrial development policies. It is time that the members of the Cabinet of this State got out of their luxurious cars and chairs, had a look at the problem and tried to do something constructive about it rather than merely putting out glossy publications and spending millions of dollars on TV ads around Australia. That money should be put into trying to do something for our male and female unskilled people.

**Mr Davis:** You know if you criticise the Minister you will get taken off his Press releases?

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Yes, I know. That happened to me because I quoted one of them back to him.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Is he wearing his Hong-Kong-made suit?

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** No, he is wearing his Queensland-made one, and that is what I wish to bring to his notice. He finished off his introduction this afternoon by saying—

“... and had great success with a revamping of the ‘Queensland-made’ campaign which is aimed mainly at increasing awareness of the wide range of goods made here to boost demand and improve local job opportunities as we ‘make it great in the Sunshine State.’”

Fine words, but I now want to cite to him some words of a different nature from the employees of the Redbank Railway Workshops. They find the situation exactly the opposite. They are finding that this State Government is sending Queensland jobs interstate and overseas because it will not spend a few paltry dollars compared with the millions it wastes on projects such as the building next door and on ministerial and

departmental extravagances. I have here a letter from moulders at the Redbank Railway Workshops which states—

“The foundry commenced operations in 1965. At that time steam was on the way out so that the foundry which was designed and built to produce large quantities of straight gray-iron castings which were needed in the days of steam, was out of date before it opened. Since that time not one new piece of equipment has gone into it.

“The work that the foundry was designed to do no longer exists. Brake-blocks (cast-iron) which were the mainstay have been almost exclusively replaced by non-metallics. Those in control obviously know this but no effort has been made to put equipment into the foundry to do the different work that is now required by the Railways, except by the moulders. It can be shown in copies of minutes of deputations to no less than 3 C.M.E.s (Chief Mechanical Engineer) that the moulders have requested the installation of a suitable furnace to handle the modern metals that the Department now requires a lot of their castings be made of.

“Some work is currently being done to try to modify the existing furnaces. What is really needed to put the Redbank foundry on an equal footing with private enterprise is an induction furnace (electric), and moulding and coremaking machines that can utilize the ‘new’ sands, that have been in use in foundries, that would be in the back-yarder category, for many years. The Dept. recently accepted tenders for \$300,000 worth of castings, \$295,000 worth of which is currently being made interstate at a time when 3 moulders have been shifted out of the foundry through lack of work and Mr. Lee is flashing his buy Qld. made all over Qld. on T.V.”

That is what they think of the advertising campaign.

The number of apprenticeships in the Ipswich area has been dropping steadily each year. It has dropped from 693 in 1973 to 557 in 1979. Let me take a breakdown of those figures. The building industry is supposed to be a boom industry in which young people should be gaining apprenticeships. The figures that follow refer to the period 1975-79. We find that the number of apprenticeships in that trade has dropped from 206 to 123. It is no wonder that the quality of buildings constructed by private enterprise is dropping. Only yesterday a lady came to me and complained that a house, which is barely 12 months old, is starting to fall apart.

The number of apprenticeships in the coach and motor body building category has fallen from 35 to 31. The electrical industry is a boom industry at the moment, but the number of apprenticeships in that trade has fallen from 58 to 53. The number of

apprenticeships in this trade in one of the largest provincial areas of Queensland has dropped.

We see Press release after Press release from the various Ministers of this Government, including the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services, informing us about the lack of skilled workers, particularly in the metal industries. However, the number of apprenticeships in these industries has fallen from 253 to 241. The number of apprenticeships in the furniture business has dropped from 42 to 33. They are the major areas for apprenticeship training in the private and Government sectors in Ipswich. There has been a dramatic decrease in the number of apprenticeships available in one industry and a steady decrease in the number available in other industries. Yet we continue to read in the newspapers the propaganda, lies and misrepresentation put out by this Government.

One newspaper article I have here is headed "State leads the way in jobs, claims Joh". Another article is headed "Youths in slave conditions". Another article deals with what the Roman Catholic Commission on Justice and Peace says on the question of unemployment. It states—

"Politicians cannot go on denying the problem. They have to realise the gravity of the whole unemployment situation.

"They have to change with the rest of society from the grass roots level up and look at work in a different light.

"Work should be seen not as something which brings in money so much but as a service and contribution to the community."

The attitude of the Ministers in this Government can be summed up in a quotation from the Premier of this State. He has been reported as saying—

"I believe if you really want to find work and you are sincere about it, you will."

Nothing can be further from the truth for the hundreds of young people not only in the Ipswich area but also in the other areas of the State. Time after time we see young people being bashed in the newspapers by politicians from the conservative parties. They refer to them as "dole bludgers". These views are expressed by politicians who sit in these opulent surroundings, ride in their big black cars and have big ministerial expense accounts. If they had to walk from door to door looking for work, or were told lies by employers in private industry, they, too, would become disillusioned. Yet the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services skifes so much about what the Government is doing for employment. He cares nothing for these people. The Minister does not appreciate the situation and I suppose, as he is close to retirement, he does not want to.

Through the ministry of Industry and Administrative Services the Government has failed to tackle with any degree of success a number of problems.

We read Press headlines such as "Another 20 jobs lost after another southern take-over"; "Union boss slams overseas job hunt"; The latter referred to the Government's going overseas to employ people. The secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union, when talking about a take-over bid for the Red Comb Stock Feeds Co-operative, said that similar take-overs in the last 18 months had cost his union 2 500 members. By way of a smoke-screen the State Government announced that the State would make available 10 000 extra jobs. When that was looked at closely we found it was on the never-never system over the next 10 years.

This Government's so-called promotion of the private sector failed the young people, as it also failed them in the public sector. A typical example of the mismanagement of the Liberal Party regime—until recently Liberal Ministers were in charge of the railways—is what has happened in the Railway Department. Previously I mentioned the \$295,000 casting deal sent interstate. Poles are sent interstate for galvanising, and massive amounts of electrical work are sent to places such as Bathurst. When it comes to international coal deals, New South Wales wins hands down.

**Mr Mackenroth:** Did you know that the "Made in Queensland" stickers were made in New Zealand?

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Is that right?

**Mr LEE:** I rise to a point of order. I ask for that to be retracted.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Row):** Order! Make your point of order.

**Mr LEE:** He said that the "We Make It Great in the Queensland State" stickers were made out of Australia. That is incorrect and a deliberate lie. I ask for it to be withdrawn.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister has asked for a withdrawal.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I did not say it.

**Mr LEE:** It was said by the member for Chatsworth.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I do not know whether it is a point of order.

**Mr LEE:** It is a point of order. He interjected.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I rise to a point of order.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I am taking another point of order. I ask the Minister to quote the remark that he asks the member to withdraw.

**Mr LEE:** I ask the member for Chatsworth to withdraw the statement that the "Made in Queensland" stickers were made out of Queensland.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I rise to a point of order.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** I have not finished with this one. I ask that that inference be withdrawn.

**Mr WRIGHT:** My point of order relates—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I will withdraw it.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** The Government should do something about the weighbridge at Wacol and also encourage industries to use the railways for transport. These two things would help the Ipswich area. The Government does deals with industries around the State, particularly with cheap electricity tariffs, as was mentioned in this Chamber earlier today. Those sorts of deals are not available to the passengers and those, except for friends of the Government, who send freight on the railways. Over the last 15 or 20 years people have used road transport instead of the railways to transport goods around the south-east corner of Queensland.

Compared with the overcrowded Wacol Industrial Estate, industrial estates to the west have many bare acres. I instance the Wulkuraka Industrial Estate which has quite a good development with plenty of room for expansion. The problem with the Wacol weighbridge is that it is on the country side of Brisbane and therefore large transports can roam around the city area carrying unlimited weights. Something should be done to encourage industries to move from the overcrowded Wacol Industrial Estate to other places in the West Moreton and Ipswich area. That would create employment opportunities where the unemployed really are.

The situation is very serious for young people who have been out of work for years. A typical case is that of young girls or boys who were out of work for some months after leaving school at age 15 years, 16 years or 17 years. They may then have got a job under the SYEPT scheme, a Commonwealth-funded scheme, for six months. Immediately their wages ceased to be subsidised under that scheme, they were given notice and sacked by a private employer. In some cases it was agreed by both parties that employment should cease; in some cases it was not.

Take Woolworths. They sacked all their check-out girls at 18 years of age, and I assume that they were receiving the subsidy. It is all very well for a girl to get a job at Woolworths, but when she reaches the age of 18 years and is sacked, it is very difficult for her to get a job elsewhere, particularly in Ipswich and other areas of

Queensland in which the employment situation for women is very difficult. Something should be done by the Minister's department to discourage that vile practice by employers such as Woolworths and other big food chains that are making enormous profits by the use of technology, fancy advertising promotions, and fancy storage procedures that have received publicity in States such as New South Wales. Their prices should be brought into line with their profits or their profits should be brought into line with the employment situation—in other words, profits should be used to employ people rather than machines.

Exploitation of the young unemployed is not uncommon, and from time to time the Press does get round to exposing some of it. One headline that I have here says, "They exploit the unemployed"; another one says, "The jobless syndrome". Not everyone in private industry is ignoring the problem, because Mr Ian Russell, who was then president of the Queensland Confederation of Industry, is reported in "Sunday Sun" as saying that it is a shame that so little has been done to tackle unemployment in Australia. There is a man at the top of the so-called private-enterprise system castigating that system for its unworthy treatment of young people.

Government and industry refuse to face up to their responsibility to ensure that work is available for young people, particularly the unskilled and semi-skilled. People who are never going to get jobs should be assisted. One has only to look at reports of the Police Department to see how the crime rate is increasing, or to look at reports of the Department of Welfare Services to see how social problems, marriage breakdowns, child bashing, and so on, are increasing.

Most of those problems stem from money problems, which, in turn, stem from unemployment, low wages, pressures on the family because workers have to travel from one side of the city to the other, and stresses on people having to spend most of their time away from home on night shift, sometimes taking on two, three, four or five jobs to meet their hire-purchase commitments, pay for their home, pay their car off, and keep at bay the crooks and shysters such as Waltons who threaten people who do not really understand the system. In some instances, people lose their Housing Commission homes because they are afraid that if they do not pay Waltons they will be in real trouble. That is only one instance.

Earlier today I spoke about people eating only bread and jam. That is true; it is happening tonight in homes in Brisbane, Ipswich and other parts of Queensland. Many families cannot afford to feed themselves. All they have to eat is bread and jam. For breakfast they might have nothing. The children in those families will go to school tomorrow morning and ask their friends for some peanut butter sandwiches in the hope that their friends do not like peanut

butter sandwiches. This is not an isolated case; it is quite common. In fact, it is becoming more common. I am sick and tired of this Government's garbage headlines about jobs when it is covering up the situation that exists.

It is time that something was done for these people. If nothing is done, they will take over the country. If that happens, we will need not a 10 per cent increase in the Police Force but half the male population of the State as police officers. We will need iron bars across our windows to protect ourselves from those people who miss out on everything.

(Time expired.)

Mr LANE (Merthyr) (7.46 p.m.): I am very happy to support the Minister in his presentation of the Estimates for the Department of Industry and Administrative Services. In a debate on this particular area of administration, most of the emphasis seems to rest on employment and industrial development. I want to make what are probably the first comments made in this debate about an equally important aspect of the Minister's department, namely, the aspect under the rather cold-blooded WASP-ish heading "State Migration Office".

I want now to speak about the State Migration Office and ethnic affairs. I should like to see the State Migration Office change some of its emphasis and area of interest.

In presenting his Estimates, the Minister devoted only a few lines to the State Migration Office. He told us that last year approximately 10 000 migrants came to Queensland and that number included 2 176 from the United Kingdom, of whom 208 received assisted passages. It is a very easy transition for migrants who come from the mother country to Australia. We are tied with a common language bond. Migrants from England are used to speaking the language spoken on this continent and they can be assimilated quite readily into the Australian community. I want to make some comments about those people who come from lands in which English is a foreign language. They experience certain problems when they arrive on Australian shores.

I want to deal firstly with those people who arrive from Europe and speak Latin languages. They arrive here full of enthusiasm and the determination to make something of their lives. They set out to achieve a future that would be an improvement on that that lay ahead of them in their native lands. From day to day certain problems are associated with life in the more complex society of Europe, in which countries are quite close to one another. It is quite easy for someone to go on a Sunday afternoon drive into a country in which another language is spoken. European migrants come to this vast land of ours, which is grossly underpopulated. If this land

needs anything, it needs more people. Probably the most dangerous problem facing us is underpopulation.

When I think of the complaints made by retailers about the curtailment of shopping hours, and all the things that come under the heading of orderly marketing in Government circles whereby the market is controlled so that virtually only sufficient is produced to meet the needs of this country, my first thought is that the problems would be solved if our population were larger. I should like to see a large increase in migrant intake. By boosting the population we would generate more initiative and have more consumers of the products of this country, which is so far from the rest of the world.

If our State Migration Office could make a contribution to that end, it should do so. Unfortunately it is not doing that. Under its brief from the Commonwealth, established by an agreement made in the '20s, its role in encouraging migration is confined mainly to Great Britain. It has no base on the Continent from which it can work. It has no real way, in an administrative sense, of encouraging migration from Europe, particularly from southern Europe, where the demand for access is great. I should like the work of the State Migration Office, under the Industry and Administrative Services Department, expanded throughout Europe generally so that all people who wish to migrate to our remote continent in the South Pacific would have an opportunity to do so.

It is not sufficient to draw migrants from only the traditional area of Great Britain. Migrants from southern and northern Europe have contributed a great deal to this country. I frequently share the company of many of these people socially and I know what warm and satisfying people they are. I would like to see more of them here. I should like the Minister and the department to become adjusted to this new thrust and do something about it in a positive way. I know that it is primarily the role of the Department of Foreign Affairs in conjunction with the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs at the Commonwealth level to go to overseas places, but I see no reason why the State should not fill a role in collecting migrants from parts of the world other than Great Britain.

A great demand exists in South-East Asia for opportunities to migrate. I wonder what a heartless, non-compassionate nation we must be when we hear of people drowning, being murdered by pirates, being subjected to butchery and all the other heartless things that happen in the lands to the north of us, and do nothing about it. I am very disappointed that no political leader at any level in our society has ever made a major public commitment to take aboard the refugees who are in such terrible circumstances in South East Asia. I am very disappointed with the Prime Minister. Whilst

he has encouraged limited immigration, including limited immigration from South East Asia, he has never come out in compassionate terms in favour of looking after the poor, unfortunate people perishing in South East Asia. I am equally disappointed with the Federal Leader of the Opposition because he has not done so, either.

Where are the bleeding hearts of several years ago, like Dr Jim Cairns and the other people around him, like Mr Tom Uren who is still a member of Federal Parliament, who stood on street corners, waved placards and sat down in the roadway demonstrating so-called compassion for the rights and the very lives of the people who were under threat in South East Asia? I wonder where their cries are today, I suggest that there is a good deal of hypocrisy in those people; that they only want people on the shores of this nation and are only prepared to make the personal and financial sacrifices that would sustain them if they happen to agree with their own political views. If they are Marxist, they are welcome. But if they are apolitical or do not hold an attitude that happens to accord with international socialist philosophies and ideals, like those of Dr Jim Cairns, they are not welcome and they are not worth crying out for.

**Mr Fouras:** That is nonsense.

**Mr LANE:** It is not nonsense. I challenge the honourable member for South Brisbane. I know he is sincere in his desire for more immigration and I hold him in respect in this regard. However, I challenge him. Where are the public figures who were crying out to save the lives of the people who were being murdered in Vietnam just a few years ago, just as people are being killed in Laos and other South East Asian countries? Where is Jim Cairns today? The last picture I saw of Jim Cairns showed him running round in the nude with a bunch of hippies on some commune in the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales. He had suddenly become a flower person or something like that.

**Mr Prest:** He told me that is where he saw you last.

**Mr LANE:** The honourable member for Port Curtis takes up the defence for Dr Jim Cairns. I suppose we will open our magazines over the Christmas break and see a picture of the honourable member for Port Curtis running round in the nude with Jim Cairns at Nimbin or some other place. What a pretty picture that would be! However, I do not want to get involved in that sort of political play.

I really mean this. I would like to know where the cries are to rescue from the South China Sea the men, women and tiny children who are being butchered and raped and drowned in the sea by pirates and whose boats are foundering with no-one to save them.

I am disappointed with the Australian Government for not sending its boats there. God knows there are enough of them tied up at wharves while the officers and crew march round in starched, white uniforms. Why aren't they out in the South China Sea picking up these poor people in such tragic circumstances, bringing them here and giving them a home in this vast nation of ours? Billy Hughes made the classic remark, "It is a matter of populate or perish." I agree with that statement and I believe in it. The sooner we wake up to it, the better. There is a role here to be played by the department under the control of this Minister.

I have been to the Wacol Migrant Hostel. I have spoken with refugees from South East Asia who have escaped the murder and butchery there. I have sat at the table and had dinner with them. I have spoken to them and to many of the welfare and social workers there. I know what a great, decent and proud people they are. Many of them are well qualified professional people; many are artistic and many are just simple souls who want a place to rear their families.

I am very sorry that we in this country do not open our doors more to them. There is a society in Australia that is doing something for them, but I am sorry to say that it is probably the only one. I refer to the St Vincent de Paul Society, which has set up conferences in parishes throughout the city of Brisbane to adopt these families, to look after them, find them jobs and accommodation, to endeavour to teach them the common conversational English we speak in this country, to assimilate them into their homes, to share their meals with them and to have them home for a simple family barbecue so that they have some experience of what the Australian way of life really is. That is the only society of which I am aware that is doing this in an aggressive way. It sends families to the hostel on at least two nights a week just to sit down and dine with these people, to converse with them, to explain to them the provisions of the Social Security Act and to make them feel comfortable and at home on our shores. That is the least we can do.

I must say that I am disappointed that the Minister's department has not played a more positive role in this regard. It seems to have a deliberate commitment to assisting only British migrants. I have nothing against the British migrants—some of them are very fine people—but surely we can spread our area of compassion more broadly to take in other nations. If anyone in this Committee does not know geographically we are thousands of miles removed from our nearest powerful neighbours then he is not looking very far into the future. I would like to see a more enlightened approach, and if I sound a little repetitive in my speech here tonight, it is to emphasise to members, the Minister and his officers sitting in the lobby that they should broaden their minds in this respect and make the State Migration

Office an office of ethnic affairs properly staffed by a director with some sort of personal commitment and involvement in this area. In fact, the Minister should not just be the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services or the Minister for paper clips, as he has been described (I think it is an uncharitable description), but he should be the Minister for Industry and Ethnic Affairs.

He should have a Director of Ethnic Affairs under him, a man with a real, personal commitment. I am not talking about some hairy, fairy academic who would look down upon people from other cultures, a man who would complain about the fact that we were indeed becoming a multicultural society, but a man with a real feeling and a real, personal commitment to this sort of approach to the future of this nation. The United States of America became a great nation by taking aboard the weary and the lost in the early part of this century, people who had nowhere else to go. That country took almost any element from any other country. If one looks at the inscription on the bottom of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbour, one sees that America's proudest boast is that the American people were prepared to open their doors and their hearts to people from right around the world, and having taken them in, they then grappled with the problems some of them may have caused.

Certainly a country can buy a pig in a poke in many respects when it takes aboard the unknown, but I believe that that is a chance a country as wealthy and resilient as this one can well afford to take. I believe that we can outlive such problems. If it takes one generation, or even two, to perhaps breed out some of the unfortunate characteristics of some of the migrants we might take aboard, it would still be worth it. There is nothing as innocent as a newborn child. When we have these people, perhaps the second generation, we can make something of them in this country. We have an education system that is probably one of the best in the world. It is well-equipped to mould new arrivals. It is well-equipped to mould young children to the normal Australian way of life, whilst respecting something of their own way of life. I urge the Minister to consider these remarks in all sincerity.

(Time expired.)

**Mr PREST** (Port Curtis) (8.6 p.m.): We have just heard the member for Merihyr speak in his usual after-dinner alcoholic condition. I am very pleased to see that he has taken his doctor's advice. He was told that if he gets another social complaint it could be dangerous. I agree that he should take care whom he associates with.

Tonight I wish to express my concern about the development that is taking place in the State, particularly in my area. However, before I get on to that subject, I wish

to say how pleased I am to hear the member for Redlands getting on side and expressing concern about the take-over of Provincial Traders and other businesses in this State. The member for Lytton has been crying loudly about this matter for a long time. He has been putting up a great fight almost single-handedly. He has not received any assistance from Government members in his fight against these take-overs.

In a recent Press release the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services stated—

“ . . . a statement by the member for Lytton (Mr. Burns) that Queensland was losing its young managers because of take-overs showed he had adopted a dog in the manger attitude to the Government's success in attracting scores of businesses from the south.”

In another Press release he said—

“ . . . while total employment in Queensland grew by 2.8 per cent in the year ended June 30, the unemployment total increased because migration pushed up the labor force by 3.1 per cent.”

We are importing unemployment into this State. No doubt this is being brought about by the propaganda about the job opportunities in Queensland that has been put out by the Minister. He has repeatedly stated that there are 11 800 jobs available in Queensland. We find that these statements are attracting workers from the other States to Queensland and pushing up our unemployment figure by 1 or 1½ per cent. We have no-one to blame but the Minister for putting out that propaganda.

**Mr Katter:** Do you think he should try to keep them out of the State?

**Mr PREST:** No, I do not believe that we should be putting these people out of the State. Once they are here I think that they should be allowed to go wherever they want to go. But why do we advertise that there are 11 800 jobs available in Queensland when there are not?

That is not the first time that the Minister has done this. He remembers the time when he said that there were plenty of tradesmen's jobs in Queensland that could not be filled. When we wrote to him and asked where those jobs were, he did not have the courtesy to reply. Eventually, we found from the department that the Minister only thought that was the position. In fact, it was not the case. We sincerely hope that he does something in Queensland by way of training tradesmen. A technical college is being built in Gladstone. It will be in a position to accept students in 1982.

It has been stated that there will be 4 800 jobs for tradesmen on one project and 530 jobs for tradesmen on another project by 1989. In the interim period we will have job opportunities for some 1 300 tradesmen on some of the other projects. So there will

be a need for job training in Queensland. At the moment there is no demand for skilled tradesmen, but no doubt that has been brought about by the Government's attitude to apprenticeship training over the years.

The Minister issues many Press statements, and I think the last one was No. 1163. In that statement it is claimed that the number of new registrations of motor cars and station wagons on a national basis fell during the financial year by 2.5 per cent but in Queensland it rose by 4.8 per cent. Of course, the Minister did not say that the reason for the increase in vehicle registrations in Queensland was no doubt due to the condition of the roads in this State which causes cars to fall to pieces twice as fast as in other States. The Government should get no credit for that. Roads in this State have been sadly neglected, and no doubt that was brought out with great vigour at the recent Local Government Conference in Rockhampton. At that conference I believe Mr Katter Snr was told to tell his Government just how disappointed Queensland local authorities were with Federal Government road funding, not only for this year but also for the future five years when the funding program will be cut considerably.

When one goes through the report of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development one finds many references to Gladstone, and there is no doubt that that is the city where development will take place and where Government money should be spent. In that report, under the heading "Economic Impact Studies" appears the following—

"A study to appraise the economic impact of planned major industrial developments in the Gladstone area was completed for the Department and the Co-ordinator-General's Department by the Department of Economics, University of Queensland. The report is an extension of the previous Gladstone Input-Output Study prepared by the same University team for Comalco Limited and the Department. It includes an assessment of the impact of the proposed Rundle shale oil project, Gladstone Aluminium Limited's aluminium smelter at the four-potline stage, Alcan Queensland Pty. Limited's aluminium smelter at the one- and three-potline stages, and the proposed expansion of the alumina refinery of Queensland Alumina Limited."

I believe that report should be made available to those who are interested in it, and I am sure that what is contained in the report will show what effect the development of these industries will have on the region. We find in particular that local authorities are unable to provide the necessary infrastructure to service these great developments.

I give credit to the Minister that his department, through its forward planning, has provided industrial land for future industries for many years to come. When the

agreement for the Rundle project was signed some three months ago it was envisaged there would be 6 000 workers. Only two weeks later Mr Viner stated that at its peak the project would employ 7 000 workers. Only a week ago, in conversation with the developers, it was intimated that during the peak period of construction 12 000 workers would be employed. If 12 000 workers have an average family size of 4.5 persons, then 50 000 people will be brought to the Gladstone area by one company alone. If the infrastructure is not provided and if money is not made available by the Government to the local authorities to supply the infrastructure, many problems will be created. The local authorities do not have the capacity to provide for the future requirements. It is not that the authorities are looking for loans; they are looking for grants. Loans are repayable and with interest rates at 12.6 per cent the authorities have to repay the initial capital five or six times over by the time the loan is repaid in 15 years. If the life-style of the people who are brought to the area by industrial development is to be acceptable, grants must be made available to provide the necessary infrastructure.

In 1974-75, the Whitlam Federal Government made the Gladstone/Calliope region a growth centre. Unfortunately, the Premier of this State refused to take money for it from the Whitlam Government. He told Mr Whitlam that he would not be dictated to, that he would take the money but he would spend it where he wanted to spend it. Therefore, money was not made available for that purpose.

**Mr Katter:** Of course he should have been able to spend it where he wanted. Your mob want to give all the power to Canberra. Why don't you just resign?

**Mr PREST:** I remind the honourable member that two years ago, when honourable members were discussing the petrol-pricing policy, he was proud of the Fraser-Anthony Government's policy, which was to put the price of petrol beyond the capacity of the consumer to pay. He said that the only way to prevent people from buying a scarce commodity was to price it beyond the capacity of the motorist to pay. The Fraser-Anthony Government has been very successful in that regard. The price of petrol is beyond the reach of the ordinary consumer. It is now about 30c a litre, whereas two years ago it was only about 15c a litre. What a great Government! That is part of its policy of federalism. The honourable member for Flinders should have attempted to throw out both that policy and the Government that introduced it.

The Opposition is conscious of what is going on in the field of industrial development, and I sincerely hope that the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services will take some positive action. He should ensure that money is available for development,

because his Government and the Federal Government will reap the benefits of the great expansion that is taking place in the Gladstone area.

On a lighter note, Mr Row, I think I have spoken previously about the Minister's welcoming the importation of a component from Western Australia. As the honourable member for Lytton pointed out earlier in the debate, that was not the first occasion on which that has happened. Queensland goods are sent to New South Wales to be repaired. If the Minister and his department were fair dinkum about "Buy Queensland Made", they would be making money available to small industries and engineering workshops to enable them to carry out work in Queensland. That would not only make Queensland industries competitive with interstate industries; it would also ensure that work was done in Queensland by Queenslanders for Queenslanders.

I am positive that the Minister is not as bad as people make him out to be. Officers of his department have been able to advise him and guide him along the way. However, the Press releases that he is issuing—

**Mr Lee:** Don't you want them?

**Mr PREST:** I like them, because even the kids read them and laugh at them.

**Mr Lee:** Do you want them or don't you?

**Mr PREST:** The honourable gentleman gives me material for my speeches; of course I want them. They enable me to show how public money is being spent, so the Minister can keep me on his mailing list. But I say to him, "For God's sake do something to assist Queensland industry, and don't be so proud of the fact that Queensland has to import from interstate things that should be made here!"

**Mr MILLER (Ithaca) (8.19 p.m.):** The speech by the honourable member for Port Curtis concerned me, because I see in it what the new ALP represents. The honourable member spoke about the lying employers, the crooks and the shysters. How many times have we heard those words used by Opposition members in this Chamber? I point out to members of the Opposition that in Australia we have to rely very heavily on private enterprise to ensure that people have employment.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** This is speech No. 23. I heard you make it in 1972.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Gunn):** Order! If the honourable member for Archerfield keeps that up, he might not be hearing much more of it.

**Mr MILLER:** It is a pity that the honourable member for Archerfield did not make the same speech. However, because he feels exactly the same way as the honourable member for Ipswich West, I know that he cannot do so. He has no time whatever for private enterprise.

One thing we must recognise is the need to encourage private enterprise to increase its expenditure so that it, in turn, can increase the number of workers that it employs. We will never achieve that while a threat to private enterprise exists from the alternative Government in any State. In America, private enterprise can say, no matter which Government is in office, "We are assured of Government support for private enterprise." In Australia, however, there is the grave doubt that, if ever the Australian Labor Party came to power in either the Federal sphere or the States, something terrible would happen to private enterprise.

We saw what the Federal Labor Government under Mr Whitlam was prepared to do. He introduced the RED scheme. All of a sudden he decided that he would overcome the unemployment problem. What did he do? Did he encourage private enterprise to take on more employees? Oh, no! That would be too clever, that would be too smart, for the ALP. Mr Whitlam decided that he would have local government employ more people. All of us now know about the waste of thousands of millions of dollars throughout Australia as the result of his efforts to overcome the unemployment problem.

What was the end result? Australia was nearly bankrupt and the unemployment figure was higher than it was when Mr Whitlam started. If anything shows the people of Australia what we need to overcome the unemployment problem, it is the action of the Whitlam Government.

**Mr Underwood:** What have you blokes done since about changing things? Nothing.

**Mr MILLER:** The honourable member has made his speech. I am now going to make mine. The present situation in Australia was brought about by the Whitlam Government.

**Mr Underwood:** That was nearly 10 years ago.

**Mr MILLER:** Ten years ago?

**Mr Underwood:** Nearly 10 years ago.

**Mr MILLER:** That really amazes me.

**Mr Lee:** He can't add up; that's his problem.

**Mr MILLER:** Yes—and he was a teacher.

From the debate that has taken place today and tonight it is quite obvious that it

is a shame that the Department of Labour Relations and the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development were ever separated. They go hand in glove. Some relationship between these two departments must exist to encourage private enterprise to increase the number of industries and to take on more employees. I hope that tonight's debate will revolve around this problem. Not very long ago these two departments were under the administration of the one Minister.

I fail to see how we can have unions coming to see one Minister about problems relating to employment when a group of employers who wish to discuss the same problem go to see another Minister. If we are going to overcome the unemployment problem, we have to get the two groups together. It would be a lot easier if the one Minister were responsible for both. In Queensland we have not only separated the Department of Labour Relations and the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, but also we have isolated small business. We have three Ministers looking after industry. The whole thing revolves around industry.

**Mr Mackenroth:** I agree with you. The Minister should be given more work so that he stops running around playing with his suit coat.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Gunn):** Order! The honourable member is interjecting from other than his normal place.

**Mr MILLER:** The need is grave. If honourable members knew about the number of small businesses that have approached the Government seeking advice and help, they would realise how necessary it is to bring the three departments under the one Minister. That must be done because small business is the backbone of industry in Australia—and it always will be. Large business is confined mainly to mining, which involves very little employment compared with the expenditure required. Any enterprise that involves a large number of employees is usually related to small business. We must encourage small business activity.

It is a great pity that Mr Whitlam did not say to the State Governments of Australia, "Let us get together with small industry; let us see how it can employ more people, but at the same time let us make sure that the people of Australia and the States of Australia get value for their money." If he had done that, I am sure that the people of Australia, and the States of Australia, would have received value for money. The Government-controlled RED scheme was a disaster. It proved that Governments cannot control industry.

We must encourage more and more people into industry. We are trying to do that by opening up more and more industrial estates, but we must look at what we are doing in

those industrial estates. What sort of employment opportunities are available to the unemployed people in Queensland in industries that are going there?

As a Government, we must play a dual role. As I said earlier, industry has two facets: industry and unemployment, and employer and employee. It is useless to encourage employers to open a large factory if it will benefit only the employers and one or two employees. We should encourage employers who are prepared to take on employees. Rather than the Commonwealth Government's paying unemployment benefits to people who do nothing for the State and the nation, I would prefer it to pay employers to take on employees. That is happening already in Australia in one instance but, unfortunately, it is again related to local government.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** Why should the taxpayer subsidise cockroach capitalists?

**Mr MILLER:** That is the attitude of the Labor Party. I will tell the honourable member what is happening already so far as the Government subsidy is concerned in the area of unemployment.

On Mornington Island, instead of giving money to the employers to ensure that employees get a job, we have made the same mistake. The Commonwealth Government said to the local authority on Mornington Island, "We will give you the unemployment benefits, and, in return you will pay those men."

**Mr Scott:** That is Fraser's RED scheme.

**Mr MILLER:** That is right, and I am totally opposed to it because he will do no better with his Fraser RED scheme than Whitlam did with the Whitlam RED scheme. No Government project will work under those conditions. There is one good aspect of it. Rather than pay out money for nothing at all—no benefit to the community—the Fraser Government is saying to the people on Mornington Island, "You will receive some benefit in return for the money that is being paid out."

**Mr Scott:** That is what Whitlam did.

**Mr MILLER:** If the honourable member went round the State as I did when the RED scheme was in operation—

**Mr Scott:** It worked effectively.

**Mr MILLER:** It did not work effectively, and the present scheme will not work any better. What was going on was a disgrace.

**Mr Prest:** There was plenty of work done under it.

**Mr MILLER:** There was plenty of work not finished under it. It is surprising how many people were paid to do work but did nothing.

Another aspect of industry that I am concerned about is strikes. We are trying to encourage people to buy Australian-made goods. Holden motor cars are manufactured in Queensland.

**Mr Underwood:** Assembled, not manufactured.

**Mr MILLER:** Assembled. I take the point made by the honourable member for Ipswich West.

That is employing people in Queensland. But how many cars are imported and how many people in Australia want foreign cars in preference to Australian cars? Why do they favour imported cars? It is because they realise, in buying one, they buy less trouble. It is a shame that I have to admit that that is a fact of life.

**Mr Scott:** GMH and Ford refuse to compete.

**Mr MILLER:** The honourable member for Cook is talking about American cars. Most imported cars are Japanese and not American. The Japanese employers are paying much higher wages than the employers in Australia, yet they can outdo the motor industry in Australia.

**Mr Kruger:** Does the Japanese Government work better than yours?

**Mr MILLER:** In Japan, the motor industry is not run by the Government; it is run by private enterprise and it knows how to operate. The employees respect the employers. They get together. How often do we hear of a strike in the motor industry in Japan? Very rarely.

**Mr Kruger:** They must negotiate with the men.

**Mr MILLER:** Of course they negotiate. That is why I said earlier that all of these matters must be controlled by one Minister.

All of the problems are not caused by one side. I do not say that all employees are bad or that all employers are good. I do say that if we want Australians to buy Australian-produced goods we must ensure that they are of good quality. They must be competitive and reliable. There is no reason why we cannot compete with any other country with a wage structure similar to that in Australia. I hope that the Minister will do everything in his power to get all of these facets of industry under the one ministry.

**Mr Lee:** You realise that we lost 276 900 working days through strikes in eight months last year?

**Mr MILLER:** That is the unfortunate part. I still say that all of the problem is not on one side.

We have a problem with apprenticeships. Employers are looking for trained personnel and, quite frankly, our apprenticeship system cannot handle the number of young people who want to be apprenticed to learn a trade. I think it is time the Government looked very seriously at this problem. Rather than worrying about importing tradesmen, let us train our own. I think the average Australian employer would much prefer to employ a well-trained Australian than to import a tradesman from overseas.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** I've been telling you that for the last eight years.

**Mr MILLER:** The honourable member has? I have not heard him.

There are two systems of training people. Unfortunately, we are relying wholly and solely on the apprenticeship system of indenture, and I think it is a shame when young people have to rely on an employer who is prepared to indenture them. We have to have an alternative scheme under which young people could go into colleges for full-time training. Why should a young lad or girl have to go up to an employer and say, "Please indenture me."? If the employer says, "No, I cannot take any more on" that young person cannot learn the trade. What a crying shame! What a shame that we are paying unemployment benefits to those young people to learn nothing. They are still at home, watching TV or listening to the radio. They want to learn a trade, and they should have every opportunity to do so. So if we can get the whole of industry under the one Minister surely that Minister could then say, "Let's have two systems of training." Let us say to these young people, "You can go to college full time." We have a system at present under which young people can go to college for 12 months. In the first three months they find out for themselves which industry they want to take on, but the unfortunate part about it is that when they finish the 12-month course if they do not find an employer willing to indenture them then they are back on the unemployment stack. What a waste of money! Those young people should be able to continue in that full-time training into which they have already put 12 months' work. They spend the first three months going into different industries and seeing for themselves how they work. Quite often young people do not know what they want when they start the course, but at the end of three months most of them do know what they want and then they commence nine months' training. Why should that nine months' training be wasted? If we are going to throw them back on the unemployment stack it means that 12 months of TEAS benefits have been wasted.

**Mr Underwood:** What about their lives? They are more important than the money that is being wasted.

**Mr MILLER:** The honourable member is quite right. That training should continue until they have finished the course that they

have chosen. What the honourable member for Ipswich West has said is quite true; not only is the money being wasted—Government money, the people's money—but these young people are being completely frustrated. Can members imagine for one moment an unemployed person all of a sudden having the opportunity of going into a technical college for 12 months, finding out what he wants to do, training for that trade for nine months and at the end the college saying, "We're sorry, we can't find an employer so you have to go back on the unemployment stack."? What sort of frustration must those young people go through? I say we have to look at the way we spend our money. We have to encourage private enterprise to take on more young people, but we have to help private industry.

(Time expired.)

**Mr KATTER** (Flinders) (8.40 p.m.): I pay tribute to the way the Minister has handled his portfolio in the past 12 months and to his departmental officers who have done an excellent job. I had dealings with the department when we were trying to help the Mt Isa inventors, the Little brothers, to secure a Government grant to enable them to get into production with their solar hot-water device.

**Mr Kruger:** Are they going quite well?

**Mr KATTER:** Yes, they are. They have received literally thousands of requests for agencies all over Australia. I was on the National Party committee that went to Melbourne to discuss the Small Business Corporation in Victoria. We were discussing the sorts of problems that small business faces in the other States. We were told what was the biggest problem facing small business. A man will get a good idea; he will be able to sell the product; he will be a good worker and be able to handle his men well; in all ways he will be a good potential industrialist, if I can put it that way. What happens is that he desperately needs finance to go into production on a large scale. More than anything else, he needs plant and equipment. When he goes to the bank to get the sort of credit that he needs to purchase this plant and equipment, he has no collateral to offer the bank; he is not able to secure a loan in spite of the fact that he is an extremely successful man with possibly a red-hot idea. The Little brothers in Mt Isa kept leaping to my mind when we were discussing this matter in Melbourne.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** If they leapt through your mind they would not have too far to leap.

**Mr KATTER:** I am sure that they would get lost in the miasma of sophistication.

To return to the Little brothers and their solar energy device—they have moved into production, and I think it will be an extremely

successful operation. It has already been extremely successful. However, without the grant from the Government the project would not have got off the ground.

The first question that a bank asks, the first thing that it wants to know, is: what collateral, what security can the bank hold? If a person has not got that, his project cannot get off the ground. No matter how clever a person's invention might be, no matter how expert he might be in producing the item concerned, no matter how excellent the item that he produces, he will still get no money from the bank unless he has some sort of security. Therein lies the problem. The major job that a Government has to do is provide the finance. The finance simply will not come from lending institutions, such as those that exist in Australia, and I wish to forcefully bring that point home to the Committee tonight.

**Mr Kruger:** The Government has been a bit of a failure in that respect.

**Mr KATTER:** Not only this Government, but past Governments, both State and Federal, have failed in this respect. On many occasions I have brought to the attention of honourable members the economic policies of Edward Theodore, who probably had the greatest intelligence that the State of Queensland and the nation of Australia have ever produced. He adopted that attitude. He said, "It is the Government's duty to finance these sorts of projects." Where finance is needed, we must step forward and finance these projects. We must have the confidence to be able to produce the money. If a project fails, then we are looking at an inflationary situation. We have produced money and there is no wealth to back up that money. One of the great subjects at the time was the Snowy Mountains Authority. Another was the trans-continental railway line. Theodore said, "We can build both of these projects. We should lend the money for them."

Let us reflect upon the fact that the big early settlement of the United States started much later than it did in Australia. In fact, the movement westward in the United States to California did not take place until well into the 1850s. In 1850 settlement started on the West Coast of the United States. The population of what is known in the United States as the Sunbelt, an area stretching from Florida through Texas and California and taking in the States of Utah, Colorado and Arizona, is nearly 100 000 000. Yet settlement started there well after it started in Australia.

One must ask oneself: Why have they been so remarkably successful and why have we failed so lamentably? One of the answers that leaps to my mind is that they had locally owned banks, a very freewheeling banking system. That system had drawbacks within it, as were evidenced in the 1920s when bank after bank in the United States crashed. But

we did not escape scot-free from the depression either, in spite of our banking institutions supposedly being well run. So the first great advantage they had over us was this thing called finance. That is one of the major parts to be played by Government, particularly within the Minister's portfolio. With the few dealings that I have had with the Minister's department on the subject of the invention of the Little brothers in Mt Isa, I found it excellent and that it did its job as it should.

If we fail to secure funds through QEAC for the Little brothers we will have to go to the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development. One of the spin-off benefits of the invention is that if photovoltaic cells are attached to the rod that goes up the centre of the reflector that carries the water and the sun's rays are concentrated onto a thin line of silicon photovoltaic cells, the net result is that—even though present technology cannot economically produce sufficient silicon chips for a normal house—

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** What has this got to do with the Estimates?

**Mr KATTER:** I am getting to that. Understandably it might be going over the honourable member's head but for his benefit I will try to bring it down to a very low level.

**Mr Frawley:** He is all bone from the neck up. How could he understand it?

**Mr KATTER:** That is right, but I will try to explain it very simply so that he can follow it.

It is not economically feasible to buy an array of photovoltaic cells big enough to provide the amount of electricity needed by an isolated household or community, but if the rays are concentrated on a small bank of cells, then they can be afforded. That is the sort of approach that could be used with the device invented by the Little brothers to provide electricity to isolated homesteads and fettlers' camps in the areas surrounding the Gulf of Carpentaria. During our lifetime and during the lifetime of our children those people will never be connected to the electricity grid system. It is not a realistic proposition for them unless we go about it in this way. A device of this type is particularly useful in a country such as Australia where a large percentage of tourism is the caravan trade. This type of device would enable people with caravans to travel and take their electricity supply with them wherever they go.

For something like \$11,000 or \$12,000 an item can be built to produce 10 to 15kWh of electricity per day. That is considerably more than the average household in Brisbane uses.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** This is not a bad speech but it is on the wrong Estimates.

**Mr KATTER:** What I am saying to the Committee is that the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development should involve itself in this area and provide the finance and necessary back-up help by way of marketing and similar information for people such as the Little brothers who have a new project but no collateral backing and therefore have absolutely no hope of obtaining money from a bank. Rather than see such an invention wither on the vine or be taken to the United States the department should provide the money to develop it.

A major area in which the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development could improve its services is in the field of market and technical information.

I bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that until recently half a million kangaroos have been harvested annually in mid-western and northern Queensland areas. But at the present moment the 60 or 70 people who are involved in that industry are without a job because the price of kangaroo hides has fallen so low that their harvest is no longer economic. Numbers of kangaroos are again increasing greatly. It is a sad fact that although half a million kangaroos a year have been shot in my electorate, the carcasses—high-protein food—have been left in the field to rot.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** Would you eat kangaroo meat yourself?

**Mr KATTER:** I am told that it is extremely good-quality meat. It does not contain cholesterol, which both pig meat and beef contain, and I am told that the taste is quite pleasant.

**An Honourable Member:** What about parasites?

**Mr KATTER:** I do not think that kangaroo meat would contain any more parasites than meat from beef herds that feed on native pastures.

I very much regret to say that when approaches were made recently to the Department of Primary Industries, it rather high-handedly said that human consumption of kangaroo meat would never take place in Queensland. That seems to be rather usurping the functions of the Legislature and telling us what we can and cannot do in the State of Queensland.

I say to the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services that extremely high protein food is going to waste. Each carcass would weigh about 30 kg and, as I said, half a million kangaroos are being harvested each year in my electorate. A vast resource is being allowed to go to waste. Secondly, kangaroos will now simply die and their hides will be wasted. The leather is of exceptionally good quality; in fact, kangaroo-skin gloves are being sold in France. The industry will wither on the vine and 60 or 70 people will lose their jobs.

I point out forcefully to the Minister that markets cannot be found on which to sell the meat or the leather. Therefore, the assistance of the department in finding markets would be very much appreciated.

In conclusion, I reiterate my firmly held belief that one of the great tragedies in Australia is that this country has not followed the methods of financing used by Japan Incorporated, under which the private sector goes to the Government and says, "We want to build motor cars. We need \$40m, \$100m or \$200m to kick the project off." In my opinion, the financing of such projects comes well within the scope of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, and I have given two examples of instances in which the department has done that successfully. I could probably mention many more if I had more time. Let us follow the example of Japan Incorporated and make finance available to embryonic industries, instead of their having to go to the United States for finance. Let us rescue them, assist them and promote them, particularly, by providing finance. The Little brothers are a classic example of what can be achieved.

A potentially large industry in this State is dying. The last of the kangaroo shooters in my area were given notice last week and 60 or 70 jobs will virtually cease to exist because a market cannot be found for two excellent products—kangaroo meat and kangaroo hides.

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (8.54 p.m.): In speaking to these Estimates, I shall canvass first some of the matters contained in the report of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development. Let me deal first with the State Stores.

The report mentions the method by which the hospital purchasing system has been standardised and streamlined. Does that take into account that all hospital laundry is now to be done in bulk? Of course, I understand that the Department of Health has the responsibility for that. Another question that concerns me is whether the purchase of meat for all hospitals is now to be made by the State Stores Board or by the Health Department under the new standardised procedures. That is very important, because the purchase of meat was the matter of an inquiry conducted by various people in the department. The particular consideration was the fact that the top price was paid for meat that was not of top quality. Indeed, a better job could have been done. The other matter for concern was the quantity of meat finding its way into the homes of the people working in the State Stores at the time. Now that the meat is being purchased under large contracts I hope that those kinks have been ironed out of that section.

The section under the heading "Migration" is a farce on the part of Queensland. Obviously it is nothing more than a little

badge that can be worn by the Agent-General's Office in London, which, as I have said publicly on previous occasions, is only a waste of money in any event. However, the fact that a migration promotion officer is attached to the staff of the Agent-General never fails to shock me. It is an absolute anachronism that a State such as Queensland should be involved in this ridiculous head-hunting game of trying to get people to come to Queensland.

Under the heading "Employer" the report states that many Queensland employers were able to satisfy their needs by engaging tradesmen arriving under the Queensland Government Group Scheme. The report also states that for those whose specific labour requirements could not be met from within the local work-force, the State Migration Office arranged nomination under the Employer Nomination Scheme. How very nice! But how very wrong!

If we need tradesmen, they should be trained in Australia. The idea of going to England, or, for that matter, anywhere else, to dangle a carrot in front of qualified tradesmen in order to induce them to migrate to Australia before we consider training our own tradesmen is foolhardy in the extreme.

I wish that we would see from the present Federal Government, which is probably incapable of seeing more than three years ahead anyway, a looking-further aspect. Tradesmen must be trained in Australia in order to gainfully employ people who are growing up in Australia. I wish we would see a whole overview of this tradesmen-training scheme that the Federal Government has set up. I am sorry to see Queensland engaging in this sort of activity.

In this debate some members have pushed the old "populate or perish" anachronism. Saying that Queensland gets "only 10 000 migrants" a year is a sad reflection of the fact that some people still believe that consumerism is the god of modern society and that we will not have sufficient people to consume all the consumer products that are produced. That type of economic thinking is "economism" in the extreme and it is "monetarism" in its simplistic terminology. Merely to consider that we need consumers to consume and keep on consuming is not looking at the fact that what we have to do is ensure that everyone in Australia who is capable of working has a job and that that can be achieved by our buying only what we need and not by continually changing things. That would mean that no over-production would take place. People with "hobonken" minds would find it very difficult to grasp that.

It is sad to see the heading "Small Business". This, after all, is one of the carrots that the Premier dangled. But I suppose that someone in his position has to clutch at any straw. The first paragraph under the heading is written very nicely. Although

it is very difficult to say that the Minister's department no longer controls small business, that fact has been got around very nicely in the paragraphs under that heading. I congratulate the public servant who was given the unhappy task of writing those paragraphs. I am pleased to see, however, that the department still has some role to play in administering small business.

The publicity given by the department to the "Buy Queensland made" slogan has been excellent. Some of the productions have also been very good in that they depict various industries and a lot of people doing many different things of a cultural nature. It is very important that Queensland be seen as more than a primary production State with peripheral industrial development. Queensland is much more than that.

On looking at the Estimates, I have a few questions to ask about certain expenditure. I do not wish to nit-pick on financial administration, particularly at this touchy time, but what does the \$3m appropriated to the Estates Maintenance Fund represent?

I also query the provision for the Industrial Design Council of Australia. How is that \$40,000 to be expended? Does Queensland have a say in the Industrial Design Council and what contribution is made by each State? The special grant to the Assistance to Industries Fund seems to be a very large allocation in that \$105,000 is required for 1981 as against about \$68,000 last year. What is that money to be used for and why is the amount much larger?

I consider the appropriation of \$653,000 for Immigration to be extraordinarily large. While I realise that a goodly proportion, or one-sixth, is taken up in a grant to the Good Neighbour Council, I believe it is a great deal of money considering that so little is done. I may be wrong, but I have given my opinion on this before. Under the heading "Salaries" the largest amount appears. It is equal to two-thirds of the amount, being \$419,000 of \$653,000. Those are salaries to whom, and for what purpose? Obviously they should be for the hostels; I cannot think of any other purpose.

I would like to know the salary paid to the migration promotion officer in London who is attached to the Agent-General's Office. I presume that position would carry a goodly salary, yet all it involves is attending the cocktail circuit in London. That is rather sad.

Under the heading "Government Printing Office" an amount is shown as the Cash Equivalent of Long Service Leave. The amount seems to be decreasing.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** We heard the same speech last year. You have just dressed this speech up a little differently and trotted it out under the number "Speech 22".

**Mrs KYBURZ:** We heard the same interjection last year from the honourable member. He just dressed it up and trotted it out in drag.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** How dare you accuse me of dressing in drag?

**Mrs KYBURZ:** I do not think that clothes are made in a size to fit the honourable member.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Gunn):** Order!

**Mrs KYBURZ:** I am a little concerned about the Cash Equivalent for Long Service Leave. I do not understand why it has been reduced from \$27,000 in 1979-80 to \$14,500. Perhaps that can be cleared up.

I raise a query about postage and incidentals. It seems that a particularly large amount has been set aside for this item. This is rather touchy. The appropriation required for 1980-81 is \$364,000. A heck of a lot of junketing around Queensland could be done for that amount. It seems to me to be an extraordinarily large sum of money.

The department has done a grand job in decentralisation, particularly in giving financial assistance towards decentralisation. The one sore point about the decentralisation policy is included on page 16. It is the financial assistance to industry. Included in the list of industries is the grand old company named Queensland Cement & Lime. Two amounts have been approved. The first is \$2m and the second is \$16m. I should like to know if that has been a grant, a guarantee for borrowing, money appropriated from loan funds, or what.

Under the column headed "Amount repaid" is shown a grand total of nil. Therefore I presume it was a grant. The amount outstanding is shown as \$2.5m. I would like that explained. I did discuss this matter with the Minister last year. I know that a sweetheart agreement has been reached between the Government and Queensland Cement & Lime. But I believe that the Government should come clean and stipulate the conditions under which it has allowed the development of Queensland Cement & Lime.

The department has been and should be given a good pat on the back for the way in which it has developed its industrial estates. One hears very few complaints from tenants about the way the estates are managed, their setting out or the terms of the agreements.

**Mr Lee:** They are the best in Australia.

**Mrs KYBURZ:** I quite believe the Minister, because Queensland is far ahead in the development of Crown industrial land. This is important for the future of Queensland industry.

I give a bouquet to the Technical Services section. It has initiated very many different activities in the department, particularly in energy studies. It has been a very important development in that at last the Government is starting to look ahead rather than simply considering the present time.

What I would like to question are the economic impact studies. In its annual report, the department says that it has undertaken an economic impact study of the Gladstone area and that the report is an extension of the previous Gladstone Input-Output Study prepared by Comalco. It is very important, now that so much industrial development is taking place in the Gladstone area, that such reports become the norm. It could well be that other areas of Government have to look to that report in regard to population, demographic surveys, schooling, housing and so on. They become very important when it comes to providing all the infrastructure that goes hand in hand with industry. It is very laudable that economic impact studies are being made.

The other study that is interesting is planned to commence early in 1980-81. It is the manpower study. I hope that the matters I have raised will be considered. The study will investigate the demands for both construction and operating labour in terms of specific skills. I hope that it will apply particularly in the building industry, because that industry will have a great need in the future for skilled labour.

That does not mean that we need to import skilled labour immediately; it means that we have to plan here and now to train our skilled labour in this State. The methodology and terms of reference have been determined, so that probable shortages of particular skills may be identified. That is very important. However, I do not like the statement that the investigation will be undertaken by consultants. I want to know the fee to be paid to the consultants undertaking that study. I realise that more and more Government departments are farming out these types of studies, and that they are extremely expensive. If it runs into the realm of \$60,000 or \$70,000, then as far as I am concerned it is just not on. There must be experts in the Minister's department or in the Co-ordinator-General's Department who could carry out this type of study. I think we are just going a bit overboard with these studies.

The economic statements that head the report are very valuable. It is a very full and helpful report, and if one were to hand this document to a budding industrialist or someone about to set up a new business in this State, I think he would be very impressed. After all, it is an extremely important department and obviously deserves the importance which is now being attached to it. I believe the tables in the front of the report are also excellent.

I only hope that in the next Government this department is given a higher status than it now has, and that peripheral matters such as migration, etc., are not tacked onto the edge of the department just to dress up a Minister. Once again, my congratulations to the department. I think it has been doing an excellent job, although obviously there are little points which one can criticise. I

did hear earlier a member criticising the Minister for his attitude towards multiculturalism, and I think in large part those criticisms were warranted. I believe, however, that with growing sophistication in the coming years and with an improving attitude by Australians towards the fact that Australia is a multicultural society, that it is an asset to be able to speak two or three languages and that it is an asset to have travelled, those types of attitudes which have been displayed in the past by the Premier and some others of his ilk will change. After all, as I said, when people of greater education take the reins of this State we are bound to see only a better Government.

**Hon. N. E. LEE** (Yeronga—Minister for Industry and Administrative Services) (9.12 p.m.): Because of our very heavy legislative program it is not my intention to fully reply to what all members have said, but I think I should at least acknowledge some of the contributions that have been made.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the very reasonable speech made by the honourable member for Maryborough. He said that small business affairs should be returned to my department, from which it was taken, and I certainly cannot argue about that. The honourable member also spoke about manpower and the employment losses caused by increasing technology. I think the Government can hold its head proud in that regard, particularly when we look at the Government Printing Office. We are purchasing new machines and installing them in the printing office at great cost so that when we do move over to South Brisbane the men will already be trained in the use of those machines. I think that we should be given credit for that move.

I am sure that the honourable member for Maryborough did not really mean to be critical when he referred to pay-roll tax. He said we should give greater pay-roll tax exemptions. In reply, let me read to him from the Treasurer's Financial Statement—

"As from 1st January 1981 employers with an annual pay-roll less than \$180,000 will be exempt from pay-roll tax. The new maximum exemption proposed is an increase of 20 per cent on the previous maximum of \$150,000 and will be more than double the present maximum exemptions applying in other States."

I think that we are really doing well when we can double the exemptions in other States. As far as I am concerned, the honourable member made quite a reasonable speech, and I thank him for it. He did not try to play politics to try to score political points, as did some of his friends.

I agree with the honourable members for Isis and Salisbury when they said that the advertising campaign "We Make It Great in the Sunshine State" has made a great impact in this State.

I appreciate the point the honourable member for Isis made about reducing freight rates to some of the decentralised areas. However, he should take this matter up with the Railway Department. We are doing all we can, and we cannot do much more.

He, like other members, said that small business should be the responsibility of my department. In spite of what the member for South Brisbane said, I agree with the honourable member for Isis that the members of ethnic groups should learn our language. I am not saying, as the member for South Brisbane implies, that older people who come to this country should turn around and learn English. I am not saying that at all. He is deliberately twisting it around so that he can make political capital out of it. He is not worthy of the origin from which he comes. I know his father-in-law to be a fine, upstanding man, and he would be completely and utterly ashamed of the honourable member.

The honourable member for Isis also spoke about four-cylinder cars. I agree with what he said. However, when we sell those cars the resale value might not be as great as we would like. Perhaps it is a good idea that we are taking some time to consider this matter.

The member for Southport made a well-balanced speech. He wants a good balance between manufacturing and services. He does not want us, as a private enterprise Government, to take up all the land for industrial estates and leave nothing for private enterprise. I will be watching this matter very closely. I know that my officers are private-enterprise minded in their outlook and they, too, would be watching this matter.

The only time that the member for Lytton mentioned my portfolio was when he thanked me for the support I am giving him on Whyte Island. Whyte Island is not my responsibility. The honourable member spent his full time in tipping a can on the Government. It was a typical electioneering speech. Not once did he deal with matters that come within my portfolio. He spoke about everything else.

In order to show how wrong his facts are, he referred to the COD at Rockhampton. There is no COD in Rockhampton. Again his facts are wrong. Ports come under Harbours and Marine; BPA comes under Transport; building societies come under my colleague the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General.

**Mr K. J. Hooper:** I know that.

**Mr LEE:** I know he does. I wish he would tell the member for Lytton so that he can get a few of his facts straight. He was really right off the track. All he did was make a pure political, electioneering speech and try to discredit this Government. He made a bad job of it. People will see through him.

The member for Pine Rivers outlined very well the socialist policies of the ALP.

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

**Mr LEE:** The honourable member for Archerfield should read them. He is very chirpy now; a little while ago he was asleep.

The member for Pine Rivers also referred to the audio-visual unit. We are very proud of it, and we are about to update it. We have just given assistance to the Rockhampton audio-visual centre and the honourable member for Rockhampton should know that we are going to update that.

**Mr Yewdale:** We have had it for months.

**Mr LEE:** At least it was supplied, wasn't it? The honourable member should not discredit the Government when things are provided for the community. I will tell the people of Rockhampton that the honourable member really did not want that facility provided. It will be on record that the honourable member said that he did not want the audio-visual.

The member for Pine Rivers spoke about the Strathpine Industrial Estate. That is the reason the Government should not buy land at Pine Rivers. There are a thousand-odd hectares already there, and next week I will have the honour of going out with him to open a factory there. That is why this Government has not purchased any land in that area. There is already plenty of industrial land provided, and I believe the Government should be very particular about where it purchases further industrial land. The Government has decided to provide an industrial estate at Narangba.

The honourable member for Caboolture has made some very good representations. He has referred to the bridge that has been constructed across the freeway and the tunnel that was constructed for the railway that will go through the industrial estate. Of course, that is exactly where it should go. He has said that on many occasions and I am sure he will persuade the Government of the day—which will be our Government, of course—to do that.

The member for South Brisbane really disappoints me. He said he wanted the Good Neighbour Council disbanded. He forgets about the hundreds of people who give their services free of charge up and down the coast. He thinks we are in Sydney or Newcastle where all the ethnic peoples are in little groups so that it is easy for the councils to help them. But the Good Neighbour Council is spread right up the coast, and he does not want the Government to give that council any funding at all.

**Mr Frawley:** Who is that? Name him.

**Mr LEE:** The member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras).

Only last night the President of the Ethnic Committee of Queensland said that it was wonderful to have the Good Neighbour Council to work with. How does the honourable member for South Brisbane get over that? The honourable member says that he wants the Good Neighbour Council disbanded. He should be ashamed to call himself a member of one of the ethnic groups.

The honourable member for South Brisbane conveniently left out parts of my Press statements to misconstrue them and make them sound as though I wanted everybody to speak the English language. Do honourable members think I would want aged people to do that? Of course I would not. I believe that if people come to this country of their own free choice, surely it is good enough for them, if possible, to learn the language. I have said that over and over again, and I will always repeat it. It is one of their duties to do that so that they can mix with other people and not get into ghettos and that type of thing.

The honourable member was quick to call me names, use slang terms and that sort of thing. I could return the compliment and call him "Fourarse".

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Miller): Order!

Mr **LEE**: That is the same sort of thing because he got right down into the gutter.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: I expect the Minister to set an example in the Chamber.

Mr **LEE**: I will, but nevertheless, the honourable member got right down into the gutter. In fact, he found a sewer hole and he crawled down the sewer. He is the lowest type one could ever see. In fact, the Greek community has completely disowned him. Although I cannot produce evidence of the truth of the allegation, I was told by an honourable member that the honourable member for South Brisbane is so disliked within the ethnic community that wherever he goes at night he has to take a guard with him so that he will not be knocked off. That is how bad his standing is within the ethnic community. He is the man who spoke about disbanding the Good Neighbour Council. I would hang my head in shame—

Mr **Burns** interjected.

Mr **LEE**: I have just spoken about the honourable member. I ask him to keep quiet for a moment.

Mr **Burns**: Tell us about your wife sending shoes down to Surfers Paradise with your chauffeur to get—

Mr **LEE**: That is a deliberate lie.

Mr **Burns**: That is unparliamentary.

Mr **LEE**: That is a deliberate lie. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it because it is offensive and not true.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! Is the honourable gentleman taking a point of order?

Mr **LEE**: Yes.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: I ask the honourable member for Lytton to accept the word of the Minister. He finds the words offensive and asks that they be withdrawn.

Mr **BURNS**: I understand that the word "lie"—

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! There will be no discussion. I ask the honourable member to accept the word of the Minister.

Mr **BURNS**: I will withdraw in the terms in which I am required to withdraw.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Thank you.

Mr **BURNS**: Now I ask a question of you, Mr Miller. The Minister used the word "lie", which I understand is unparliamentary. I want it withdrawn.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! The honourable member for Lytton is within his rights in asking that the word "lie" be withdrawn. I did not hear the Minister use the word "lie", but I ask him to withdraw that word.

Mr **LEE**: I will certainly withdraw the word "lie". I will substitute "untruth" for it.

Mrs **KYBURZ**: I rise to a point of order. Speaking of untruths—although I am not the member for South Brisbane, I personally found the Minister's accusation that the honourable member for South Brisbane, as a member of the ethnic community, is followed round by a guard to be so derogatory of the ethnic group to which we both belong that I would ask the Minister to withdraw that ridiculous comment.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury cannot take a point of order on behalf of an ethnic group or on behalf of the honourable member for South Brisbane.

Mr **FOURAS**: I rise to a point of order. Usually, Mr Miller, I have a very thick hide, but under the circumstances I did find that comment to be uncomplimentary and untrue, and I would like it withdrawn. I thought that the Minister was being rather frivolous. However, as the honourable member for Salisbury believes that he was not being frivolous, I find his comments uncomplimentary and untrue and I would like them to be withdrawn.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: I ask the Minister to accept the word of the honourable member for South Brisbane and to withdraw the words.

Mr **LEE**: I accept the denial.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw those words.

Mr **LEE**: I withdraw the remark, whatever it was.

Mr **FRAWLEY**: I rise to a point of order. A member has to ask for a withdrawal immediately the words are spoken. He cannot do it five minutes later.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! There is nothing in Standing Orders to say that it must be within two minutes. I have asked the Minister to withdraw the words. I again ask him to withdraw the words.

Mr **LEE**: I withdraw the words.

The honourable member for Redlands suggested that an industrial estate should be established at Redland Bay. I agree with him. I have been down there personally and inspected the land that it is proposed should be used. It is very suitable for an industrial estate, and I believe that such an estate would be very well used. Manufacturing industry is required in the area, and I hope that the honourable member can persuade the Lands Department to surrender some land for the use of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development. My department would make good use of it, whereas it is not being used to best advantage at present.

The member for Ipswich West made another election speech. At no stage did he refer to my portfolio. In fact, he got so far away from it that he was pulled up even by one of his ALP colleagues, the member for Wolston. The member for Ipswich West spent about 15 minutes roaming around the Wolston electorate, until the member for Wolston could not stand it any longer and had no option but to say, "Hey listen. You are making it a bit rough, old fellow. You are in my electorate."

Mr **R. J. GIBBS**: I rise to a point of order. I ask that that comment be withdrawn. At no time did I say to my colleague that he was wandering around my electorate. I did not even imply it. I find the Minister's comment highly offensive and ask that it be withdrawn.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN**: Order! I ask that the Minister withdraw the statement.

Mr **LEE**: Opposition members are thin-skinned, aren't they? They do not like the truth. I made a note of the honourable member's remark. He made it, and he knows he made it.

I am amazed at the way in which the member for Ipswich West tipped the can on this Government. All he did was condemn it. He did not want to see the Government advertise that "We make it great in the Sunshine State", nor did he want to see "Buy Queensland made". All he did was criticise the Government. Having listened to him, I am satisfied that he has no pride whatever in Queensland.

Mr **Frawley**: You can easily see the ALP scraped the bottom of the barrel at the last election to get him for a candidate.

Mr **LEE**: I cannot help agreeing with that.

The honourable member for Merthyr displayed his wisdom concerning ethnic affairs. Unlike the member for South Brisbane, he does not want to stop people coming to Queensland, nor does he want to see the end of the Good Neighbour Council. In fact, he has encouraged me to keep the Good Neighbour Council going. As usual, prior to the presentation of the Budget he asked whether we would be funding the Good Neighbour Council again.

I am somewhat disappointed by his comment to the effect that the Migration Officer, Mr Arthur Marshman, was not a good officer. No man could have a greater commitment than he has towards the ethnic people and migrants. I could not speak too highly of him. It is disappointing to hear anyone speak disparagingly about him.

As for the member for Port Curtis—I suppose no-one has been better treated than he has been. In his area he has 1 300 ha of industrial land, yet he did not say one good word about it. I wonder how anybody could be so ungrateful for the amount of work that has been done in his electorate.

Mr **Warburton**: Is that the criterion you use?

Mr **LEE**: That is what he did. He was not prepared to say one good word. He stands condemned.

If I might say so, Mr Miller, your speech was a brilliant one. You are a private-enterprise man through and through. Have honourable members seen a fairer Temporary Chairman? You pulled me up a couple of times, which is more than would happen if an Opposition member had been occupying the chair while another Opposition member had been speaking. You want to see small business back where it belongs, and you said that you would like to see the Department of Labour Relations combined with my portfolio.

We encourage manufacturing industries that will create employment. We consider that aspect before we grant permission for the establishment of a factory. If people who will employ only one or two workers apply for a lease at the same time as some other people who will employ, say, five, 10, 15 or 20 workers, and if those people are

on equal terms in other ways, we will certainly give the lease to the people who will employ the greater number of employees.

The honourable member for Flinders referred to the Little brothers. Certainly we gave them a loan of \$100,000 over 10 years at 7 per cent interest. That is better than bank interest of 10½ per cent and a finance company's rate of 15 per cent. We are very proud of the help that we have given to the Little brothers as well as to other people.

The honourable member for Salisbury asked whether meat came under contract to the State Stores. It does. The processing of food at Wacol comes under the Health Department. Migration is still essential to Australia and Queensland.

No-one can truthfully deny that our industrial estate terms are the best in Australia. The terms that we offer people to come to Queensland from the other States, and to people to go from Brisbane to decentralised areas, are the best offered anywhere in Australia—in fact in the world.

At 9.36 p.m.,

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Miller): Order! By agreement, under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 11 September, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Industry and Administrative Services.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

Industry and Administrative Services—

Chief Office, Department of Commercial and Industrial Development .. ..	6,426,525
Balance of Vote, Consoli- dated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund Account .. ..	36,701,008

Progress reported.

## SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### FIRST READING

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

### SECOND READING

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mt Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (9.40 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill provides for the appointment of masters of the Supreme Court.

In more recent times there has been a steady build-up in the work volume set down for the Supreme Court. Naturally, this has caused some delay in the hearing of both criminal and civil matters. The measure now before the House is designed to alleviate the position which now exists. I do not consider that the appointment of additional judges is an answer to the problem as organisational difficulties would still exist.

A considerable portion of the time of Supreme Court judges is, at present, taken up with chamber matters. These matters, while important and complex, are nevertheless, in the main, formal. It is considered that the time of judges could be more profitably spent in disposing of substantial cases in trials.

In many jurisdictions outside of Queensland, the court has for its assistance a number of judicial officers known as masters. These masters perform important functions which are performed in Queensland by judges.

The system of masters was originally developed in the United Kingdom. It has for some time been successfully operating in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. In more recent times, the office of master was established in Western Australia. This was after a considerable investigation as to the need for such an office in the Supreme Court structure of that State.

This Bill therefore provides for the appointment of masters in the Supreme Court in Queensland. The appointment of masters is intended to take the procedural work from the judges of the Supreme Court. This will enable them to fulfil their main and most important functions.

The Bill provides that persons qualified for appointment as masters are—

- (a) District Court judges;
- (b) Barristers of the Supreme Court of not less than five years' standing;
- (c) Solicitors of the Supreme Court of not less than five years' standing.

It is proposed that the salaries payable to masters be the same as those payable to District Court judges.

If a District Court judge is appointed master, the Bill provides that his service as a District Court judge shall be taken into account in computing length of service as a master for the purpose of determining any matter relating to leave of absence, pension or any other entitlement.

The Bill provides that a master shall not practise as a barrister, solicitor or notary or be directly or indirectly concerned or interested in the practice of a barrister, solicitor or notary. It also provides that he shall not be capable of being summoned or being chosen as a member of the Legislative Assembly.

The precise limits of the masters' jurisdiction will be provided for by Rules of Court. The limits of this jurisdiction have

not yet been finally settled. However, in broad terms, the philosophy in other States is to invest the masters with the jurisdiction exercised in chambers by the judges subject to exceptions. The exceptions in relation to which there is general agreement include matters relating to—

- (a) Criminal proceedings or to the liberty of the subject;
- (b) Injunctions;
- (c) The review of taxation of costs;
- (d) Construction summonses;
- (e) Contested applications for custody.

I am confident that the introduction of the appointment of masters will be of significant benefit to litigants. I am also confident it will result in a more expeditious determination of civil matters.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

#### BANK OF ADELAIDE MERGER BILL

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (9.44 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to supplement by legislation of the State of Queensland The Bank of Adelaide (Merger) Act 1980 of the State of South Australia, which provides for the transfer to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited of the undertaking of The Bank of Adelaide and for the transfer to Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited of the undertaking of The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited and for other purposes, and to provide for related purposes; and that so much of the Standing Orders relating to private Bills be suspended so as to enable the said Bill to be introduced and passed through all its stages as if it were a public Bill.”

Motion agreed to.

#### FIRST READING

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

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (9.45 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the merger of The Bank of Adelaide and its subsidiary The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited, with the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and its subsidiary the Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited.

Following substantial losses by its wholly-owned subsidiary, the Finance Corporation of Australia Limited, it was necessary for The Bank of Adelaide in May 1979 to obtain the support of the other Australian trading banks and the Reserve Bank of Australia. Flowing from this situation, The Bank of Adelaide was directed by the Reserve Bank of Australia to merge with another Australian bank.

An arrangement was then made by the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited to acquire the share capital of The Bank of Adelaide by a scheme of arrangement under section 181 of the Companies Act of South Australia. The scheme was subsequently agreed to by the necessary majority of members of The Bank of Adelaide and approved by the Supreme Court of South Australia. It became effective from 30 November 1979.

The Bank of Adelaide is now a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited. The merger has the approval of the Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia. He has given his consent pursuant to section 63 of the Banking Act on the understanding that steps will be taken as soon as practicable to bring the operations of the two banks into a single entity and for The Bank of Adelaide to cease carrying on banking business. To complete the merger, it is necessary to amalgamate the business and undertaking of The Bank of Adelaide and of its savings bank with the business and undertaking of the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and its savings bank respectively.

In practical terms, the merger of these banks will involve the transfer of over 260 000 accounts and the transfer of borrowing arrangements of more than 46 000 customers. The bulk of this business is in South Australia. However, there is a considerable volume of business in Queensland.

The time and effort involved in carrying out the merger by means of separate transactions with each customer would be unduly onerous. It would involve not only the staffs of the banks but also the customers themselves and officers of Government departments such as those in the Stamp Duties Office and the Titles Office. It would be necessary to obtain an authority from each customer to transfer accounts from one bank to the other, new mandates for the operation of a variety of types of account, new authorities for periodical payments and new indemnities for various purposes connected with the accounts. New securities such as guarantees, mortgages and liens would be required from borrowing customers and their sureties, or else authorities would need to be taken for transfer of existing securities, where practicable. The work involved in preparation of documents, obtaining signatures, stamping and registration would be totally unproductive, at the expense of, and with delays to, new transactions.

This Bill will minimise the volume of paperwork to be handled by customers and others such as bank staff and Government officers. It will preserve the rights of staff involved and give them continuity of employment. The savings in documentation which will be achieved by this Bill are not intended to deprive the State of any revenue which might have been derived from the stamping of such documentation. Negotiations are taking place with the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited as to payment in lieu of stamp duty that will properly compensate the State for the loss of revenue which would otherwise have occurred.

This follows the precedent set by the merger by legislation of Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited with the English, Scottish and Australian Bank Limited in 1970. As The Bank of Adelaide has branches in each State, legislation similar to this Bill is being sought by Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited in each State.

Clause 5 of the Bill is a key provision. This clause vests the undertakings of The Bank of Adelaide and The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited in Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited respectively.

By virtue of this clause, Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited succeeds to the whole of the property assets and liabilities of The Bank of Adelaide (except the excluded assets and liabilities relating to those assets). The position with the savings banks is the same.

The authority of the Registrar of Titles and like registrars to make necessary entries and endorsements to give full effect to the statutory vesting is provided for by clause 6.

Clause 7 of the Bill gives a protection to persons dealing with Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited in respect of "excluded assets".

Clause 8 amplifies clause 5 and provides in some detail for the continuation between Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and the customers of, and other persons dealing with, The Bank of Adelaide, of exactly the same relationship as already exists with The Bank of Adelaide.

Clause 9 is a similar provision relating to the savings bank of each bank.

The purpose of clause 10 is to ensure that, where The Bank of Adelaide or The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited was occupying premises under a lease, licence or other agreement which is not transferred (because it would be classed as "excluded assets"), nevertheless Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited may exercise the rights of The Bank of Adelaide or The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited thereunder.

Clause 11 will facilitate service of documents, continuation of legal proceedings and enforcement of judgments against either of the merging banks.

Clause 12 relates to evidence. It has the effect that any document which before the commencement of the Bill could have been used as evidence against The Bank of Adelaide or The Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank Limited, may, after the commencement of this Bill, be similarly used for or against the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited or Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited.

Clause 13 deals with the position of The Bank of Adelaide staff. They become employees of Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited on the same terms and conditions as applied to them as Bank of Adelaide employees. The clause preserves any right which at the commencement of the Bill had accrued in respect of the employment.

It is necessary, from a practical business point of view, to expedite the merger of these banks as much as possible in the interests of the staff and also the customers of The Bank of Adelaide.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

## EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### FIRST READING

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

### SECOND READING

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Mines and Energy) (9.54 p.m.): I move—

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

The proposed Bill consists of an amendment to section 22 only of the Explosives Act and includes a clause for the purpose of validating regulation 25A of the Explosives Regulations.

Section 22 of the Explosives Act 1952–1975 was amended by the Explosives Act Amendment Act 1978 for the purpose of providing for the manufacture of a particular type of explosive having a simple formulation at places other than a factory as defined by the Act. That amendment was designed to enable the manufacture of ANFO to be carried out elsewhere than in a factory licensed under the Act for such manufacture. ANFO is easily prepared and is used by many different types of person including primary producers, miners, and contract blasters.

When recently proposing certain amendments to the Explosives Regulations 1955, in particular regulation 25A, it became apparent that a deficiency presently exists in the

Explosives Act 1952–1978 which precludes further action with respect to that regulation in that the Act does not provide for a licensing system for the issue of licences for the manufacture of ANFO “at a place other than a factory”.

Section 22 of the Act, as it now stands, sets out that a person shall not manufacture, or permit or allow to be manufactured, any explosive elsewhere than at a factory licensed under the Act for the manufacture of that explosive. The section then sets out four situations to which the provisions of the section do not apply. The fourth proviso, that is, section 22 (1) (iv), which was the amendment inserted by the Explosives Act Amendment Act 1978, sets out that section 22 does not apply to the manufacture of a certain type of explosive “at a prescribed place other than a factory”. The section however does not allow a licensing system to be set up as has been done in regulation 25A. Clause 2 of the Bill amends section 22 as is necessary to provide for such a licensing system.

Section 22 also, at present, provides for “prescription” of the place of manufacture of the explosive in question by regulation. To accommodate current practice it is desirable to remove the condition that the place of manufacture of this explosive be prescribed. The present regulation 25A provides for the place of manufacture to be “specified in the license” which achieves adequate control and safety. Clause 2 of the Bill also provides the necessary amendment to this effect.

Clause 3 of the Bill validates regulation 25A of the Explosives Regulations, 1955, which already contain provision for the manufacture of this explosive, elsewhere than at a factory, under and in accordance with the conditions of a licence granted by the Chief Inspector of Explosives and at a place specified in the licence.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

## LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS SUBSIDY BILL

### FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Dr Edwards, read a first time.

### SECOND READING

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of the Bill is simply to provide the statutory authority for the payment of subsidy under a scheme that has been formulated by the Commonwealth under its own legislation and is funded by the Commonwealth.

The scheme is for the subsidisation of the cost of LP gas used for certain purposes. It was announced by the Prime Minister in January last and is to operate for three years from 28 March 1980. The rate of subsidy is \$80 per tonne on LP gas sold to consumers and on LP gas or naphtha purchased for the production of gas for subsequent reticulation to consumers.

As this subsidy is selective in nature in that it applies only to certain usages, there is a constitutional impediment to the Commonwealth paying it direct. The Commonwealth therefore sought the co-operation of the States, and as most could not pass the necessary legislation in time for implementation of the scheme on 28 March, the scheme was introduced administratively by arrangement with the Commonwealth. In Queensland, the scheme commenced from 3 July, with subsidies being paid retrospectively to 28 March.

The scheme is one of a number of measures taken by the Commonwealth towards reducing dependence on imported oil by encouraging the use of LP gas. This particular measure is directed towards reducing the cost of LP gas used by householders and non-profit residential-type institutions and schools, to allow them time to adjust to the rising prices of LP gas and, where possible, to convert to more readily available alternative fuels such as natural gas or electricity.

Subsidy is payable on LP gas used for the following purposes:

- At residential premises for providing food, drink, heating, air-conditioning, hot water or other domestic requirements;
- at hospitals, nursing homes or other non-profit institutions; and
- at non-profit schools.

No subsidy is payable on gas used for commercial or automotive purposes. (Reasons for these exclusions are somewhat obscure.)

The provisions of the Bill are very much on the same lines as those of the petroleum subsidy scheme. This subsidy payment is, however, different in concept in that the actual cost of the commodity is subsidised whereas in the other scheme the freight costs only are subsidised.

From an administrative viewpoint, the operation of the two schemes is very similar. The State's role is purely that of agent for the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government has formulated the scheme, has the responsibility for registering the distributors for purposes of the scheme, and Commonwealth Government officers, appointed by the State Minister, carry out all the checking of claims, inspection of premises and general policing of the provisions of both the Commonwealth's and the State's legislation. Once the legislation is passed, the State Government and its officers are involved to no greater extent than arranging for the appointment of Commonwealth officers as “authorised officers” in terms of the Act, sending out

cheques as authorised by the Commonwealth officers, and claiming funds from the Commonwealth to meet these payments.

I again commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wright, adjourned.

## GOVERNMENT LOAN BILL

### SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 9 September (see p. 354) on Dr Edwards's motion—

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

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (10.4 p.m.): I was not in the Chamber when the Minister introduced the Bill, but I have had an opportunity to consider what is being proposed, and I took the opportunity also to refer to what happened in 1976 when the previous Government Loan Bill was introduced.

As the Minister said, the specific objective of the Bill is to give legal authority to the loan borrowings of the Government. Therefore, the Opposition expresses no opposition in terms of a vote in the House. However, it is necessary for me to mention some matters that are continuing to play an important part in the financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and this State.

It is quite obvious that in this instance the task of honourable members is simply to approve a measure that has been put before them. It could be said that, in the case of Government Loan Bills, this Assembly is no more than a legislative rubber stamp. All members of Parliament, at least in this Assembly, are aware that they have little say in the terms of borrowing and no say in the maximum amounts that are allowed to be borrowed. They have to accept that all that is being determined by the Australian Loan Council.

I appreciate that in November last year, when the Premiers Conference was held and the Loan Council met, a decision was made to allow the States to borrow substantially more money overseas for various developmental projects. When I read this I was not surprised, because over many years considerable pressure had been brought to bear to convince the Commonwealth that it should make way for greater decision-making powers on the part of the States. That is not surprising, because the States had been asking for a freer hand.

In the first instance I thought that was a good thing. In June this year, the Loan Council approved a State Governments' program of \$1,307.25m for 1980-81, which was an increase of 5 per cent over the previous year. Honourable members will appreciate that two-thirds of that sum

was made up of borrowings and the other one-third was provided as an interest-free capital grant to the States.

I noted also that the planned borrowings for Queensland were stated in the Federal Budget Paper No. 7 to be \$115.554m and the capital grants were \$57.777m. So we are talking about a lot of money. We are talking about a program of borrowing that is vital to every State, especially this State, which has such great development potential. It is understandable that a State such as Queensland would push or press for a greater right to borrow for infrastructure development. I note that this has been given some cognisance.

I accept that Australia is somewhat unique compared with other federations. For over 52 years we have had this co-ordinated planned effort when it comes to borrowing. It has been going on for a long time. Having considered this matter when I was doing some study some years ago, I dug out my old notes to see what the benefits were stated academically to be at that time.

They were stated to be, firstly, that the total target for Government borrowing could be better achieved; secondly, that competition by individual States on the international loan market as well as the domestic capital market was eliminated and that if competition is eliminated it can be expected that better interest rates can be obtained. The third benefit was that the efficiency of loan raising in general was improved and in the long term meant cheaper loans.

This co-ordinated planned effort has been a constitutional requirement since 1928, but the thing that has always concerned me as something of a States' rightist is that the Commonwealth, irrespective of this co-ordinated planned program, always had the final say.

For example, in the Loan Council the voting power is with the Commonwealth. It has two votes plus a casting vote. All it has to do, as it has been doing for 50 years or so, no matter which political party is in power, is simply con two of the States to go with it. By doing so, it obtains the numbers. All the important decisions other than the aggregate loan funds among States must be decisions of a majority. If the Commonwealth has three votes and obtains two others, it has five and that is all it requires.

I can understand that the Commonwealth, or, for that matter, any centralist-type Government or federation-type Government, would want to have major controls over the loan borrowings of the various types of Government that exist in a nation, whether they be local authorities or semi-governmental authorities. The Commonwealth, however, constantly plays one State off against the other. It has also bound the States to confidentiality. Secrecy binds all members of the Loan Council. I believe this is in the interests of the Commonwealth but not necessarily the States.

Although these points might not pertain strictly to the measure before us, I am raising them to develop again the picture that has been coming forward over many years—for something like 15 years, anyway—of the Commonwealth's taking a tighter grip on the financial management not of the Commonwealth but of the States and other authorities. Whilst the fact that the States will be able to go ahead and borrow more, as this report of 4 December 1979 says, may be welcomed, I start to question whether this will be in the long-term interests of Queensland and the other States.

One report that I read said that Western Australia and, in particular, Queensland had been criticising the Commonwealth Government on the inflexibility of the Loan Council arrangements. A State such as Queensland with massive potential needs further moneys for the infrastructure for mineral and industrial developments and it must have a greater ability to borrow. The inflexibility was working to the detriment of Queensland.

It could well be said that Queensland has a right to borrow additional funds for those purposes, but that also reduces the Commonwealth's responsibility. I ask the Treasurer to clarify the situation. Despite my inquiries I have been unable to get a clear answer. Previously the Commonwealth undertook to complete the financing of approved State Government borrowing programs by subscribing from its own resources any shortfall in loan raising. I ask if the Commonwealth will continue to do this with additional moneys raised. As I said, the Commonwealth formerly underwrote these shortfalls, but will it continue to do so? If the States require further moneys to complete development projects will the Commonwealth meet that demand or need?

I visualise this State's embarking on a major project to complete Hay Point, the electrification of railway lines and so on, and pursuing a massive borrowing program of \$100,000,000 or more, but being unable to raise money because of the money market and its inability to service the loan under the terms or conditions offered. We could place ourselves in a dilemma. A project could be embarked on with limited borrowing available and without any guarantee that a shortfall would be met.

I see a difficulty here. If the Commonwealth will not underwrite the shortfall the States will find themselves in a dilemma. There will be a breakdown of former advantages such as having shortfalls underwritten and competition between the States will prevail. If the States have to go after this money because it is not underwritten the Commonwealth will simply sit back and let the States buy the money at any price. There will be demands from Queensland, Western Australia and elsewhere coupled with increased competition because we already have Commonwealth semi-government authorities and public enterprises such as Telecom entering the capital market and

borrowing on this basis. They are already competing. I see the reduction in commitment by the Commonwealth as a growing problem. I see a trend whereby more and more loans will have to be negotiated as additional loan-borrowing programs outside the Loan Council.

I have tried to clarify the matter with some people with whom I discuss Treasury matters, but they have been unable to tell me the exact situation. If the onus is to be placed on the States to make up the shortfall they face the problem of having to service loans at tremendous interest rates. They will have to compete for the money available. Worse still, they will find that to service the loans they will need additional revenue.

I know of the debate that has taken place for many years as to how we should finance Government expenditure—whether it should be by borrowing or taxation. Because of the dual arrangements under the financial agreement allowing the States to enter into taxation I wonder whether the Commonwealth Government is planning to force this and all other States in an indirect manner—by allowing them to borrow additionally—to introduce a separate taxation system. I know that has been denied, and I do not put this on a political basis. However, I see very clearly that we will be forced to carry the additional loans, to underwrite them and meet the shortfalls. We will have to borrow at high interest rates under conditions that are not normally competitive. We will need extra money. I see the old debate on taxation versus borrowing to meet State Government or Commonwealth Government expenditure programs arising again. Without some protection for the loans borrowed we will have a problem of public debt.

I do not know the present Queensland Public Debt, but just looking at some of the loan programs that have to be met up to the end of the year 2004 I believe it is extremely high. Increasingly we will be put in the position where the emphasis will have to be one of meeting past debts rather than embarking on new projects. I accept that we should spread the cost of development over future generations because they, too, will benefit, but I still ask the Treasurer to clarify the situation. Will loans be underwritten? I ask the Treasurer to get his officials to look very carefully at this program. An open-door approach whereby we can borrow what we like is akin to saying to a person on a fixed income, "Come to my bank and I will lend you what you want." Such loans have to be serviced and if the borrower is not able to service a loan a reborrowing program is looked at to repay what has been borrowed. That is what happens in the everyday situation. I can see some great problems arising here.

On the other hand, the Commonwealth might say as it did in 1928 and wiped out all public debts everywhere, "Yes, we will meet your debts, but you will introduce a dual taxation system." I do not want to

create a party-political debate, but this is a matter of major importance to the future of Queensland and we as a Parliament, and the people of Queensland, deserve some answers.

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.16 p.m.), in reply: I appreciate the support that the Opposition gives to the Bill. That was expected. The Opposition spokesman on Treasury matters raised some very interesting points.

The matter of infrastructure borrowing is not related to the Bill, as the honourable member said, but the points he raised are indeed very vital. The Government of Queensland supported the infrastructure program—and I am sure that the honourable member for Rockhampton would also support that principle—to allow us to borrow off shore, thus keeping out of the Australian market and allowing the other bodies that have to raise their money in Australia a greater opportunity to do so. Also it gives us more flexibility. Large amounts are involved in our development projects. For example, electricity alone will need something like \$2,500m over the next 10 years. If that borrowing, together with the infrastructure of the other States, were made on the Australian market, no other money would be available. So the matter that the honourable member raised is well appreciated and I accept his support in it.

He raised the matter of Commonwealth inflexibility in regard to Loan Council decisions and loan borrowings. The Queensland Government is on record as supporting that view entirely. As a Government, we have been critical of the Commonwealth's attitude to flexibility regarding loan programs for State public works activities. One of the mistakes that the Federal Government has made in its economic policy has been its failure to allow loan borrowings at a time when the economy needs stimulating to produce more activity, especially in the capital works program. As the honourable member indicated, all States would share that view and in fact did share it at the last Loan Council meeting. We were disappointed that the Federal Government gave only a 5 per cent increase in the Commonwealth loan program.

As to the Commonwealth's attitude towards the States, I share the honourable member's view that, irrespective of political viewpoints, there is a feeling that the Loan Council is totally controlled by Commonwealth view, and in fact the financial arrangements are totally controlled by the Commonwealth. I do not believe that this is the true spirit of the federalism policy or indeed the federalism concept that was originated at the beginning of this century. The big problem is the Commonwealth's underwriting of the State's loan program, which puts undue power in the hands of the Commonwealth and makes it difficult for the States to accept any other proposal. In

essence, I agree with the honourable member. We are concerned, as he indicated, about the inflexibility of attitude of the Commonwealth Government—not only the present Government but also the Labor Governments in years gone by—in regard to the loan program.

The honourable member mentioned State taxation. We made our position clear on that matter and I know that he shares my view.

We will continue to press for realisation of our aims in the infrastructure program. The honourable member asked whether the States can raise this money. As he indicated, it must be approved. We believe that the infrastructure program, on its basis, should be adhered to. We have been disappointed that the Federal Government has, through the Loan Council, been rather restrictive in its attitude towards the infrastructure program as well. Once it got under way, that Government suddenly turned turkey and went cold on this attitude and it has been rather restrictive in its approvals in the matter. I appreciate the points that the honourable member raised.

He referred to the size of the debt and infrastructure. I am advised that each project has to service its own debts. This is a criterion of the guide-lines. It cannot be funded by the taxpayer. I am sure that the honourable member was aware of that. This is one of the conditions that the infrastructure program must have; it must be funded by the project. For example, the Hay Point project, which is being funded under the infrastructure program, must be self-supporting and self-generating for it to be approved by the infrastructure program.

I thank the honourable member for his comments; he has made a valuable contribution to the debate on the Bill.

Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

Mr Miller (Ithaca) in the chair

Clauses 1 to 11, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971–1980 in certain particulars and for a related purpose.”

Motion agreed to.

## FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Dr Edwards, read a first time.

## SECOND READING

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.24 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to give effect to the pay-roll tax concessions which I announced in the Financial Statement presented to this House last month.

In accordance with the Budget announcement, the Bill provides for two changes to the exemption levels. The maximum exemption is to increase by 20 per cent—from \$150,000 to \$180,000. The minimum exemption is also to increase by 20 per cent—from \$30,000 to \$36,000.

The new maximum exemption level will mean that an employer whose annual pay-roll is \$180,000 or less will not be liable for any pay-roll tax. For pay-rolls in excess of \$180,000, the maximum exemption reduces by \$5 for every \$2 by which the annual pay-roll exceeds \$180,000. Therefore the benefit of the concession reduces gradually up to an annual pay-roll of \$237,600, at which point the minimum exemption of \$36,000 is applicable. For pay-rolls above \$237,600, the minimum exemption of \$36,000 will be effective.

The Bill is technical in nature. It provides only for these changes in the exemption levels as announced in the Financial Statement. As announced in the Budget speech, the additional concessions are proposed to be made effective from 1 January 1981.

I am sure that all honourable members will welcome these adjustments to the exemption levels. They represent a further step in the program of pay-roll tax reform which has been followed by the Government for a number of years now.

Our policy of providing a very generous maximum exemption means that small businesses particularly benefit. The small business sector is a very significant employer and the substantial concessions which we have provided in recent years have been of real benefit to our local businesses. I believe it has assisted them to maintain employment and encouraged them to engage additional employees. Other businesses as well will benefit from the increase to \$36,000 in the minimum exemption.

This State took the lead in pay-roll tax reform some years ago. We have been justifiably proud of our record in limiting the incidence of pay-roll tax. Thousands of small businesses no longer pay any pay-roll tax. Many others have benefited from the increased exemption levels.

I believe our progressive attitude in pay-roll tax reform has improved the confidence of the business community. We are continuing this progressive attitude now with another updating of the exemption levels by a further 20 per cent. This is a very generous increase as the exemption was last adjusted in 1979.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wright, adjourned.

## LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Land Tax Act 1915–1979 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

## FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Dr Edwards, read a first time.

## SECOND READING

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.27 p.m.): I move—

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

Honourable members will recall that in the Financial Statement which I presented to the House last month, it was proposed that land owned personally by residents and being used by the owner or some other person for agricultural, dairying or grazing purposes be made totally exempt from the payment of land tax. This Bill provides for these concessions.

The Bill is technical in nature and provides for nothing more than the Budget announcement. At present under the Act there is a statutory exemption of \$108,000 in respect of land owned other than by an absentee or a company and used for the purposes of agriculture, dairying or grazing by the owner personally.

Firstly, the exemption of \$108,000 now applicable will be extended to total exemption. Secondly, the application of the exemption will be widened so that in order to obtain an exemption it will no longer be required that the land be used only by the owner personally for the purposes of agriculture, dairying or grazing. Total exemption will now also apply in those circumstances where land is owned by a resident but worked by some other person for the purposes of agriculture, dairying or grazing.

The basic statutory exemption of \$36,000 available to an owner other than an absentee or a company is still to apply. It will be available where land eligible for the new

concession is less than \$36,000, in which case it will apply in respect of all land owned by the owner and where no part of land owned is eligible for the new exemption.

Honourable members will be aware that under the Act no exemption is provided in respect of land owned by absentees and companies. In line with this policy the proposed amendment restricts the eligibility for total exemption, in those circumstances where some person other than the owner is working the land, to the case where that person is other than an absentee or a company or an agent or nominee of an absentee or a company.

As land tax is charged on land owned at midnight on 30 June immediately preceding the financial year in which the tax is levied, the Bill provides that the amendments shall be deemed to have commenced on 29 June 1980 in order that these concessions will apply during the 1980-81 financial year.

I believe that the proposed concessions will be significant assistance to many primary producers. The new total exemption in conjunction with its extended application will mean that, for all practical purposes, primary producers who do not operate on a corporate basis will be exempt from land tax in respect of land used for agriculture, dairying and grazing. This will benefit about 920 primary producers.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wright, adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. M. J. AHERN** (Landsborough—Minister for Primary Industries): I move—  
“That the House do now adjourn.”

#### LAND DEVELOPMENT AT RAINBOW BEACH; BUDGET CUT-BACKS

**Mr STEPHAN** (Gympie) (10.31 p.m.): I rise this evening to speak about a cut-back in funds provided by the Budget for the further development of land, and the area of great concern to me is Rainbow Beach. The cut-back in funds means that allotments in that area will not be developed before 1982.

Most of the land in that area is owned by the Crown. There is not a great amount of land, but there is an enormous interest in and a tremendous demand for it. Workers in the area require land. There is, therefore, a tremendous number of sales. The area has always attracted far more buyers than there are blocks available. A large percentage of the buyers come from interstate and bring with them finance and goodwill. That sort of thing has been going on for quite some time. If it continues, because of future land sales that will take place, it will generate its own money.

Every year 20 or 30 blocks of land have been released, which has helped generate employment with the local council in that area. With the close-down of the sand-mining operations, that has been very important. Work has been found for most of the people and they are to be commended for the way they have adjusted and changed their thinking and their approach to the altered circumstances. In many cases that has been to their benefit and to the benefit of those around them.

Because the Crown makes a profit from the sale of Crown land, I find it hard to understand the reason for the Budget cut-backs. I believe the profit made from the sale of land in the Rainbow Beach area should be channelled back to the development of the area. If it is realised that the money is not being taken from other departments, we can see what a great advantage it would be to develop the area. It would help to overcome the unemployment problem and not add to the problem itself. As more people are attracted to the area they create more employment. That is the whole process that has been going on.

**Mr Davis:** Do you want a new road or something?

**Mr STEPHAN:** New roads are being built in the area as new allotments are opened up. If the honourable member for Brisbane Central knew the area and had some idea of its beauty, he would understand why so many people want to buy land there and become a part of the area. I suggest that he has a look at it. He will be most impressed. It is far different from anything that he would have seen before.

At the present time no industrial land is available and that is causing some concern. In the release that had been envisaged, industrial land was to be made available.

**Mr Davis:** Is there any reason why it was not released?

**Mr STEPHAN:** If the honourable member had listened to what I said, he would have understood what is happening.

Because the land has not been developed, no rates are coming from the area, and that creates problems. Some people say that rates are too high, anyway, but the money is returned to the area from which it came.

Five stages have been suggested, and on present costing a profit of \$4m would be made on a turnover of \$7m. I stress that the work that would flow from the development is most important. If the Government cannot finance the first stage, land has already been developed but not sold that would return in the vicinity of \$500,000. If that land were released for sale, it would provide a financial return and, in turn, create employment.

It is very important that the decision should be reconsidered and that development of the area should proceed for the benefit of the people who rely on it for their livelihood.

(Time expired.)

#### CHARGES AGAINST PERSONS SHOPPING AT SUPERMARKETS

**Mr BURNS** (Lytton) (10.36 p.m.): I wish to speak briefly about problems that are experienced by many people who shop in major shopping centres or supermarkets when police are called in in connection with charges relating to certain purchases or the small stickers on which prices are shown.

I refer particularly to the case of an old lady, the widow of a former school headmaster who lived in my electorate for many years, who went to shop at the K mart supermarket at Cannon Hill. She put a number of items on lay-by, paid a small sum of money as a deposit, and the articles were to be kept there for a month or two for her to pick up when she had paid them off. When she went outside, two ladies on the staff of the store called to her and said that they wanted her to come back inside. When she went back, they said that the labels—the little stickers that had the prices on them—had been changed, that that was fraud, and that they were going to get the police. Sure enough, they rang the police and a policeman appeared on the scene immediately.

I recall that when I was handling the Russell Island matter, Detective Sergeant Mahoney said that on a number of occasions he was taken off the Russell Island inquiry to handle \$1 frauds at supermarkets, or suggested \$1 frauds at supermarkets. Many of the people in my electorate who have their homes broken and entered cannot get a policeman to call, but when an old lady is charged with an offence of this type the police seem to appear on the scene immediately. In other words, it seems to me that there is some arrangement under which supermarkets can demand the services of a policeman but an ordinary citizen cannot.

**Mr Moore:** It is a shame.

**Mr BURNS:** Of course it is a shame.

The little old lady concerned is to be charged with fraud because it is alleged that she altered the price tags on some items that she left at the supermarket. If she had wanted to steal those items or to defraud the store, the best idea would have been to pay for them, take them outside the store and remove the stickers. Instead, she deposited them with the store and left them there because she intended paying them off at so much a week or so much a month. They were there for everybody to see, and any shop assistant could check and discover that the tags had been altered.

She says she did not change the tags, and I believe her. I suggest that every one of our wives who shop at such shopping centres could be placed in a similar situation. If the manager can say, once a person is outside the store, that a tag has been changed and the person concerned is then responsible for proving that she has not changed it, that someone else did it, and charge her if she cannot do that, what chance has she got? There is no possibility of justice being done in those circumstances. I begin to think that in committal proceedings or proceedings under the Justices Act or the Criminal Code—and I make it clear that I am not a lawyer—where people want charges taken before the court and a person is able to defend himself successfully, there ought to be an order for costs against the people bringing the charge.

I telephoned a top policeman and spoke to him about this case.

**Mr Moore:** If the shop was in any way fair dinkum, there would be all sorts of prices because of the number of times that prices have changed.

**Mr BURNS:** That is right; so one could see all the tags.

As I said, I telephoned a policeman and said, "What is the story on this case?" He said, "Tom, she would be better off pleading guilty, because it will be cheaper. Instead of going to defend herself against the charge, at her age she would be better off pleading guilty." Why should she do that? What sort of justice have we if it is better for people to say they are guilty of something of which they are not guilty simply because it is cheaper?

Many motorists who are given tickets for speeding or for driving through "Stop" signs are told that it is cheaper for them to plead guilty than defend the charge. On-the-spot tickets are a rip-off. They are forcing many people to plead guilty to offences that they did not commit. What happens to public servants, railwaymen and other employees whose jobs are threatened by a conviction in the courts? They are forced into an insufferable situation.

It seems to me that somehow or other the stores have to be told. I want to warn people about shopping at K mart in my area. I should hold some street meetings outside the store to tell the people, "When you shop in there, remember that if a couple of kids from the local school come down this afternoon and have a bit of fun swapping price tags on various items, and if you are caught with the goods on which the tags have been changed, you will have the police on you and they will suggest that you take the easy way out and plead guilty because it is cheaper." That does not seem to me to be the way ordinary people should be treated. In this particular instance, the person involved was a lady who has a long history of raising funds for schools. She had not had one black mark against her name.

**Mr Elliott:** It's a shameful disgrace.

**Mr BURNS:** Of course it is.

What worries me is that Detective Sergeant Mahoney said in his report that he was taken away from his investigation into the Russell Island fraud involving millions of dollars and told to go down to the store immediately to investigate an alleged \$1 fraud.

(Time expired.)

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG SQUAD ON GOLD COAST

**Mr BISHOP** (Surfers Paradise) (10.41 p.m.): On numerous occasions I have put before the Government the suggestion that the Gold Coast should have its own Drug Squad. My requests have constantly been refused. All honourable members recently received Book F of the report of the Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs. The Queensland Government, as well as many other Governments in Australia, spends a good deal of money on investigations into the drug problem.

The Gold Coast faces peculiar problems because of the rapid growth of the area, the transient population, the relaxed way of life and the general difficulties associated with growing up and employment in such a community.

I believe that it is no longer practicable to have drug investigations on the Gold Coast carried out by the squad in Brisbane. One of the reasons that are put forward for not setting up a Drug Squad on the Gold Coast is that the specialised training of those officers in Brisbane and the special experience gained by them are sufficient training for those men.

These days the drug problem is not a simple one-off thing; a wide range of drugs is involved. Special knowledge is required to be able to recognise certain drugs and users. The criminal population is so large today that even on the Gold Coast it is not possible for police officers to know all the faces. Ordinary police simply do not have the time to specialise. The Police Force on the Gold Coast is overburdened with investigations into the usual criminal activities of burglary, hooliganism and so on. Even with the assistance of the Drug Squad in Brisbane, the police officers on the Gold Coast are unable to concentrate on the drug problem. The fact that the drug problem is a growing one indicates a need for specialisation. Those honourable members who have read Book F will realise that specialisation plays an important part in the apprehension of drug offenders.

If we had our own squad on the coast, we would have our own equipment, cars and facilities and those officers would become more specialised. In this way there could be an interchange of Gold Coast police with interstate and overseas squads in this specialised business. It would be sensible, indeed

vital in the light of this report, to have our own undercover agents to infiltrate the drug community.

**Mr Lane:** That is a key point in the report.

**Mr BISHOP:** It is, as honourable members who have read it know.

**Mr Davis** interjected.

**Mr BISHOP:** Because the honourable member for Brisbane Central has difficulty in reading, I have to tell him these things. I am sure he agrees with me that this drug squad would have to include women police. Because of the complexity of the problem on the Gold Coast and the fact that many young women are involved in this extraordinarily prolific crime that has saddened so many families—

**Mr Lane:** It leads to prostitution, too.

**Mr BISHOP:** . . . and because it leads to prostitution, we need such a squad.

Government Members interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order!

**Mr BISHOP:** The magpies next to me are making life very difficult. While their advice is sound, it is not nearly as sound as that offered by the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to a point of order. I object to the honourable member for Surfers Paradise referring to me as a drug addict.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member withdraw the remark?

**Mr BISHOP:** Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. (Time expired.)

#### FUNDING OF SOIL EROSION CONTROL

**Mr ELLIOTT** (Cunningham) (10.47 p.m.): My speech tonight concerns the paltry sum of money that is spent on soil erosion control in Queensland. I am pleased that the new Minister for Primary Industries is present tonight. I know that he shares my concern about the shortage of funds for erosion control in Queensland and elsewhere throughout this nation. It is particularly disturbing to me. I am at loss to understand how the Federal Government, which prides itself on its conservation stance, can reconcile its attitude with its desertion of soil erosion funding. It is beyond me.

The Commonwealth Government Standing Committee on Soil Erosion stated that of 5m square kilometres of agricultural land in the Commonwealth, 1.48m square kilometres require some erosion control. The 1975 costing estimated that this will require the spending of some \$675m. The statement by the then Commonwealth Minister, Mr Newman, on this matter was that the Commonwealth accepts in principle the need for the Commonwealth Government to give assistance to accelerating soil conservation

throughout Australia. How on earth can that statement be reconciled with the blank space in the Federal Estimates for specific purpose payments for 1981? As far as I am concerned, the Federal Government stands condemned on this matter.

For that matter, the State Government does not get off scot-free, either. On looking at last year's funding for primary industries, I note that \$429,820 was appropriated, and this year \$430,000 has been allocated—a magnificent increase of \$180. That does not even keep pace with inflation. It throws out a challenge. I am confident that our new, young, fit, energetic Minister for Primary Industries will be able to push the case at both the Federal and State Government levels.

He has already demonstrated an ability to get out into the field and have a look at the problem. Recently he attended a soil erosion control field day in my area. I welcomed him there. Everyone was pleased to see the interest he was taking in the soil erosion problems in that area.

I go on record as saying that, at all costs, we must take more notice of the need for both the State and Federal Governments to do something about soil erosion. The farmers are spending money on it and are demonstrating that they are interested.

At the soil erosion control field day, the Minister presented a cheque which made the millionth dollar of subsidy paid by the State Government. We accept that the State Government has done something and is trying to do more, but the percentage of increase is not good enough. I hope that the Minister will be able to push this matter at both the Treasury and Cabinet levels in the hope of increased funding for this most pressing problem. When all is said and done, nothing is more precious than our soil.

(Time expired.)

#### ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (10.52 p.m.): The time has long passed for the Government to change its policy on land rights for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. The issue has been debated in this House on many occasions. I have put forward a strong case for the adoption of a different policy on this matter. This has been supported by all thinking people in the community and by church leaders. This is a most important matter. It is Australian Labor Party policy, and we say it with a great deal of pride. But a new emphasis is coming from the Commonwealth Government. It is absolutely essential that, from now on, the State Government change its policy and give these people rights to their own land. I do not intend to go into their natural needs to have

this land or the needs for Aborigines and Islanders to have rights to their land and to the seas surrounding it. A totally new emphasis has been given to this matter. It is now becoming an economic necessity and black people will not be held back any longer.

The people of the Torres Strait islands have been given a very sharp lesson. The communities at St. Paul's and Kubin Village on Moa Island have been denied the right to have houses built there by the MAW Corporation. They have been denied that right by the Premier and the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs. This policy comes straight from the Director of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement. It is no good the Minister for Primary Industries nodding his head; that information was given in answer to a question. They have been denied this housing and they know what they have lost.

The island people should have learnt a very sharp lesson from what happened at Aurukun when this callous and unthinking Government removed land from that Aboriginal reserve. Very understandably the island people had the feeling that it could not happen to them. Now they have seen the effect that it can have in their own community. They are losing housing because of it. It is known that the DAIA cannot get itself geared to spend the necessary money to provide essential housing. Just recently the people of the Torres Strait islands were told in no uncertain manner by the chairman of the Aboriginal Development Commission that if they did not have control of their own land they would miss out on necessary developmental funding. All the leaders of the community were grouped together when this piece of quite startling information was given to them. For the information of members who might not know, the Aboriginal Development Commission has been set up by the Federal Government as a means of providing direct funding to the communities. All the funding is to be under the control of the people in the communities themselves.

The Premier of this State has failed the people of the Torres Strait area for far too long, particularly over the border issue. I have urged the Premier to make a statement in this House about his backdown to the Commonwealth Government over the change in the Australia-New Guinea border, but I have waited and waited. The Premier sold out the people of the Torres Strait area over that prime issue, and the people up there now know that they simply cannot trust him. Not once in the three years I have been in this Chamber, and since the matter has approached resolution in a very unsatisfactory way for the people of the Torres Strait area, has he made a statement in this House. So he has

let them down over that issue, he has let them down over land rights, and I believe they are now poised to tell him that it is time for the Government to change its policy. They know they are suffering as a result of regressive policies. They have no reticulated electricity supply, they do not have proper water supplies and they suffer from a very poor standard of housing, schools and health services.

It is time for a change. I have pointed out to the people of those communities that they can get these things from an enlightened Government, and they realise that. It is time that this Government woke up to itself and did something for the people up there. They need something because of the lack of employment prospects for their young people. They know that if they are not given direct funding they will not improve those prospects.

(Time expired.)

#### TWO-WAY TRAFFIC IN KEMP PLACE UNDERPASS

Mr LANE (Merthyr) (10.57 p.m.): The matter I would like to raise here tonight pertains to a proposed development in Fortitude Valley which would assist the people of New Farm to travel with freedom from the New Farm residential peninsula to the city without being inhibited by the congestion which currently exists at the corner of Ann and Brunswick Streets, Fortitude Valley.

I refer to a proposal which was put to me more than two years ago by a local resident, Mr Andy Corbett, who suggested that the Kemp Place tunnel should be converted to a two-way tunnel to allow traffic to travel back towards the city from the New Farm peninsula. At the present time traffic is congested at the corner of Ann and Brunswick Streets. Traffic travels along Brunswick Street from New Farm, and at the Empire Hotel two lanes of traffic have to wait for a change of lights in order to turn left towards the city. This causes delays so that at each change of traffic lights only about three cars are able to turn left. The development at Kemp Place has isolated the traffic from the New Farm peninsula.

Mr Corbett came forward with a suggestion that to facilitate the flow of traffic to the city the Kemp Place tunnel should be redesigned so that it would allow traffic to flow back towards the city as well as travelling from the city down to the Story Bridge and the Valley. It is an excellent proposal. It has the endorsement of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board. The proposal would assist fire engines to travel out of the front door of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade headquarters in Kemp Place, turn back through the tunnel and travel to the city in a very short time rather than having

to go down Ivory Street, turn left into Brunswick Street, left again into Ann Street and travel through the congested traffic into the city.

This proposal has been inhibited in recent times by the Main Roads Department, which has adopted a design to turn traffic into McLachlan Street, break into the wall of the Kemp Place underpass and then travel into the city. The Main Roads Department has already acquired, by negotiation, property at the corner of McLachlan Street and Brunswick Street, the Peter Shearer's building, to allow this development to take place.

Unfortunately, a land owner named Mr Peluso, who had early knowledge that the Main Roads Department needed the property adjacent to that building to facilitate the development, bought it for the sum of about \$63,000 two years ago so that he could hold the Main Roads Department to ransom. It was a speculative buy. At the moment he has the premises rented to a massage parlour, known as the Hideaway Massage Parlour. Last week in asking the Minister a question in this Parliament I drew attention to the fact that the Hideaway Massage Parlour was standing in the path of the public interest; that, in fact, it was preventing this Main Roads Department design from being achieved so that people could travel to the city through the tunnel. I do not believe that a massage parlour that is owned by a speculator should be allowed to stand in the path of the public interest. I call on the Government to use its powers under the Land Acquisition Act to acquire this property, to close the massage parlour and allow many thousands of people from the residential area of New Farm to travel back through the Kemp Place underpass tunnel to the city.

I have been in touch with the Police Department. I have informed it that this illegal activity is being conducted in these premises. I have suggested that it give the same treatment to the owner of these premises that it gave recently to a well known real estate and business man who went before the courts charged with receiving proceeds earned from prostitution. I think that would deal very adequately with a speculator who seeks to inhibit the public good, to stand in the path of the people of New Farm, by refusing to sell his property on reasonable basis to the Main Roads Department. I believe that the department, taking the Valuer-General's valuation, has offered this man about \$65,000 for the property, but he has asked for an amount that runs into telephone numbers—hundreds of thousands of dollars. He bought the property for about \$63,000 and he is endeavouring to sell it for hundreds of thousands of dollars. He is keeping this massage parlour open and preventing the development from taking place.

(Time expired.)

Motion (Mr Ahern) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.3 p.m.