

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 31 MARCH 1981

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 31 MARCH 1981

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker:—

Canned Fruits Marketing Bill;
Dairy Products Stabilisation Acts Repeal Bill;
Evidence Act Amendment Bill;
Oath Acts Amendment Bill;
Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act Amendment Bill;
Securities Industry (Release of Sureties) Bill;
Sugar Experiment Stations Act and Another Act Amendment Bill.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies, for the year 1979-1980.

Commissioner of Water Resources, for the year 1979-1980.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

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

Orders in Council under—

Industrial Development Act 1963-1979.
Registration of Plans (H.S.P. (Nominees) Pty. Limited) Enabling Act 1980.

Commissions of Inquiry Acts, 1950 to 1954.

Irrigation Act 1922-1979.

Harbours Act 1955-1980.

Electricity Act 1976-1980.

Regulations under the State Housing Act 1945-1979.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

ALLEGED DELAYS IN COURT SYSTEM

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.5 a.m.): In relation to the ministerial statement I made on Thursday, 26 March, in this House, I wish to advise that where the word "Monday" appears in the first and second paragraphs the word "Tuesday" should be substituted.

MOTOR VEHICLE SPARE PARTS

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Employment and Labour Relations) (11.6 a.m.): Recently the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs prepared a report on the availability and price of motor vehicle spare parts in Queensland. This report has now been considered by Cabinet.

The report concludes that people outside the Brisbane metropolitan area in particular are seriously disadvantaged by the application of sales tax on freight. This applies not only to motor vehicle spare parts but also to many other goods. As a result, Cabinet has decided to act upon the commissioner's recommendation and ask the Federal Government to eliminate the practice whereby sales tax is calculated on freight. This approach will be made to the Prime Minister by the Premier.

During the commissioner's inquiry, a great deal of evidence was gathered and some of it was submitted on a confidential basis and not to be published. The commissioner has prepared a report on the inquiry which thoroughly summarises the evidence submitted and at the same time observes the promise of confidentiality.

I now table this report.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the report on the table.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice by members were answered as follows:—

1. ACCIDENTS AT PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Mr Innes asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) How many accidents have occurred between pedestrians or child cyclists and motor vehicles at marked pedestrian or school crossings, including crossings associated with traffic lights, in each of the last five years?

(2) How many of these accidents have resulted in death?

(3) How many of these have resulted in serious injury?

(4) How many of the above accidents involved children under the age of 15 years travelling between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.?

(5) In how many of the above accidents which involved crossings controlled by traffic lights, was there evidence of the vehicle travelling through a red light?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) The specific information which the honourable member has sought is not readily available without a special examination of the records being implemented. Knowing the concern of the honourable member and his obvious desire to make a genuine contribution in the area of road safety, I have instructed my department to carry out the necessary measures to

retrieve the information sought and I shall give the honourable member a more detailed answer when that information has been extracted.

2. CONTROL OF GROUNDSEL

Mr Stephan asked the Minister for Lands and Forestry—

(1) With the noxious weed groundsel bush still causing concern in South-west Queensland, has the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board been successful in making any appreciable gain in the methods of control of this bush?

(2) Has any successful establishment of colonies for biological control been made?

Answer:—

(1) The most widely used method for groundsel control is herbicide treatment and the Alan Fletcher Research Station has recently developed improved herbicides for low-volume spraying and basal bark treatment.

(2) Since 1967, 13 species of insects have been imported from overseas by the Alan Fletcher Research Station for further testing. Of eight species released in the field, four have definitely become established. However, none of the established species has yet revealed itself as capable of bringing about significant control. Research station officers are confident that investigations into biological control currently being undertaken in Brazil will yield extra organisms for testing and, hopefully, provide a suitable organism for control. There is little prospect of spectacular success in the short term.

3. REPORTING ON APPLICANTS FOR POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDERS ADVANCEMENT

Mr Jones asked the Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs—

(1) Is he aware of the document being used within the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement headed "Interim Report", which is obviously a record of interview from interviewees applying for positions within the department and which contains the words: "Notable Attitudes to Policies of Governments", for comment by the interviewer?

(2) If not, will he investigate the intention of such a heading and the purpose of this type of reporting on applicants for placement in the DAIA and, if so, is it undertaken under a general instruction by direction of Cabinet or the Government to all departments, or is it peculiar to the DAIA?

(3) Will he undertake to have this form of subheading, which is now included as a mandatory report to ascertain "political motivation", withdrawn immediately?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) My department has been unable to identify the document as in current use. It is not consistent with a standard record of interview by the department. In short, this document is not now in use, but obviously was used in years gone by. In the circumstances, I am unable to assist further.

4. FLUORIDE SUPPLEMENTS

Mr Underwood asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Has ministerial or departmental advice been given to the appropriate manufacturers and Queensland suppliers of revised recommended fluoride supplements?

(2) If so, when was this advice given and what was the substance of that advice?

Answer:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The advice referred to was included in amendments to the Poisons Regulations of 1973 published in the Government Gazette dated 9 August 1980 in the following form—

"Every label required to be used in connection with sodium fluoride substances for human ingestion containing 2.2 mg or less of sodium fluoride per dosage unit shall contain such directions for use as are specified by the National Health and Medical Research Council."

5. EXPENDITURE BY HOSPITALS BOARDS

Mr Underwood asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to financial difficulties being experienced by hospital boards in Queensland because of reductions in health funding—

(1) Which hospital boards' expenditures (a) capital and (b) recurrent, have exceeded their approved budgets this financial year to date, by what amounts and for what reasons?

(2) Which hospital boards expect to exceed expenditures of their approved budgets this financial year, by what estimated amounts and for what reasons?

(3) Have there been any instances where hospital boards' requests to exceed their budgets this year have been refused and, if so, what are their names and what are the reasons?

(4) Which boards exceeded expenditure of their approved budgets, by what amounts and for what reasons for the years 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) There are 134 hospitals in this State, 24 outpatient centres and 17 State nursing homes, every one of which operates on a financial budget approved by the Governor in Council. In view of the fact that the salaries and wages appropriation allotted in these budgets for a financial year is based on the rate of salary or wages applicable at 1 July of that financial year, most, if not all, the hospitals, outpatient centres and nursing homes would exceed the salaries and wages vote if there is an award increase or a national wage variation within the relevant financial year.

The financial allocation to boards, outpatient centres and nursing homes for contingency items allows for some indexation based on known cost indices but cannot anticipate further cost increases, particularly in the special areas of hospital purchases such as any drug supplies, X-ray films and disposable medical items.

The Hospitals Act allows the Minister for Health to approve of transfers between budget votes, and the true and actual position of a budget is not known until the end of the financial year. The occasions on which hospitals, outpatient centres or nursing homes exceed an individual budget heading (and there are 15 of these) are very numerous, and if the honourable member is seeking advice concerning a particular hospital, outpatient centre or nursing home, then on request I would be prepared to advise him accordingly.

As I stated on previous occasions, hospitals boards are not placed in a position during a financial year where they cannot pay their normal monthly accounts.

6. SUPPLY OF FROZEN FOOD TO HOSPITALS

Mr Underwood asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to serious problems being created for hospitals and other Government institutions by his department's insistence that they use the new State frozen food factory at Wacol and, in particular, the escalating cost of food, its inferior quality and the loss of jobs—

(1) What is the (a) cost of the project to date and (b) total estimated cost?

(2) Which hospitals and institutions are using the facility and what were the costs of their installations and the cost to supply the food?

(3) What dates are others expected to come on line and what is the estimated cost of (a) installation and (b) the supply of food?

(4) Can any of the food poisoning at hospitals and institutions be traced to frozen food?

(5) What measures have been taken to overcome the escalating costs, inferior quality of the frozen food and the loss of jobs?

(6) Is he aware that the State Government was advised prior to establishing this venture that it would be a "white elephant"?

(7) Do all hospitals and institutions have sufficient emergency power to operate the frozen food storage refrigeration units in the event of power failure?

(8) Will he recommend abandoning the project in the light of growing opposition and costs?

Answer:—

I am not aware of problems of the nature outlined by the honourable member and suggest that he check the reliability of the source of his information. I reject the statement that the food is inferior in quality and that any person presently employed will lose his or her job as a result of the introduction of frozen foods. In respect of costs, I advise him that when the facility has reached maximum production and maximum supply to hospitals and institutions has been achieved, costs will be very comparable with the present method of supply.

(1) The final costs of construction and equipping the facility at Wacol have not yet been finalised but is anticipated to be \$7,890,000.

(2) Royal Brisbane Hospital (partly); Moreton Bay Nursing Care Unit; Basil Stafford Training Centre; Redcliffe Hospital (partly); Prince Charles Hospital; Halwyn Centre for Intellectually Handicapped; Gold Coast Hospital; Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital; Wolston Park Hospital (partly); Princess Alexandra Hospital (partly);

Cost of installation of the necessary facilities is not readily available, nor is the comparable cost of actual product supplied compared with the previous food supply.

(3) It is anticipated that the following hospitals and institutions will be receiving product by the end of 1981 (the cost of installations is still the subject of investigation for a number, and the cost of supply will not be known until product is actually received)—

Redcliffe Hospital—remainder; Eventide Home, Sandgate; Princess Alexandra Hospital—remainder; Challinor Centre for the Training and Care of the Intellectually Handicapped, Ipswich; Ipswich Hospital; Toowoomba Hospital; Baillie Henderson Hospital; Royal Brisbane Hospital—remainder.

(4) I am not aware of any problems of the nature referred to since product was supplied from the facility at Wacol.

(5) See opening comments.

(6) No.

(7) Those hospitals and institutions which do not already have available emergency power are being examined with a view to installation of necessary emergency power.

(8) No.

7. INCREASED POLICE STRENGTH, SUNSHINE COAST

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

In view of his recent announcement of additional police and police stations for the Gold Coast when will he announce increased police and police stations for the Sunshine Coast bearing in mind that the per capita police numbers are less on the Sunshine Coast than at the Gold Coast?

Answer:—

Since May 1980, station strengths in the Sunshine Coast District have been increased by eight. In addition, eight first-year constables are temporarily attached to these stations at present. The staffing situation is continually reviewed in the light of availability of additional trained personnel, as increases are dependent upon this. Funding arrangements for new police buildings have not been completed at this stage, and I am unable to comment on this aspect.

8. REPLACEMENT DENTURES

Mr Simpson asked the Minister for Health—

(1) How long is the delay in obtaining replacement dentures in Nambour, Brisbane and other parts of Queensland?

(2) What is the cost to pensioners who cannot wait for replacement dentures and must obtain these from dentists in Queensland?

(3) What is the cost to pensioners in New South Wales who have the advantage of obtaining replacement dentures from dental technicians or dental prosthetists?

Answer:—

(1) The delay in providing replacement of usable dentures at the Nambour Dental Clinic is approximately 18 months and at the Brisbane Dental Hospital approximately 5 months. The delay at other dental clinics throughout Queensland varies. For example, there is no delay at the Townsville clinic; 4 months delay at Maryborough and Rockhampton clinics; 6 months at Ipswich clinic and 14 months at Toowoomba clinic.

Every patient seeking dentures is seen by a dentist before that patient's name is placed on a waiting list. Where urgency is seen by the dentist to exist, it is usually possible to reduce this waiting time considerably. In many instances adjustments are made to minimise inconvenience during the waiting period.

(2) The Department of Health has no jurisdiction over fees chargeable by dentists. The fee paid by a patient is a matter for agreement between that patient and the dentist.

(3) I am informed that certain persons in New South Wales, such as pensioners with medical entitlement cards, may be authorised to obtain dentures without charge from dentists or dental technicians. However, I am also informed that funds allocated for this purpose for this financial year have already been fully expended.

The fee payable by a pensioner in New South Wales seeking replacement dentures outside this arrangement would be a matter for agreement between the patient and the operator concerned.

9. GROYNE CONSTRUCTION, GOLD COAST AREA

Mr Simpson asked the Minister for Northern Development and Maritime Services—

(1) How many beach restoration and control groynes are situated on the Gold Coast?

(2) Where are they situated?

(3) How effective have they been?

(4) How has each groyne been financed?

(5) What contribution has been made to each groyne by the (a) Federal Government, (b) State Government and (c) local authority?

(6) Has sand pumping been associated with these groyne constructions and, if so, what contributions have come from State, Federal and Local Government?

Answer:—

(1) Six.

(2) Kirra Point; Miles Street, Kirra; Currumbin Creek; 11th Avenue, Palm Beach; 21st Avenue, Palm Beach; Tallebudgera Creek.

(3) The groynes at 11th and 21st Avenues, Palm Beach, have not been constructed in sufficient time for their effectiveness to be assessed.

All other groynes have operated effectively in trapping and/or retaining sand on their updrift or southern sides. However, there has been loss of sand from the beaches to the north of the groynes requiring beach nourishment in some instances and, in the case of the Kirra groyne, construction of the Miles Street groyne to retain sand in front of the surf pavilion.

(4) Kirra Point was an experimental groyne financed by the State. The Miles Street, Kirra, groyne was built by Gold Coast City Council using loan funds with a 20 per cent State Government subsidy. The Currumbin Creek groyne was built by Gold Coast City Council using loan funds with a State Government subsidy at the

increased rate of 33½ per cent which applies to beach protection works which also benefit navigation.

The experimental groynes at Palm Beach were financed entirely by the State Government on the condition that the Gold Coast City Council expend \$500,000 of its own funds on sand-pumping for beach nourishment to Palm Beach. The Tallebudgera Creek groyne was financed by Gold Coast City Council from loan funds. Again a 33½ per cent State Government subsidy was paid on most of the cost, as the groyne was also considered to be a flood mitigation structure.

(5) The contributions of Federal, State and local government to the groyne construction costs are as follows:—

(a) Kirra Point groyne—Federal nil, State \$220,000, Local nil;

(b) Miles Street, Kirra groyne—Federal nil, State \$13,000, Local \$52,000;

(c) Currumbin Creek groyne—Federal nil, State \$33,500, Local \$67,000;

(d) 11th Avenue, Palm Beach, groyne—Federal nil, State \$327,000, Local nil;

(e) 21st Avenue, Palm Beach, groyne—Federal nil, State \$275,000, being the estimated final cost, Local nil;

(f) Tallebudgera Creek groyne—Federal nil, State \$238,500, Local \$480,400.

(6) Sand-pumping has been carried out in association with all groyne constructions. The cost shares are as follows:—

Kirra Point and Miles Street, Kirra—Federal nil, State \$200,000, Local \$800,000;

Currumbin Creek—Federal nil, State \$31,000, Local \$124,000;

11th and 21st Avenues, Palm Beach—Gold Coast Council is committed to spend \$500,000 of its own funds on this work (no State Government subsidy is applicable). The works are still in progress;

Tallebudgera Creek—Federal nil, State \$46,300, Local \$145,000.

10. REGISTRATION OF UNIONS

Mr Powell asked the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations—

(1) How many unions are registered in Queensland under the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

(2) How many unions are there represented in Queensland?

(3) What criterion is used to decide whether a union will come under the Queensland Act or the Federal Act?

Answer:—

(1) There are 74 unions of employees and 39 unions of employers currently registered under the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1980.

(2) All of the above unions operate in Queensland. In addition, there are approximately 147 Federal unions of employees and 81 unions of employers registered under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904. The majority of those unions of employees would have State branches which operate in Queensland whilst only approximately half of the number of unions of employers would have branches in Queensland.

(3) The making of awards and industrial agreements under the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act is facilitated by registered bodies of industrial unions being bound as parties.

Unless a union is registered under the Queensland Act, it has no access, as of right, to prosecute claims before the State tribunal.

This would be a compelling factor for a union to consider when seeking registration. Since the now famous case of Moore v Doyle, it has been made clear that a branch of a Federal union registered under the State industrial legislation is a separate legal entity.

I should also mention, for the benefit of the honourable member, that some workers, because of the restraints of the Federal Constitution, are not engaged in "industry" as it is legally defined. Therefore, they would not be eligible for registration under the Federal Act. School-teachers would be one example.

The system of conciliation and arbitration under the Queensland Act, with its ability to achieve quick decisions, has a minimum of legal wrangling in comparison to some other jurisdictions. This perhaps is a significant reason why some 66 per cent of workers in Queensland are covered by State awards.

11. ALLIED BREWERIES LTD

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

(1) Did he grant an exemption from the provisions of the Company Take-Overs Act 1979 to Allied Breweries Ltd to enable it to lift its shareholding in Castlemaine Tooheys Ltd from 14.8 per cent to 20.9 per cent?

(2) On what grounds was the exemption granted?

(3) In considering whether to grant an exemption to Allied Breweries Ltd, did he have regard to the Government's previously stated policy of retaining control of Queensland companies in Queensland?

(4) Has the effect of the acquisition of these further shares been to give effective control of Castlemaine Tooheys Ltd to a foreign corporation?

Answer:—

(1) Yes.

(2 & 3) The decision was based on "public interest" considerations.

(4) No.

12. ARCHERFIELD ASTRODOME

Mr Hooper asked the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services—

(1) Has the Noise Abatement Authority conducted tests at Durack concerning noise emanating from the Archerfield Astrodome?

(2) If the noise has been proven to be of an excessive level why have no prosecutions been launched?

(3) Will the Noise Abatement Authority commence an education campaign to inform the public of the correct procedures for lodging noise abatement complaints?

Answer:—

(1) Yes. Following complaints about the operation of the astrodome, the first tests were carried out towards the end of the astrodome's first season in 1980. In order to make a valid comparison, further tests were also carried out since operations recommenced in the latter half of 1980.

(2) As a result of these tests, the Noise Abatement Authority has imposed certain conditions on the astrodome to ensure a curfew of 10.30 p.m. This curfew has been complied with, except for one lapse, which was brought to its immediate attention.

(3) At present, up to 100 complaints are processed monthly by the division. This would already indicate that there is some degree of public awareness about the procedure for lodging complaints. However, many industries are still protected by the moratorium provisions of the Noise Abatement Act which expire on 28 September 1981. A public education campaign will begin after that date.

The honourable gentleman may be interested to know that the staff of the Air Pollution Council will move from 484 Adelaide Street to "Kantara", 64-70 Mary Street later this year. These premises are more closely situated to the heart of the city and it is hoped that this will lead to greater public awareness of the work of the authority.

13. FIRE SAFETY, HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS

Mr Akers asked the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services—

With reference to my statements in the Matters of Public Interest debate in this

House on 18 March concerning the apathy of the public regarding fire safety in high rise buildings—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a series on Channel "O" Television News naming the management of several high-rise buildings in Brisbane that had answers varying from very good to extremely poor and frightening in reply to a series of questions asked in a survey by Mr Paul Bongiarno, including places such as Morris Towers which has never had a full scale evacuation drill, has no warning systems at all, has no fire wardens appointed and therefore nobody responsible for and trained for the use of first-aid fire equipment?

(2) What action has been taken by his department to ensure compliance with the Fire Safety Act, its regulations and normal common fire safety procedures in other high-rise buildings in Queensland?

(3) What action has been taken to improve fire safety in the Parliamentary Annexe?

Answer:—

(1) Yes. This recent survey of fire safety in 46 high-rise buildings highlights the very genuine concern of Brisbane's fire authorities that some building owners are not facing up to their responsibilities in promoting fire safety among their tenants. The survey shows that 13 of the 46 buildings have not had an evacuation drill, three buildings did not know when their last evacuation occurred and the management of three other buildings declined to answer the question. Five of the buildings had not completed a fire drill for over 12 months. I table a summary compiled by my office of the findings of this survey.

(2) The Fire Safety Act requires all new premises, alterations and additions to existing buildings carried out since November 1976 to comply with strict fire safety standards. These premises are regularly inspected at least once every three years for buildings open to the public and at least once every five years in the case of other buildings. Under the Fire Safety Act, the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the State Fire Services Council, can designate certain classes of buildings built before November 1976, which must comply with the Act's regulations. The council is presently looking at different classes of buildings, such as buildings with night clubs, shopping centres, hotels and motels, which could be designated under the Act. One alternative being considered is to introduce an amended series of fire safety regulations for these designated classes which would not prove prohibitively expensive to implement.

I have recently given my full support to a public awareness campaign under which every high-rise building in Brisbane and the Gold Coast will receive fire safety cards specially prepared by Channel O and the A.M.P. Society in co-operation with the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board. I commend those two organisations for the steps they have taken. This program is already paying dividends with inquiries from several buildings about fire safety and evacuation drills. I am hopeful that the program can be extended to other centres in Queensland. I have also asked the State Fire Services Council to write to all high-rise property owners in Brisbane which, according to the survey, have not had a fire evacuation drill for over six months.

I would remind the owners of all buildings carrying a fire safety certificate under the Act that they must ensure that all staff are given adequate instruction of what to do in case of a fire. This instruction must be carried out within one month of the person being employed within that building. While there is no compulsion under the Act to carry out an evacuation, this emergency fire instruction for staff in these certified buildings must be carried out at least once every 12 months.

(3) A fire safety certificate is in force with respect to the Parliamentary Annexe. The present system of a general fire alarm sounding throughout the building each time a detector is activated will be discontinued. In future, the general alarm will be activated manually on the direction of a fire brigade officer or the building control officer.

This should ensure that unnecessary alarms are not given throughout the Annexe. However, it is essential that honourable members, staff and the public take all precautions, including the correct use of fire stairs and fire doors, when there is a general alarm.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the summary on the table.

14. USE OF DEAGON RACECOURSE BY ST PATRICK'S COLLEGE

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

With reference to proposals to redevelop the Deagon racecourse—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the fact that St Patrick's College at Shorncliffe has for many years developed, at its own cost, and used four football fields and the second best cricket pitch in Brisbane, inside the track?

(2) Will he give an assurance that the college will be able to continue that use

or be given reasonable recompense for the large expenditure on these ovals in the past?

(3) Will he initiate discussions on this matter with the management of the college?

Answer:—

(1) Yes.

(2) I am advised that at this stage the inconvenience to the college's use of the Deagon racecourse area has been minimal.

As proposals for the racecourse are only in the preliminary stages and no substantive planning has yet been undertaken, I am unable at the moment to give the honourable member the assurance he seeks.

(3) The college has written to me about the matter, and if the need arises for discussions with the management of the college I will be only too pleased to arrange a meeting for that purpose.

15. CLOSURE OF TAB AGENCIES, PINE RIVERS ELECTORATE

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

(1) Is it the intention of the TAB to close its agency at Albany Creek and, if so, what are the reasons?

(2) What other agencies in the Pine Rivers electorate face closure?

(3) What facilities will be provided for customers of the TAB in the districts which lose their TAB agencies?

Answer:—

(1) The TAB is currently considering the closure of the Albany Creek operation. The turnover at this office is currently approximately \$5,400 per week and on this turnover level is not viable for automation. Since moving to new premises in the area, turnover decreased by approximately \$500 per week and on the current levels the office is hardly viable even as a manual operation. The TAB has been established in Albany Creek for some six years and has proved to be a most disappointing operation.

(2) At the present time, no other offices in the Pine Rivers electorate are under investigation for closure.

(3) The TAB is giving consideration to providing other facilities in the area, and I can assure the honourable member that the interests of those in the area who wish to place a bet with the TAB will be looked after.

16. VILLA FOR INTELLECTUALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS, TOWNSVILLE

Dr Scott-Young asked the Minister for Health—

During the election campaign prior to the 1980 State election a firm promise was given to the electors of North Queensland that a villa for the intellectually handicapped would be established in Townsville—

(1) What stage has planning reached for the proposed project?

(2) Has money been allocated for this project?

(3) What is the estimated cost?

(4) What is the estimated annual budget?

(5) Will he assure the electorate that the project is fact and not an election gimmick?

Answer:—

(1) Approval in principle has been given for the continuation of planning towards the construction of a community villa complex at Townsville.

(2) The matter of capital and operating costs of this facility is the subject of consultation between the Department of Health and the Treasury.

(3) The total capital cost has been estimated at something in excess of \$600,000.

(4) The estimated annual budget for the villa is in the vicinity of \$400,000 per annum.

(5) The need for training and residential facilities for the intellectually handicapped in North Queensland is recognised and, within the financial and manpower resources of the department, an immediate start is being made to meet those needs.

The most urgent requirement is for intensive personal and family support services, and a team of professional staff from the Central Assessment Clinic in the Brisbane area will be made available on a visiting basis to institute the service and lay a clinical foundation for the community-based service to North Queensland.

Consideration is being given to providing a small residential facility during the next financial year, and this facility will have the capacity to provide residential relief care on both an emergency and planned basis to support families who are coping with the intellectually handicapped members at home. These services will be provided to meet the most urgent needs while further progress on the planning of the community villa complex progresses. On

present indications, the provision of the villa complex may be on a staged basis such as was taken in the establishment of the Rockhampton service.

17. CONDITION OF BRUCE HIGHWAY, NORTH QUEENSLAND

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

(1) Is he aware that the section of the northern highway north of Giru has broken up badly despite the fact that it has only been recently constructed?

(2) Will he investigate this problem with a view to ascertaining the (a) quality of materials used and if they were up to standard, (b) techniques and standards of workmanship used in the construction and (c) total estimated cost of work to repair the section?

Answer:—

(1) I am aware that failures occurred in some sections of the Bruce Highway between Palm Creek and Emmett Creek south of Townsville. The section was constructed in 1979 but the problems did not show up until early this year, when very heavy and prolonged rainfall was experienced in the area.

(2) A departmental investigation, which commenced on 5 February, has revealed that the gravel base used in the failed areas is abnormally sensitive to moisture. This type of gravel will not be used in further paving operations in this area. The techniques and standards of workmanship used on this section were similar to those used on rural highway construction throughout Australia.

In a restricted funding situation, it is not economically feasible to build roads which are totally immune to failure. It is accepted that there is an element of risk that on rare occasions, premature failures will occur under abnormal climatic conditions. In this instance, the cost of the repairs was \$28,500, or 2.37 per cent of the original construction cost of \$1.2m.

18. SPECTACLE FRAMES

Mr Kruger asked the Minister for Health—

(1) How many choices of spectacle frames are available at hospitals under the free scheme?

(2) How many types are displayed?

(3) What is the general value of frames available for purchase by persons not happy with the free issue frames?

(4) Is it usual practice to display only one very cheap frame as free and produce the better free frames only when requested so to do?

Answer:—

(1) The specification for the supply of spectacles for all hospitals provides for frames to be constructed of acetate or material equal in strength. A choice can be made from the following colours of frames:—

Male	Female
Black	Brown
Brown	Green
Half grey	Blue

Gold-filled frames are also supplied mainly for patients who have difficulty in using ordinary frames.

(2) It is a requirement that hospitals boards provide display notices in prominent positions setting out, inter alia, the types of frames which are available free of charge. Hospitals boards are advised to issue written advice to each patient referred to the optometrist in respect of, inter alia, the types of frames available.

(3) The matter of the value and types of frames etc. available for purchase by persons who do not desire the contract frames would be a matter solely between the optometrist and the patient. This would depend on the types of additional frames that the particular optometrist has available.

(4) See (2).

19. DAM ON BREMER RIVER

Mr Kruger asked the Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs—

(1) Is the Water Resources Commission currently surveying land in the Mt Walker area along the Bremer River for the purpose of building a dam?

(2) If so, what is the level at which the dam is to be constructed and when will construction take effect?

(3) What is the purpose for which the water is to be used, i.e., increase Rosewood town supply, additional water for Swanbank and/or water for a coal wash plant?

Answer:—

(1) The Queensland Water Resources Commission is investigating two possible dam sites on the Bremer River near Mt Walker. Field work, including surveys, geological investigations and drilling, has been completed and engineering studies are in progress.

(2 & 3) The investigations are being carried out as part of a program to identify possible future storage sites and assess

their potential for development. There is no proposal at present for development of any site in the Bremer River and future development will depend on the location, magnitude and purpose of water-supply needs which arise in the region.

20. Mr Y. IWASAKI

Mr Kruger asked the Premier—

(1) Is he aware of the accusations made about his friend Mr Iwasaki by the visiting Japanese businessman Mr Masao Ohmori?

(2) If so, does he intend to investigate any or all of the claims?

(3) Does he agree that the statements about Mr Iwasaki's business dealings make him suspect in regard to the proposed development at Yeppoon?

(4) Does he still insist that Mr Iwasaki will meet the requirements laid down under the franchise agreement and in particular the planned stages of the development?

(5) Does he also admit that he may have been hasty in accepting Mr Iwasaki's proposals and that he may have misjudged Mr Iwasaki's character?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) From the statements made last week by the gentleman from Japan it is obvious that he did not know what he was talking about. His comments relating to Mr Iwasaki were quite wrong and consequently I was not interested in talking to him.

Mr Iwasaki is proceeding with the development of his resort at Yeppoon under the terms and condition laid down in a franchise agreement ratified by this Parliament. I am confident he will continue to do so.

21. RUSSELL RIVER FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECT

Mr Menzel asked the Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs—

When will an environmental impact study on the Russell River flood mitigation project commence?

Answer:—

I propose to take a submission to Cabinet on the matter of an environmental study for the Russell River diversion scheme in the very near future. Pending consideration of this submission, I cannot indicate when the study might commence.

22. HIGH SCHOOL, YORKEYS KNOB

Mr Tenni asked the Minister for Education—

What further action will he take to uphold his predecessor's promise at a public meeting on 3 October 1980 held at the Yorkeys Knob State School where that honourable Minister advised the meeting that a high school would be constructed for grade 8 and an administration block for the commencement of the 1982 school year?

Answer:—

As stated in my previous answer on this subject (17 March 1981), the land under consideration for future construction of a high school in the Trinity Beach area is not yet secure. However, I have since received the site evaluation report from my colleague the Honourable Minister for Works advising of its technical acceptability. I have therefore initiated further action on the matter by giving my approval for acquisition procedures to proceed.

The standard procedure now expected to be in operation is for the Lands Administration Commission to be engaged by the Department of Works to make the necessary moves towards acquisition. The time necessary for this process is dependent upon legalities arising and the attitudes of owners. When I am advised that title to the land and availability of building funds are both secure, I shall be pleased to request my colleague the honourable Minister for Works to order the next stage, which is the design procedure.

23. HIGH SCHOOL, NORTHERN BEACHES AREA

Mr Tenni asked the Minister for Northern Development and Maritime Services—

(1) What action did he take to make certain that the high school that he promised for the Northern Beaches area within the electoral district of Barron River at a public meeting at the Yorkeys Knob State School on 3 October 1980, when he was Minister for Education, would be established?

(2) Did he instruct that the land be purchased and what date did this action take place?

(3) Did he instruct that planning take place and on what date?

(4) What funding was made available for both land and building and when was this funding available?

Answer:—

(1) Discussions with planning officers of the Department of Education established the need for the inclusion of the Trinity Bay State High School in the department's draft capital works programs for the 1982 school year.

(2) On 10 November 1980 I gave ministerial approval for the acquisition by the Department of Works of part of portion 311, parish of Smithfield.

(3) Architectural planning of school buildings is a function of the Department of Works. Draft capital works programs prepared by the Education Department indicate to the Department of Works the priorities and the extent of educational facilities required.

(4) The funding of education capital works projects falls within the ministerial responsibility of the Minister for Works and Housing.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

BJELKE-PETERSEN FOUNDATION; BRIBES BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Mr CASEY: In asking a question of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General I refer him to statements by the expelled National Party member for Callide that he was asked to pay \$10,000 into the National Party trust fund, known as the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, to buy a Cabinet position in this Government.

As the person responsible for upholding justice in this State, I ask the Minister for Justice: Will he, under section 60 of the Criminal Code titled "Bribery of a Member of Parliament", which carries a seven year penalty, order an immediate inquiry into allegations that Cabinet positions can be purchased through bribes by members of Parliament—more delicately termed donations—into this super-secret National Party fund? In the course of this inquiry will he have the member for Callide interviewed, as his remarks cast a shadow on the integrity and honesty of members of Executive Council and the Government generally in this State? After that investigation will he report back to this Parliament on all instances of donations into that fund by members of the Government parties, past and present, including in each case the amount and date of the donation?

Mr DOUMANY: I am not about to establish a precedent of giving legal opinions in this House. It is a matter for the honourable member for Callide to pursue if he so chooses. That is the appropriate action to be taken.

PAYMENTS TO POLICE INFORMANTS UNDER RACING AND BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr CASEY: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

Mr Hinze: I hope it will be better than the last one.

Mr CASEY: The Minister would not want his name to come out as a result of the last question, would he? This question is right within his province.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is about to ask a question. I suggest that he do so immediately.

Mr CASEY: I ask the Minister responsible for racing: Is it a fact that under section 244 of the Racing and Betting Act 1980, which is unchanged by the amendments presented last week, a police informant is entitled to 50 per cent of the amount of the fine imposed on a convicted SP bookmaker? Does this mean under the new Bill the Minister has placed before Parliament, which increases the minimum penalty for a first offence of \$15,000 to a maximum of \$50,000 for a further offence, that a police pimp involved in SP matters will qualify for rewards of between \$7,500 and \$25,000?

Is the Minister aware that these substantial sums of money are paid to informants through the police officer involved in the case without any requirement in law to even inform the court of the nature of such information and the fact that information was received? Does he not believe that it is unrealistic to preserve a "bounty hunter" system in this new racing law which makes it more profitable, in many instances, to do in an SP bookie than to provide information that may lead to the conviction of a murderer or rapist?

Mr HINZE: The honourable gentleman seems to know a lot about the business of dobbing people in. Is he sure he has not had his own fingers in it? I think he might have been dabbling in a bit of SP book-making. Perhaps the chickens are coming home to roost.

The Leader of the Opposition will have ample time to discuss all aspects of the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill this evening in this House. He will then have ample opportunity to put his arguments forward.

Mr Casey: There is no amendment to that section.

Mr HINZE: There will be ample time for him and certainly I will reply.

RACING AND BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL;
ALTERATION OF RACING TIMES ON
ANZAC DAY

Mr CASEY: In directing a further question to the Minister responsible for racing, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, I refer to his statement that there will be discussion in Parliament this evening on the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill, to his comments reported in today's "Courier-Mail" and over the last few days about the alteration of racing times on Anzac Day and to his comments that he had had previous consultations with various people, including those on the Anzac Day Trust, about the alteration in racing times. I now ask him: Why did he not discuss the proposed alteration with the supreme body for Anzac Day commemorations in Queensland, namely, the Anzac Day

Commemoration Committee, which co-ordinates all Anzac Day celebrations in Queensland and of which the Premier is chairman?

Mr HINZE: Quite obviously the Leader of the Opposition is either misinformed or just cannot understand. However, as I indicated previously, he will have ample time this evening to discuss in the House this and other matters connected with the Racing and Betting Act. The discussions referred to were held with the responsible body in connection with this particular matter. I have made Press statements on two occasions in the last 24 hours to reassure those who are concerned with the sanctity of Anzac Day (which this Government has no intention of tampering with) that there will be no problem whatsoever. However, the Leader of the Opposition will have ample time this evening to discuss it.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Minister in charge of racing has clearly misled the House in his comment that he had had discussions with the responsible bodies on this matter. I have in my hand a copy of a letter from the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee to the Premier of Queensland—

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A point of order has been taken by the Minister.

Mr CASEY: I am taking a point of order myself.

Mr SPEAKER: I thought the Leader of the Opposition had completed his point of order.

Mr CASEY: No.

Mr SPEAKER: I will hear that point of order first.

Mr CASEY: My point of order is that the Minister responsible for racing has just deliberately misled the House by the statement that he did in fact contact all the responsible bodies. I have in my hand a copy of a letter from the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee, which is the Queensland body responsible for the co-ordination of all Anzac Day activities throughout the State and which is chaired by the Premier. This letter clearly points out that until this news appeared in today's Press, this committee knew nothing whatsoever about this matter. I accordingly table the letter.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the Minister's explanation before I adjudicate on the point of order.

Mr HINZE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is quite obvious that the Leader of the Opposition is making much ado about nothing. I am not deliberately misinforming

the House on any count. I said publicly—and I say it again—that, after consultation with the Anzac Day Trust, the Anzac Day Act is being amended to make it consistent with the Racing and Betting Act. These consultations have been held. I cannot make it any plainer than that.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN MINERAL PROSPECTING AND ROYALTIES

Mr GOLEBY: I ask the Premier: Did he hear the talk-back program on radio station 4QR in which the Labor member for Griffiths (Mr Humphries) recommended that the Federal Government be responsible for the granting of all mineral prospecting licences in Australia and also for the setting of all mining royalties in Australia? What action will he take should the Federal Government proceed to implement such a policy?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: First, it would only be the Labor Party that would want to implement such a policy. I did not hear the radio program to which the honourable member referred, but I appreciate that the Federal member he named would be someone capable of making that sort of statement, bearing in mind the statement he made in the Federal House the other day that he had to retract when he found that the accusations he made about the Winchester South lease were wrong. Therefore, I can understand that he would make statements like this.

I can, however, assure the honourable member that that will not happen while this Government is in office in Queensland. There is no way in which a Federal Labor Government or any other Government would be permitted to so change and centralise power and control of State assets. Naturally we are completely against such a move of power to Canberra.

"COURIER-MAIL" EDITORIAL ALLEGATIONS

Mr GOLEBY: I ask the Premier: Has he read today's "Courier-Mail" editorial, which makes certain allegations? What is his attitude to that editorial?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: In the minds of many people, the nature of today's editorial in "The Courier-Mail" destroys any credibility that the editorial column may have had. It completely disregards the facts. The Labor Party did not direct its preferences as the editorial said, and I take it that the writer knew that.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Premier has the floor.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the leader writer or editor of that column had any credibility in my eyes before, he has very little, if any, now, because he has completely disregarded facts and told what might be termed deliberate untruths. The preferences of Labor were not directed to the

National Party candidates in either of the two seats mentioned. In seven seats of the whole 82 the National Party received Labor preferences, but they were not directed. They happened; they just went that way. There was no direction in that regard. In only one seat did the ALP direct its preferences to the National Party. That was in Lockyer, and that was a seat we won. There were 20 seats in which the ALP directed—and I emphasise the word "directed"—its preferences to the Liberal Party.

With all the hoo-ha about editorials and honourable members talking about independents, and all the rest of it, what about the Liberal Party not only having independent candidates but also standing members of Parliament against the National Party? The whole matter is a lot of hypocrisy on the part of the Labor Party and the honourable member for Woodridge. The attitude adopted by "The Courier-Mail" is a lot of hypocrisy, too. It is completely untrue and cannot be substantiated.

NATIONAL PARTY POLICY ON GRANTS TO RACING CLUBS

Dr LOCKWOOD: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police: When will the National Party's election promise to convert to grants all existing and approved loans to racing clubs be implemented? Will the amendments presently before the House allow that policy to be implemented?

Mr HINZE: The National Party policy enunciated by the Premier prior to the last election has yet to be made Government policy, and I discussed it at a recent Cabinet meeting. However, I assure the honourable member for Toowoomba North that provision is made in the legislation to do exactly what has been promised by the Premier.

WINCHESTER SOUTH COAL DEPOSITS

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I ask the Minister for Mines and Energy: Prior to his taking the recommendation to Cabinet, how many officers in his department participated in the decision to accept the tender submitted by the BP-led consortium to mine Winchester South?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Is that all the question?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That's a question without notice. Clean the wax out of your ears.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That's the question. Would you like me to send it by carrier pigeon?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member should have the manners to sit down and wait for the question to be answered, rather than stand up.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I call the Minister.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The Mines Department is a very big department containing a large number of employees. It is also a department with a lot of expertise within it. Those officers who were required to examine the tenders no doubt did so. I do not know all of their names offhand, so I cannot name them. The examination of the 32 tenders that were submitted took nine weeks.

I was rather disturbed by the article in today's paper written by Derek Hanaghan and referring to Winchester South. That article intimated that the applications were not examined properly. I take offence at that comment. We will be taking up the matter with the person who wrote the article to ask him where he obtained his information. If he does not have a sound basis for his statement—it is impossible for him to have one in all the circumstances—we will be asking him for a public apology.

It took some weeks to examine all the aspects of the tenders and they were examined properly by persons possessing the necessary expertise. That is the way in which the Mines Department has acted for many years, and while I am Minister that is the way it will continue to act.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I direct a further question to the Minister for Mines concerning the same subject. I ask: To what degree was the Under Secretary of the Mines Department, Mr Jack Woods, involved in that decision?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Perhaps the meaning of the term "Under Secretary" has escaped the honourable member. He should look it up. The Under Secretary is in charge of the Mines Department and he is under my jurisdiction. No matter who examines the tenders, the Under Secretary makes the recommendations to me for final assessment. The recommendations then go to Cabinet for its decision. The Under Secretary, Mr Jack Woods, has done a very good job, as did the previous Under Secretary and the one before him, right back to the days of Ernie Evans.

DUCATI MOTOR CYCLES

Mr GYGAR: I ask the Minister for Transport: Is it true that the Queensland distributors of Ducati motor cycles, Norm Fraser (Brisbane) Pty Ltd of Newstead, initially charged \$150 to replace defective mag wheels fitted to 150 motor cycles that were manufactured between 1977 and 1980?

Mr LANE: The honourable member is quite correct. The Brisbane distributors initially charged \$150 to replace defective mag wheels. However, when pressure was applied through my Department of Transport

and the suggestion was made that I could well raise the matter in this House, the distributor agreed to replace the wheels free.

I understand that at least 36 sets of wheels out of the estimated 150 have been replaced and money refunded to those owners who had paid.

The House would be interested to know that in July Federal and State Transport Ministers will again discuss whether the recall of defective vehicles should be made mandatory. There is a voluntary code at present.

In February, Ministers set up a task force to review the voluntary code of practice for safety-related vehicle-recall campaigns compiled by the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries and accepted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council in 1972. It will explore the feasibility and desirability of replacing the voluntary code with mandatory procedure.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with Government business.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 26 March (see p. 563) on Dr Lockwood's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr Casey had moved the following amendment—

"Add to the Address the following words—

"However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that your advisers have failed to immediately initiate both the electoral and Government reform in this State as indicated by them during the election campaign and they have shown no real intent in their legislative program to properly overcome the problems of unemployment and economic hardship which face all sections of the Queensland community, despite the fact that the boundless mineral and rural wealth of this State has provided them with ample opportunity, and that they have therefore lost the confidence of this House."

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (12.1 p.m.): In addressing myself to the House in reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech I wish to pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents in the electorate of Balonne to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I would also like to pay tribute to His Excellency Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay for the manner in which they carry out their duties. His Excellency is a most worthy representative of Her Majesty the Queen. He carries out the duties of his high office with dedication and displays a warm friendliness

towards the many people he has the opportunity to meet in his extensive travels throughout this State. Having now had the pleasure of receiving Sir James and Lady Ramsay in all the shires within my electorate, I can certainly say with justification that he engenders enthusiasm and confidence in the people for our democratic system of government which recognises Her Majesty the Queen as its head.

Mr Speaker, I wish to offer my congratulations to you on your re-election as Speaker of this Assembly. I am confident that you will carry out your duties in conducting the affairs of this House with fairness and firmness. I am also confident that you will uphold and maintain the dignity and decorum without which this Assembly would slip to the standard that some of our friends in the media would have the public believe it has already reached. Most members of this House at all times conduct themselves with dignity.

I also congratulate Mr Miller on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. Mr Miller has had many years of experience as a member of the panel of temporary chairmen and has already proved his capacity in that regard.

To all the new members on both sides of this House may I offer my congratulations and say, "Welcome." I am sure they have come here determined to play their part in the development of this great State for the betterment of not only their constituents but all the people of this State. I look forward to working with them and sharing their friendship. To the electors of Balonne and the many people who worked for my re-election I extend my warmest thanks for again placing their confidence in me.

We listened intently to the Governor's Opening Speech in which he gave a general outline of the course of action that this Government will pursue during the term of this Parliament. The National-Liberal Government will continue to provide good, strong government for Queensland. It will continue to implement policies that will ensure the rapid expansion and development of our resources that the people of Queensland and, indeed, Australia, expect. It will continue to introduce policies to give the people of the State a better way of life.

The Opposition, running true to form, has again come out as a party of knockers instead of bringing forward constructive alternative policies. The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment to the effect that His Excellency's advisers have lost the confidence of this House, that is, the people of this State. Fortunately, actions speak louder than words. Unfortunately, however, the Leader of the Opposition has yet to learn that simple fact.

The people of this State have, by their actions at the polls, consistently passed motions of no confidence in the ALP on no fewer than eight occasions since 1957. As a matter of fact, during the recent election campaign many electors wanted to know

just who was the Leader of the Opposition and for which half of the ALP did he speak. The proposed amendment is simply another one of the political stunts of the Leader of the Opposition, and he has moved it in an endeavour to gain a bit of mileage. It has flopped; it has gone over like the proverbial lead balloon; it has received the same short shrift that the Leader of the Opposition and the ALP received at the polls.

The Leader of the Opposition made a great play in advising this House of the details of the ALP's offer to the Liberal Party to form a minority Government by either party, based mainly on the introduction of legislation for one vote one value. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for flushing himself out of the hole in this matter. He was most vocal in western and northern areas prior to the election, telling people how he would give them more representation in this House; how he would give them nine members where they had eight. By his words in this House he now reveals his true intentions. He now reveals how he tried to deceive the people in those areas.

While he was deceiving those people and telling them bedtime fairy tales, his bosses in Brisbane—both factions—were united on one thing. Indeed, it was the only thing they were united on, namely, that any redistribution which they had anything to do with would be based on the principal of one vote one value.

Regardless of what the Leader of the Opposition had to say, he would do as he was told. There would most certainly not be nine seats in the western and northern areas of the State; rather, there would be four or, at the very most, five.

Let us take a look at this idea of one vote one value. It sounds very good. Everybody's vote supposedly has exactly the same value. Members of Parliament are elected to this House to legislate, to look after the needs of the people they represent, in particular, and of course the needs of the people of this State, in general. One might ask: What are those needs? There is no necessity for me to spell them out here and now. Any person with an average amount of intelligence has a fair idea of what they are.

Rather than look at the principle of one vote one value, I believe that we should give consideration to the value of the vote that we already exercise. Is a vote in western and northern areas worth two in the city, in so far as the needs of the people in those areas are concerned? Do they enjoy twice the amount of amenities and services that Governments provide? They most certainly do not. Is the value of their vote twice the value of that of their urban counterparts? The reality of the situation clearly indicates that it is not. One vote in those areas, in reality, becomes one vote with no value.

When we talk of redistribution, we must surely look at the principle of equality of representation. The principle of one vote one

value gives no consideration whatever to that principle; it gives no consideration to the accessibility of a member of Parliament to his electors.

The country elector pays \$3 for three minutes on the telephone. Depending on the urgency and magnitude of the problem and the length of time that the elector spends talking on the telephone to his member of Parliament, that amount can be doubled, trebled or in fact any amount be payable. His city counterpart pays 10c for a conversation lasting all day and all night, if he needs to talk that long.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: Of course, that is if the member for Brisbane Central has not already hung up.

The cost of a telephone connection is \$120 plus the quarterly rental fee in advance. However, if one is outside the 16 km radius, the golden circle—as many people in rural areas are—it can cost not \$120 but \$500, \$1,000, \$4,000, \$8,000 or even more. Most city people regard a telephone as a basic necessity. However, in many country areas it is nothing short of a damned expensive luxury.

One can go through the entire list of Government expenditure in the far-flung areas and deal with roads, electricity extensions, services in general, health facilities, schooling and job opportunities, to say nothing of freight costs on produce going to market and on the required goods in return. Of necessity country people must use fuel, which costs more in country areas.

One vote, one value—just who is kidding who? I believe I am speaking of the realities of life, not mouthing some emotional catch cry that would lead people in the more favoured areas to believe that they were not getting a fair deal, and that their vote was worth only half the value of an inland vote. In fact, the reverse applies. People in inland areas do not expect to receive the same consideration as their urban and coastal counterparts. However, they do hope that they will not be forgotten entirely by governments.

What is the situation in other western democracies, countries with a similar legislative process to that in this State and Australia? The truth is that all incorporate a weighting factor in fixing electoral boundaries to achieve, as much as possible, equality of representation. They shy away from applying a strict arithmetical system of one vote one value. Western democracies based on the Westminster system have traditionally adhered to a weighting system in deciding electoral boundaries. Such a system takes into account electors' isolation, availability of services, access to representatives, communications and a host of other variables influenced by topography,

life-styles and community of interest, the very things about which I have already spoken.

Mr Davis: The National Party takes sheep and cattle into account.

Mr NEAL: As the honourable member for Brisbane Central made that inane remark, I ask him to take into consideration that in Great Britain, the home of the Westminster system, the variation is up to 5 to 1, from about 23 000 to more than 115 000. In Canada, the smallest enrolment is 14 000 electors and the highest is 139 000—a variation of nearly 10 to 1. In the United States of America the smallest electorate has 17 000 and the largest, 951 000—nearly a 60 to 1 variation. In the State of Queensland the variation is less than 3 to 1.

Mr Davis: It is all right to be reading a brief—you have been supplied with a brief—but get the person who writes it to be correct.

Mr NEAL: I regret that I am unable to hear what the member for Brisbane Central just said.

The National Party is conveniently accused of a gerrymander and, by implication, it is suggested that we hold only those seats with low enrolments. Nothing could be further from the truth, as is borne out by the enrolment figures just released by the State Electoral Office and supplied to the members of this Assembly. Of the 10 seats with the highest enrolments, eight are held by the National Party, one by the Liberal Party and one by the ALP. In terms of being able to effectively represent their constituents and in terms of electors' getting adequate representation from their members, National Party members of Parliament and their electorates are disadvantaged at both ends of the scale. We hold those seats with the greatest numbers and we also hold those far-flung seats with sparse populations.

It is indeed interesting to view such facts in view of the revelations in this House by the Leader of the Opposition, more especially when one considers that it was he who said that the people of the western areas should have greater representation and it was he who said when he was an Independent in the political wilderness that the ALP should quit blaming the electoral system for its losses and come up with policies to win votes and elections. The Leader of the Opposition has been in the box seat for some time. I ask him now: Where are those policies to win votes and elections? He and his party have been weighed and, in the balance, found to be wanting. They should accept the decision of the people, get on with their job and stop bleating. The other proposals in the offer are hardly worthy of comment.

Having expressed my views on the merits of the Leader of the Opposition's offer, I now raise a number of matters of concern to

the people of my electorate and, indeed, throughout the State. South-west Queensland is experiencing what is perhaps the severest drought in recorded history, with some areas having been declared drought-stricken since early 1979 and yet to receive a beneficial fall of rain. Seasons are not dependent on the total rainfall received over the period of a year. They depend on the amount of individual falls and their distribution throughout the year. For farming or grazing it is no use at all to receive three-quarters of the average rainfall in showers of under 50 points. During summer heat-wave conditions, such falls are useful only to collect tank water. That has been the position in the South West since the latter part of 1978, with the exception of some small isolated areas that were fortunate enough to fluke the odd heavy storm.

The people of those areas realise that droughts are part and parcel of that country. They know and accept that fact. I have seen the effects of five major and a couple of lesser droughts. Each has been different. We can, of course, be thankful that during the course of this current prolonged drought agistment has been fairly readily available, as has fodder. Good roads and fast stock transports are the order of the day at present, as against driving along bare and dry stock routes in times past. We have had a market and reasonable prices for our stock available to us. The Government has given valuable assistance that has been well received by those people suffering the effects of the drought. This drought has been different in that it has exceeded the duration and severity of any previous drought. There is a limit to the period one can hold on—a limit determined by stock values and financiers.

Mr Davis: You didn't have a bad year yourself, did you?

Mr Sullivan: How out of date you are!

Mr Davis: He told me last year that he cleared \$150,000, which was not bad.

Mr NEAL: Another inane interjection from the honourable member for Brisbane Central. Unfortunately, he stays in the centre of Brisbane and does not go further afield. I shall be pleased to take the honourable member out and show him some of the drought-stricken country. He had better bring a water-bag with him, or he will die of thirst.

Many people cannot be expected to survive financially under the very prolonged and severe drought now being experienced. Drought is a recurring natural disaster, and over the years many wise men have exercised their minds to find some way of mitigating its effects, but droughts continue to take their toll. I wonder, Mr Deputy Speaker, just what we have learnt. Must each new generation of landholders learn by its own mistakes? Must each generation

gain its experience the hard way? That would appear to be the case, for there are no easy answers.

One cannot evade the fact that life on the land means facing the vagaries of not only seasons but also commodity prices. When seasons and prices are adverse together, the results can be devastating—financial ruin for many, which creates very real human problems.

Governments have an obligation to respond to situations of that type. They must not be content to give sideline assistance. They must be prepared to establish schemes for the rehabilitation of people who go down as a result of natural disasters. In my opinion, the Government must look very seriously at extending loans at no interest. If the situation gets worse—and it appears that it will—consideration may even have to be given to making grants. And grants are not new. Governments have assisted previously in that way, and I cite as instances grants to woolgrowers when prices were at an uneconomic level a number of years ago, and grants to beef producers when beef prices were in the doldrums.

I firmly believe that the State Government has rendered worthwhile assistance, and it has been ongoing assistance. In earlier droughts, the State Government instituted various assistance schemes, and as each new drought has come along landholders have been confident that the State Government would be sympathetic to their problems and would again implement similar schemes. In the current drought, most of the concessions that the Government has made available have been extended as the severity and duration of the drought have increased.

Mr Casey: What form would you like the grants to take? You would not go in for spaying cattle, as was done last time?

Mr NEAL: I said earlier that many wise men have considered what might be done to mitigate the effects of drought. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that, if he listens a little longer, he will hear me make a few comments not directly related to the spaying of cows. However, that could be one answer, depending on the area and the time.

The severity of the drought, coupled with the other natural disasters to which this State is prone, creates financial problems of such magnitude as to be beyond the resources of Queensland. In my opinion, the Federal Government is duty bound to render greater assistance. Because it is more disaster-prone than other States, Queensland should receive far greater assistance from Canberra. One hears a great deal about Canberra picking up the tab for 75 per cent of the cost of natural disasters and that the State has only to repay without interest the money it receives for drought and disaster loans. It is said that the State

Government is making a rip-off from that money at the expense of the unfortunate people who are suffering as a result of the ravages of the weather.

Let me deal with some of the facts. Under the arrangement for the provision of natural disaster relief, the Queensland Government is required to meet the first \$4m of natural disaster expenditure in any one financial year. Above that \$4m the Commonwealth provides \$3 for each \$1 provided by the State. In effect, that means that for the first \$12m that is expended on any one disaster, the State Government picks up the tab for \$6m, or 50 per cent. That fact should be brought out whenever the Federal Government talks about picking up the tab for 75 per cent. It does not pick up 75 per cent of the total tab.

Unfortunately, disasters such as the current drought do not take any notice of the ends of financial years; they continue. However, the State has to start each financial year by commencing its expenditure of \$4m. It has to spend that sum from its own funds before the Federal Government again begins to chip in. And, of course, as I said, \$14m has to be expended before the Federal Government comes in with its \$3 for each \$1 spent by the State.

Whilst it can be argued that that part of the Commonwealth funds that is used for the provision of loan assistance is repayable by the State to the Commonwealth interest free, it is equally true that the State has to meet administration costs, the cost of State funds that are used to provide loan assistance and any losses incurred owing to bad debts. The Federal Government cannot lose. What is more, it will reap the benefit from future taxation, provided the producers survive to pay tax. The State Government, on the other hand, does not reap any benefits from direct taxation. I believe that the Federal Government is getting off lightly.

If the Federal Government is fair dinkum, instead of merely crowing about what it is doing it should give some worthwhile incentives to people in drought-prone areas so that they will be in a better position to fight the next drought. The best thing that a person who needs help can do is to help himself.

In the middle of the current drought the Federal Government came in with a 100 per cent tax deduction on watering facilities in the year of expenditure. We are most appreciative of that; it certainly will assist. So far, however, that 100 per cent taxation concession in the year of expenditure has been of minimal use. Landholders have been more interested in spending their limited funds on fodder and agistment to preserve their breeders than on new watering facilities. No matter how much the taxation concession might be, new windmills, tanks, piping, troughs and dams are of little use without rain to fill the dams, and without finance

to enable the landholder to purchase that equipment and thereby take advantage of the tax concession.

Mr Casey: They're very handy when you come to the next drought, aren't they?

Mr NEAL: That is exactly what I am talking about.

The Federal Government, if it was fair dinkum about wanting to help people fight future droughts, would make double tax deductions available on watering facilities and also on grain and fodder storage facilities in the year of expenditure. Concessions of that type would offer encouragement. Such encouragement should be given at the beginning of the chain and not at the end by way of nothing more than band-aid assistance. If the people are given realistic incentives, they will endeavour to look after themselves.

I now turn to a subject that goes hand in hand with the utilisation of our land-water conservation. Here again the State is being starved of Federal funds for water. Australia is recognised as the driest continent in the world. In fact, it has been claimed that the total outflow of the entire Australian river system is less than that of the Amazon River alone. Water is the most precious commodity. It is far more precious than oil or minerals. We have an abundance of coal but we lack an abundance of water.

Governments at State and Federal levels should place a far higher priority on the development of our water resources and on the utilisation of water, including recycling. We must recognise that the greatest crisis this nation will face in the future is not a lack of fuel but rather a lack of water. At the State level we must carry out extensive investigations of our river systems, catchment areas and appropriate sites for dams.

The Government this year has allocated \$36.3m for water resources. Of that amount the Federal Government has contributed a lousy \$4.7m under the National Water Resources Program. That is nowhere near the amount that it should contribute. It has to play a far greater part in providing adequate finance. It has the money, and it cannot deny that. Each year it rips off in excess of \$3,000m under the oil parity pricing scheme. If \$300m of that amount were returned to the States for water projects, we might start to get somewhere. Funds like that would give water projects a tremendous boost.

We have commenced the Burdekin Dam scheme. It will make a tremendous contribution to the economies of the people in that area and of the State and nation as a whole. Do not, however, let us think that the Burdekin Dam scheme is the ultimate. We must give consideration to all schemes ranging from the magnitude of the Burdekin Dam scheme to small stream diversions. Anywhere and everywhere we

must pull out all stops. We must especially investigate all possibilities for water conservation in our dry, inland areas.

One scheme that has received publicity from time to time over many years is the proposed diversion of the headwaters of the Clarence River into the Condamine River system.

Mr Hooper: The member for Warwick said that a week ago.

Mr NEAL: Yes, and I am supporting him in what he said.

The time has well and truly arrived when we should get together with the New South Wales and Federal Governments to have that scheme fully investigated. While the Clarence River is located totally within New South Wales and while New South Wales has a Government of its present political colour, I am doubtful about the co-operation we might expect. We cannot dispute the fact that the river has enormous potential for water-harvesting, yet a great volume of that water flows into the sea. Such a scheme would be almost on a par, in magnitude, with the Snowy Mountains scheme. Its benefits would flow inland in the eastern States. For these reasons it must be considered at a national level. Water is the lifeblood of inland Australia. It is in short supply. Here is a scheme that could greatly assist in this regard. All that is lacking is the will in high places.

I raise another matter that has been of great concern to the people, especially those in my electorate. It concerns the restoration, maintenance and realignment of the dingo barrier fence. This issue is creating a tremendous amount of heartburn for not only the Minister and the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board but also landholders and local authorities within the protected area. If we wish to protect the wool-growing areas of this State, we must control the dingo menace that threatens our sheep lands. I have come to the conclusion that, to do this, we must repair, maintain and realign the barrier fence where necessary and implement, in conjunction with that work, a realistic "1080" bait program within the dingo-breeding areas under the control of the State as well as within all other areas in which dingoes are causing destruction and "1080" baiting programs are acceptable.

Mr Davis: In other words, you kill everything else on the way through.

Mr NEAL: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about; he does not have a clue. I say that to him in all seriousness, although I know he is a reasonably intelligent man.

We must make up our minds whether we want a sheep industry or dingoes; they cannot exist together. It is no use our thinking that we can control dingoes by

baiting, whether it is with "1080", strychnine or other bait poisons that are most undesirable. We will not control dingoes with a baiting program alone. In many areas "1080" is totally unacceptable to landholders, and in more closely settled areas it is just not on. The only alternative for such areas is the barrier fence and the trapping of the dingoes that get through.

Local authorities and landholders have expressed deep concern at the suggested precepts to be levied by the board, and they have every reason to do so. All the shires in the South West are suffering the effects of the most disastrous drought on record, to which I have previously alluded. The suggested precepts would mean an increase in rates in each of the shires within my electorate of between 11 and 15 per cent. If they are only to mark time with regard to the carrying out of the various services they provide ratepayers, local authorities will be compelled to increase rates by at least 10 per cent to keep pace with inflation alone. If they wish to increase services then they will be looking at a minimum rate rise of about 15 per cent. To keep pace alone with inflation running at 10 per cent, and to include the barrier fence precept, would result in a rate hike for most local authorities of between 21 and 26 per cent at the very least. Drought stricken landholders are simply not able to afford such an increase. Furthermore, concern has been expressed as to the efficiency with which the board will carry out the duties of restoration and maintenance.

The Waggamba Shire Council has taken the bit between its teeth, and, with some board assistance, repaired, maintained and electrified over half the length of the fence in its area. Whilst it has found some minor problems with the electrified wire so far, it believes that those problems are not insurmountable. At this stage it appears that it has part of the answer; and the dogs are not getting through. It believes that, having carried out the work of repairs, maintenance and electrification itself, control at a local level is most desirable; that the local authority in control will give quicker action, with less hassles as compared to the board's proposals for patrolmen stationed in convenient towns near the fence and answerable to the board in Brisbane. Waggamba's proposals have the support of the Tara and Inglewood Shires as well. They are of the firm opinion that they can provide a more efficient service, in both maintenance and control of costs, than can be provided by the board. I believe that they they have done an excellent job.

Because of the importance of the sheep and wool industry to this State and nation, I believe that the Government should give financial assistance towards the restoration and maintenance of the barrier fence. Unless Government assistance in good measure is forthcoming, we can forget about the dingo

barrier fence and progressively forget about the sheep and wool industry in this State. The dingoes will force the remaining landholders adjoining the fence out of sheep, and progressively move in on the flocks that are presently dingo-free. One by one the front lines of defence against the dingoes will collapse, and so, like the domino theory, the process will continue.

As to the precept and local authorities excluding people in those areas—there are groups of landholders who have no interest whatsoever in the barrier fence, namely, the irrigation farmers. They run no stock and they have no fences. I believe that they can be excluded from the precept by their local authority. I hope that local authorities will give sympathetic consideration to those landholders who do not run stock and have no intention of ever running stock. If I were in that sort of a situation I would find it very irksome to contribute to the cost of the barrier fence. Notwithstanding that, I believe that the restoration of the dingo barrier fence is so important that we have to get on with the job. I hope that the Government in this State will come to the party and provide assistance.

I conclude by pointing out that this State is undoubtedly in good hands with this National-Liberal Party Government and will prosper best under its policies because it is a free enterprise Government.

(Time expired.)

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (12.42 p.m.): I guess all honourable members are aware that I rise to speak today from a different place in this Chamber. I am now officially here as representing the independent people of Queensland. Thousands—indeed, hundreds of thousands—of people have given me encouragement and promised financial support to wage war against the action that has been taken against me by a political management committee. I shall elaborate on that later.

First of all, as this is the Address-in-Reply debate, I wish to pledge the allegiance and loyalty of my constituents to Her Majesty. I also wish to pay a tribute to those Ministers and members on both sides of the House who have helped me over the nine years that I have been a member of this Assembly. I value the friendship that has been so evident in recent days.

Having said that, I wish to concentrate my remarks today on one of the most unjust and undemocratic actions in the history of party politics and government in this great State of Queensland and this great nation of Australia. I remind all people that I was expelled from the National Party. I wish to take honourable members back to 1972 when I was selected by a committee that was assembled in Rockhampton for the purpose of selecting a candidate. There were 10 candidates opposing me. I was selected by a committee consisting of Sir Robert Sparkes,

Mike Evans, Laurie Martin and quite a few others. I was selected after hours of deliberation, after which Sir Robert Sparkes made a statement to the Press.

In 1972 he said—

“I consider we selected the best candidate. Hartwig has tremendous zest and ability and has definitely Cabinet potential.”

I remind the House that at that time in Callide the National Party had been described as disorganised. In the interim period some 13 branches of the National Party, with up to 1 000 financial members each, have been formed in the Callide electorate. Today they are so strong that Callide would have to be regarded as one of the top National Party seats in Queensland. Therefore, I must pay tribute to those dedicated people, who the Premier so conveniently forgot to mention recently on the media. Those people were the grass roots of the old Country Party and are the basis of the National Party. They have contributed hours and hours, weeks and weeks and months and months of their time and money towards a cause that they believed was great and one respected by its leader. But I draw the attention of this House to the fact that since my expulsion the Premier has not expressed one iota of concern for those people. Whether I was judged rightly or wrongly, the Premier had a responsibility, and should have had the manners, as the leader of the National Party and this Government, to recognise the work of people such as Gough Morgan, a foundation member of the Country Party whose father was Minister in the original Country Party Government of this State. After 60-odd years that man is resigning from the National Party. Last night honourable members would have heard his comments on “Today Tonight”—he was disgusted. He said he would lay it on the line and so would thousands of others.

I want to clear up the misconception that I named five other members of this House who might resign from the National Party. I lay it on the line that I named no member. I said to the Press that up to five members could defect. Even under oath I would state that I did not name any members who might resign from the National Party. I said that there could be five and when asked to name them I told the reporter, “You find out for yourself.” I certainly did not intend to embarrass anybody; I am big enough to fight this on my own.

Mr Casey: You are on your own. There are only nine members of the National Party in the House listening to you.

Mr HARTWIG: They will be listening; do not worry about that.

I want to comment on a newspaper article that appeared on the front page of the “Sunday Sun” in which the Premier rejected my allegations. I will now tell the House

of the relevant events. It was an August evening just prior to my overseas trip to Zambia. I was sitting in the dining-room—I can show honourable members the table—when the member for Archerfield walked in. I was the only member in the dining-room at that time and the honourable member made to go to the area in which the Labor Party usually sits. I said, “Kevin, come over here and sit with me. There are two of us here; let’s talk, even though we are on opposite sides of the fence.” Within a few minutes we were joined by the Premier. I am prepared to go on any lie-detecting machine that anybody can bring forward and I am prepared to swear an oath on the Bible that in the ensuing minutes the Premier and the member for Archerfield (Mr Kevin Hooper) discussed ways and means of defeating Liberal Party members at the coming election. Independent Labor members were mentioned. I heard the Premier say, “Kevin, we have to seek ways and means of defeating these Liberals”. I don’t tell lies, but I kept that a secret. As a matter of fact, I went outside and had a good vomit.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr HARTWIG: They can laugh, but it sickens me to find the same man—the leader who had stood up in the Whitlam era and said, “I am anti-Communist. I am anti-socialist.”—conniving with the ALP to bring about the demise of his Liberal colleagues. Let me put it on record that never at any time in my political career—or at any other time prior to that—have I ever connived to destroy my colleagues in Government, and I leave it to the people of the State of Queensland and the members of this Parliament to judge the action of a man who would do that. He denied it. He admitted then that he remembered having dinner with Kevin Hooper, or remembered talking to Kevin Hooper. He forgot I was there. He also forgot I was here when he made his Cabinet appointments!

I state to this House and to the media that I do not tell lies. I do not care two hoots whether there was a deal struck. The fact remains that I did not discuss this with the member Archerfield. I did not even name him in “Sunday Sun”. I did not know that he was going to say that this took place. However, it was on my conscience that the day I was expelled from the National Party I said, “You will rue the day.” I was referring to the party leaders. The statement was attributed to me that I would destroy the party. One word was left out: I would destroy the party leaders. There are a hell of a lot of good Queenslanders involved in the National Party. I did not say I would destroy the party. However, I make no secret of the fact—I have gone on record as saying it—that now Premier Joh’s job is on the line and there is a new Premier on the horizon. He is looming on the horizon. I assure the House also that when I am

finished with Sir Robert Sparkes he will disappear from the State leadership of the National Party.

Let me deal with Sir Robert Sparkes.

Mr Wright: I would like to check his financial situation at the moment.

Mr HARTWIG: I will leave that to the men of finance.

I lay it on the line once again that during the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation appeal I received a telephone call asking me to contribute a five-figure amount and to head the list for Central Queensland.

Mr Frawley: That’s right. You told me this the next day and I can verify it.

Mr HARTWIG: Yes. I told several people. However, I want to say that that person did not say it would get me into Cabinet. That is something that I considered only later. I point blank refused. Here again, I will swear on oath that I was requested to put in \$10,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation to head the Central Queensland list.

Mr Prest: Bill Gunn is hiding behind his hand over there.

Mr HARTWIG: Just keep quiet and listen.

It was not Bjelke-Petersen or Bob Sparkes who built this party. It was those people out there who pay their membership, who hold barbecues and who vote each election to put the members on the Government side back into office. They are the people I am concerned about. However, the Premier showed a complete lack of understanding for those people who have contributed so much to his cause to make him the longest-serving Premier in this State.

Let us look at the seat of Callide, Mr Deputy Speaker. When I was elected in 1972, I was opposed by candidates representing the ALP and the Democratic Labor Party. I received 50.3 per cent of the primary vote, which was enough to elect me without preferences being distributed. In the four elections that have been held since 1972, I have increased my percentage of the primary vote to 66 in a very strong Labor seat. Biloela, with hundreds and hundreds of coal-miners, meatworkers, powerhouse workers, dam workers, council workers, and their wives, is a highly industrialised area. Under the National Party banner, I obtained 70 per cent of the vote in that area.

Can anyone give me one good reason why any party—any mob of fogies on Capitol Hill—would want to dismiss a member of Parliament of my ability? And I say that I have some ability because members of all parties in this Chamber—Liberal, National and Labor—have appreciated and recognised it. The National Party has sacked me in a kangaroo court, because the letter that I received said, “You will be expelled unless you show cause.”

The Premier and Sir Robert Sparkes speak at great length about this great democratic, freedom-loving State. An example has been made of me, and I ask the media and the people of Queensland: How many backbenchers are game to appear on television today and voice their opinions freely?

Over the centuries, wars have been fought and men, women and children have died to achieve freedom of speech, thought and opinion without fear of recrimination. I stand in this place condemned by not one person who voted for me. Those who expelled me ignored the 8 500 out of 12 000 people who voted for me. If they had put that resolution to my electorate council, it would have been defeated three votes to one—and make no mistake about that!

The Premier later said that my credibility was nil. I say to Joh Bjelke-Petersen, Sir Robert Sparkes and everybody else that my credibility will stand comparison with that of anybody inside or outside this Parliament.

Mr Frawley: I reckon they have Carige lined up for your seat.

Mr HARTWIG: That is a good point, and I will take it. All I can say is that Carige said this morning that Callide would remain a safe seat for the National Party.

Mr Frawley: He tried to undermine you last time.

Mr HARTWIG: Yes, he did. I say to Carige that if he is the candidate for the National Party, I have \$10,000 to bet on the result, and the result will be that I will do him like a dinner. If a member goes before the people in four election campaigns and is re-elected each time with an increased majority, he must have something going for him.

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

Mr HARTWIG: Before the luncheon recess I was referring to the lack of representation in Cabinet of Central and North Queensland. Since this coalition Government was elected, never have Central and North Queensland been so denuded of Cabinet representation. We—now should I say “they”; the National Party—lost two seats in the North: one in Townsville formerly held by a Minister; the other the seat of Mourilyan. The National Party won a couple of seats on the Gold Coast, but it does not want to forget that the people in the far-flung areas in the State are the backbone of the great party known as the National Party.

The National Party deserted the North to such an extent that it spent approximately half a million dollars in and around Brisbane in an attempt to defeat its coalition colleague, the Liberal Party. I am led to believe, too, that in the Federal seat of

Capricornia the sum of \$30,000 was spent on the dearest political squib in Australia—Carige.

I was told that I was expelled because I spoke about forming a new State. For the benefit of those who have not seen me on television or heard me on radio, let me repeat that media reports to the effect that I was talking about forming a new State were a fabrication. Those reports were fabricated by a few of my opponents in Central Queensland, including someone who wrote an editorial in the Rockhampton “Morning Bulletin.”

I have said that if somebody can bring forward one person with whom I am alleged to have discussed the formation of (1) a new party or (2) a new State, I will give \$1,000 to any charity that such a person wishes to name. As honourable members know, I have not had any takers. And there will never be any takers. Yet it was on reports such as those that appeared in the media that I was sacked, in this so-called democratic State by this democratic Government.

Mr Frawley: That’s shameful.

Mr HARTWIG: Shameful indeed.

Everybody in Queensland acknowledges the tremendous importance to this State and nation of our primary industries. They produce food worth millions of dollars to this State for both home consumption and export. I want the Premier to tell the House how a bagful of black-eyed beans came to be addressed to him in a parcel marked “Books and magazines”. I want him to tell the House how he was exempted from the Quarantine Regulations after receiving or being consigned a 40lb bag of black-eyed beans.

Some years ago a certain man who owned some cattle introduced some semen and, as a result, had his whole herd shot and was imprisoned. I give the Premier an opportunity, before I spill the beans to this State and nation, to tell us from whom he received those beans. He has denied any knowledge of importing bean seeds into this country.

The importation of those beans has put the valuable agricultural industries of this State at risk. If somebody else did that he would be prosecuted and put in gaol. Yet the Premier can receive 40lb of black-eyed beans. Those beans were sent here for a purpose, and God only knows how many others have got through. The Premier got off simply by saying, “I don’t know anything about it.” The Premier said that a parcel addressed to him contained bean seeds. That is an absolute contradiction of what took place. I repeat that it was a tremendous risk to agricultural industry in this State.

Last year, in this Chamber, a debate took place about what was commonly called the

abortion Bill. There were three attempts to introduce it and eventually it was dealt with by Sir William Knox as a private member's Bill. Bob Sparkes rang me at least three times about that issue. He asked me to do my utmost to get National Party members, including me, to condemn the Bill, cross the floor and vote against it, and so have it defeated. I will take a lie detector test to prove that, and I ask Bob Sparkes to offer himself for the same test.

Mr Wright: You weren't the only one, either.

Mr HARTWIG: I am not here to tell lies. Of course other members were approached. That was completely offensive to democracy and parliamentary members. In fact, that sort of action carries a gaol sentence. I might add that I am seeking legal advice on those matters.

I want to give the lie to something else. The Minister for Transport, Ken Tomkins, and the commissioner were sent overseas on a world tour for six weeks to study the latest techniques in communication and transport so that, on their return, the State of Queensland would benefit. They went over at the expense of the taxpayer. Ken Tomkins came back from overseas and within three weeks he was made Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs. That is how much opportunity he was given to implement the knowledge that he had gained on his overseas trip. The Minister is laughing because he knows full well what a joke it was to send him overseas at the taxpayers' expense. And I am the sort of man who was expelled from the National Party, that great party that stands up for everybody.

Mrs Kyburz: What about the helicopter?

Mr HARTWIG: I thank the honourable member for the interjection. The other day I asked for some improvements at the hearing impaired unit at the Leichhardt Ward in Rockhampton, particularly for the benefit of young children with impaired hearing. The Minister's reply was that he agreed it was required but there were no funds. He said it would have to be considered in the 1981-82 or the 1982-83 Budget.

In the party room the other day somebody referred to the squash court. Joh said, "We want squash courts at Parliament House." Fancy an old man of 71 wanting to play squash! It is ridiculous. He is prepared to spend \$126,000 of taxpayers' money on that and not give the children in the far-flung areas of the State any help with school bus extensions and air-conditioning.

He nearly hanged Bertoni the other day—really ripped into him—when he asked for air-conditioning for his schools. He ripped into Martin Tenni because he wants a school. But he has \$126,000 for a squash

court at this already well-endowed playground. All of this time the roads in Central and North Queensland are becoming nothing more than dehydrated bitumen dog tracks. Russ Hinze is doing his best but he cannot get enough money. Although we already have a Government aircraft which cost millions of dollars, we can pay \$400,000 of the taxpayers' money for a helicopter.

Mrs Kyburz: What's it for?

Mr HARTWIG: "What's it for?," says Rosemary. Incidentally, I had lunch with Rosemary.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to her by her correct title.

Mr HARTWIG: We were sworn off that, too. National Party members were told that they could not sit at the same table as Rosemary, Bob Akers and a few more of them. We were told that. We were told not to be seen eating with them. But I can say that I enjoyed my lunch with Rosemary.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member will refer to other members by their correct titles.

Mr HARTWIG: We can hire a helicopter just as we hire cars. I do not hire a car; I run my own car at my own expense, as do most back-benchers. The Government buys aeroplanes and now it has bought a helicopter. Did Joh ask the Government back-benchers whether they wanted a helicopter? No, I read about it in the newspaper, just as I read about many other things. That is the way this Parliament is going. This Parliament did not sit for 160 days, yet in January 1980 the fruit growers in my electorate were decimated. They produce very good fruit—avocados, bananas, papaws and pineapples—for the Sydney and Melbourne markets, but I could not get a Minister of this Government to even go up and have a look at the plight in which those people found themselves. I appealed to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry and he said that all the State had to do was tie the application in. A few months after this occurred there was a flood at Goomeri and our beloved Premier was there the next day. He said, "You can have some money at a cheap rate of interest." My people were offered money at 10.125 per cent, yet the people of Goomeri were offered money at 6 or 7 per cent. Cop that one! That is the sort of thing that goes on, and yet without us, the back-benchers, Joh would not be Premier.

Not only did we lose a Minister in the North, we lost our only senator. I suppose I was one of the few members of the National Party at the time who advocated that Flo Petersen go to Canberra. I assure members that I have since been reliably

informed that Joh and Florence knew that if Florence could get to Canberra before the end of June she would be eligible for an extra \$140,000 or \$150,000 in super-annuation. But they conned Sheil into standing for McPherson. Sparkes came out and said that he did not have a hope in hell of winning the seat, but they put him up, got him beaten and then put Florence in. I leave it to the people of Queensland to judge whether that was right or wrong.

If they want to expel me and give me the works then they place me in the situation where I have no alternative but to defend myself and to tell the people of Queensland the truth about what is going on in this Parliament. Day after day we see it manipulated at taxpayers' expense. I want roads, bridges and hospitals. Martin Tenni wants schools, and the fellows in the West want more roads. We don't want helicopters and aeroplanes, we want roads. I have been expelled for being critical, but how many times has Joh Petersen got stuck into Malcolm Fraser?

Mrs Kyburz: Whenever it suits him.

Mr HARTWIG: That is right.

Our beloved Premier has called Fraser and threatened him. But what is the alternative to Fraser? A Labor Government! But does Bob Sparkes come down from Jandowae or Col Carige from Rockhampton and reprimand him because he speaks out? No, they say, "Good on you, Joh, you're sticking up for Queensland." I have stuck up for Callide and I have been sacked by a kangaroo court.

We need more positive drought mitigation. Over the years it has been in power this Government has never put forward one solid drought mitigation scheme. People in the South West and Far West have lost millions and millions of dollars but all the Government does is say, "Oh, we will have that shire declared a drought area. We will give concessions on stock transport and you can get your molasses carted for nothing." What the hell is the good of that? I had a splendid idea for minimising the effect of drought on our primary industries. Every time a heifer, cow or bullock dies not only does the owner suffer but the revenue of this State and nation suffers, too. As yet, nothing positive has been done to improve the situation.

What are we doing about the people on the land? All we have done is stand by while the price of fuel has increased almost to a ridiculous level. The people who have to use the long lines of communication are the ones who pay the high prices for fuel. They are the ones who have to get their children educated and who sometimes have to travel 50 or 100 miles to send a telegram. They have no telephonic communications and, in some cases, no television coverage.

I said to Vince Lester last night in Clermont, "Watch Channel 7 and see me on

'Today Tonight'". It was not a bad program, either, was it? Do honourable members know what Vince Lester said from Clermont? He said, "We can't get Channel 7." That was said from Clermont, which is almost a suburb on the east coast of this country. We have been in power in Canberra, and we have been in power here for 28 years, or something like that. What have we done for the people in the western areas of this State? Absolutely nothing.

I heard Neville Harper this morning talking about doing something about the mining companies. We are 20 years late in doing something about them. We have stripped people of their power and position and allowed them to be walked over and trodden on by big mining complexes. The little people whom most of us back-benchers represent have been annihilated by the big companies. Last Saturday I travelled on a plane with the owner of Winchester South, whose home and improvements will go underground in a few months; they will be dug up and buried. That man, whose assets total something like \$3m, has not received 1c, and does not look like receiving 1c. I wish you luck, Neville, in getting something done.

The situation is that this Government, which has been 20-odd years in office, is trying to bring forward some legislation. It has taken the Government a long time to wake up. The brains trust meets every week—and I say that with no offence to the Cabinet Ministers—while the other back-benchers and I who represent electorates have to wait 160 days for Parliament to meet before we can put any suggestions before it.

In the final words in my speech, I want to say that I am sick of party politics. Party politics are like trade unions: a lot of them have outlived their usefulness. I can say that now because I am an independent. They have outlived their usefulness. The days when we could come here to Brisbane and get things done for our electorates are fast vanishing. I heard a young fellow, the member for Mt Isa, get cut to pieces the other morning because he talked about air-conditioning his schools. Martin Tenni is jumping up and down threatening to resign. This is the same sort of thing over and over again. We have to run alongside some of the Ministers like a fox terrier chasing a Brahman bull in order to get a word in their ears.

I offer my loyalty and devotion to duty on behalf of my constituents. I have been prejudged, judged and sentenced by a kangaroo court. Never in the history of this great State and this great nation has that happened before. I stand expelled, but I say this: I stand here with my head high. The Premier said, "In a fortnight you will be like a shag on a rock." I can tell honourable members that if I am on a rock, he will be with me.

Mr Scott: Is that a threat?

Mr HARTWIG: No, it is not a threat; I am just putting him in his place. Of course he has done a great job for Queensland, but why doesn't he get out and give some of the younger blokes a go? They told me that I am too old at 60 to be a Cabinet Minister, but we have a Premier who is 71. I want to know what is the difference between the Premier and me. Anybody who likes to follow me around for a day, a week or a fortnight is at liberty to do so. Despite the fact that the people in my electorate, in four different elections in 10 years, have returned me to this place as their member in a democratically elected Government, I will never have the opportunity to impart to this Government the knowledge that I have, which would have been to the benefit of my people and the State of Queensland.

I say to all members, "Stand up for democracy." We, as the elected members of this Parliament, have the right to speak out, not the self-appointed fogies on Capitol Hill. We have been put here by the people; every three years we answer to the people. If at the end of three years the people do not like us, they can put us out. But I will not be put out by anybody on Capitol Hill—no way in the world. If they think they can silence me, they will find they have a tiger by the tail—and a bigger tiger than they thought!

I stand in this place as a democratically elected member, the same as you, Mr Speaker, and all other members including those who are not game enough to face the music in the Chamber but who are watching on closed-circuit television. Why aren't those members here to face the music?

I wish to congratulate some of the new Ministers. In a letter addressed to me one of them crossed out "Mr Hartwig" and wrote in "Dear Lindsay". At least that shows that he is reading his mail. I hate the letter I received from the Premier which commenced, "Dear Mr Hartwig". For nine years I have been one of his servants and I received a letter addressed in that fashion. I take exception to that. If the Premier does not know me by "Lindsay" now, he never will—but he did not write the letter!

What chance do back-benchers have to alter legislation and Government decisions? In those matters I include the purchase of such items as a helicopter. I read about that in the newspapers. I see that the Premier, as well as Beryl Young, is learning to fly it.

I stand for freedom of speech—I am against the suppression of speech—and I will go on fighting for freedom and democracy for the people I represent and for all other Queenslanders. I stand for freedom of thought and freedom of opinion. In so doing I hold my head as high as those who say that I have no credibility left.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (2.37 p.m.): It has become the convention in this State, and in all Parliaments that work under the

Westminster system, that at the opening of a new Parliament the Governor should make certain observations about the Government's legislative program for the next session. It is up to us, as members of Parliament, to reply to that Opening Speech. It is usually the opportunity for us to work the parish pump. Today it is quite obvious that one member, because of the problems that he has experienced, has had something to say.

As a Central Queenslander I concur with the honourable member for Callide on one major point: the lack of ministerial representation that we have in that area. Central Queensland will suffer in the long term and in the short term from the lack of Cabinet representation. I also concur with the honourable member in the points that he made about pressure being placed on members of Parliament, both within the Opposition and the Government, over certain issues. The time is fast approaching when some of us will have to take a major stand on the issues that we must determine and vote upon here. The member for Callide mentioned the proposed abortion legislation. I can factually back up his claim that the administration of the National Party tried to put pressure on certain Government members, because I, too, spoke to the Premier on the night before the vote was taken. At that time he admitted to me that, because of pressure coming from headquarters, the numbers were diminishing very quickly. So it seems that there is validity in what the honourable member for Callide said. One should listen very carefully to whatever else he says, because some of his speeches in this Assembly may be very revealing.

He has tended to put forward the point that all things in Queensland are not well, and that is the substance of my contribution today in this Address-in-Reply debate. I want to suggest that things are quite sick in the Deep North, as we are often portrayed. A deterioration is taking place in the realms of government and, although we in Opposition might like to think that it has been occurring for the last 25 years, it has certainly accelerated in the last three or four years, especially since the establishment of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation in 1979. I am told on good authority that it was initiated originally in 1978 by "the" Mr Sparkes—I suppose we must call him Sir Robert Sparkes. I am told, again on good authority, that he is the one who set up all the sordid aspects of this scheme, which has now pervaded every aspect of political life in this State and is undermining the very democratic process that we are here to represent.

When the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation was announced it was publicised in one of the newspapers as a scheme to save the National Party from bankruptcy. It was said that over three years it would try to raise \$2.5m. As members will remember, the question

arose as to how voluntary those donations were to be, because in a letter that Sir Robert Sparkes sent out he said inter alia—

“Your contribution clearly should be viewed not as an act of altruistic generosity but as a sound and very essential investment in the protection”—

and I emphasise that word—

“of your commercial future.”

Dr Lockwood: How come he sent one to you and he didn't send one to me?

Mr WRIGHT: He did not send one to me, but I have had the privilege to glean some of the information from an original letter. I am told that many Liberals, including Mr Litchfield, were able to get hold of a copy of the letter.

The point is that this was an invitation—an invitation to treat; an invitation to donate, to send hard-earned moneys to this very important foundation which was going to save the National Party. It was also a threat, and if we are going to make any analogies here, it is the analogy of the Mafia and the Godfather. It is “an offer you can't refuse”. It is no wonder that the Liberal Party got somewhat upset about it. It was Litchfield who claimed that the National Party was selling itself and the Government to the highest bidder. I know that that was the view held by a number of Liberals in this Assembly, some of whom unfortunately are not here any longer. They have been replaced by National Party members.

Mr Fouras: We do have in this State the best Government that money can buy.

Mr WRIGHT: We do have the best Government that money can buy, and the likes of Kern Brothers, the Bexley Corporation and all the others know all about that. Mr Williams is another gentleman who has learnt what can be bought by anyone interested in purchasing favours. Mr Litchfield said that business people not only received letters but also more bluntly received follow-up phone calls.

Mr Harper: What about John Curtin House?

Mr WRIGHT: I will take that interjection. There has been no opportunity for political favours by the ALP—not that we would countenance such action. I am interested in that interjection because I am told that the honourable member is one of the bagmen in the central region and that he raised \$60,000 or something like that figure. He can deny it, but I am told—

Mr Moore: Who did that?

Mr WRIGHT: The member for Auburn.

Mr Moore: That would be typical.

Mr WRIGHT: That may be. I was told that he was one of the bagmen for Central Queensland and that he very proudly raised something like \$60,000.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a point of order. I take exception to that statement and place on record that I have not raised any dollars whatsoever. I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr WRIGHT: I will accept that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Akers): Order! Does the honourable member for Auburn take exception to the words and wish them to be withdrawn?

Mr HARPER: I do, yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will withdraw them.

Mr WRIGHT: I will accept his explanation. Apparently the figure I have given is wrong, so I will withdraw it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw without reservation.

Mr WRIGHT: Very well, Mr Deputy Speaker. I wish to go on with my speech.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. In the next room, where I am receiving a deputation, I happened to overhear the honourable member saying the Kerns and all the rest of them can buy favours. I want to say to the honourable member that that is completely and utterly untrue. I am surprised that he makes that statement. I request that the honourable member withdraw that statement immediately, and I will let him off by not having to apologise on this occasion.

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw to your attention—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will resume his seat.

Mr Premier, there is no point of order. The honourable member has not referred to any member by name, other than the honourable member who took the point of order prior to yours. There is no point of order about any statement that I can have the honourable member withdraw.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I think you may have misunderstood my comment. The honourable member spoke in terms of companies buying favours from the Government by donations. He referred to Kern Bros and one or two other companies. That is completely untrue. It is unacceptable and the honourable member must withdraw that statement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Mr Premier, there is no provision in the Standing Orders under which a member can be forced to withdraw such statements.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: They are offensive to me, and for that reason they must be withdrawn. He has brought the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation into the debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not referred to the Premier by name, and there is no provision in the Standing Orders under which I can ask him to withdraw those comments.

Mr WRIGHT: I can understand that the Premier takes exception to what I am saying, because it is very serious.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is not true.

Mr WRIGHT: The honourable gentleman says that it is not true. I intend to show that it is true. If he will sit and wait and listen, he will see that he is the one who should be apologising, not me.

Let me get back to the point I was making. It was not the Labor Party but the Liberal Party, by the way, which claimed that pressure was being put on certain companies because of political favours.

Mr Moore: Which Liberal? Name the Liberal:

Mr WRIGHT: It was Stephen Litchfield. He claimed that not only were people being sent letters but also that they were followed up and that blunter overtures were being made in relation to their donations. It was also reported—and Mr Litchfield said this—that if they did not fork out the money, they would go to the bottom of the list in Government contracts. So perhaps the Premier should take some exception to what Mr Litchfield said.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, how long are you going to allow a member to make statements, quoting somebody outside Parliament, that are completely untrue?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no provision in Standing Orders for the Speaker of this House to take any action on the points that have been raised by the honourable member for Rockhampton. They can be denied by further speakers who wish to defend the Government, but the honourable member has a perfect right to make them.

Mr WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I now substantiate my claim. On 8 July 1979, in a story published by "The Sunday Mail", headed "Joh fund standover

claimed", Mr Litchfield said that the Nationals were openly selling their party, and thus the Government, to the highest bidders. He said—

"People are saying, 'What do we do? If we don't fork out money we go on the bottom of the list for Government contracts.'"

That is not my allegation; it is an allegation by a very senior Liberal. In fact, he is the Executive Director of the Liberal Party, Mr Stephen Litchfield.

I believe that the claim can be substantiated, because a few days later—on 11 July 1979—"The Australian" newspaper carried a story of a \$250,000 bribe offer that was made to the National Party. That was announced not by any Liberal but by Mr Compton, who I believe was the professional fund-raiser hired by the National Party, and Sir Robert Sparkes substantiated that such an overture was made. Honourable members will note that no company was named. However, no legal action was ever initiated in relation to such a bribery offer. No effort was made to bring the people concerned to justice, and it is quite obvious that they flouted the criminal law.

So one begins to question a few things. If the bribe was made so blatantly, did the company act with such optimism that it had good reason to believe that it was going to be accepted? That is the first question that one must ask. It has been suggested to me that the whole story was a put-up by Sir Robert Sparkes to show that the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation would not take the money, thus establishing an image of honesty. There has been a third suggestion, that is, that the \$250,000 was not enough for the political favours being asked.

Irrespective of all that, the whole idea of bribery is now in keeping with the reputation of this Government, the National Party, and the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. I suggest that the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is the greatest political scandal ever to hit what might be called the Bjelke-Petersen reign.

The Premier says that he is free of it. However, I read another statement in "The Australian Financial Review" of 17 July 1979, in which he dissociated himself from the tactics being used by his own party to raise money, and his comment was, "It's not for me to judge." It is quite obvious that he did not want any part of it. He says that he is free of any involvement except in the use of his name. It has been rattled around the corridors that Mr Sparkes is the architect; that he is the bagman; and that he is the bully. From what has happened to the honourable member for Calide, it seems that he is certainly the bully.

The whole scheme is a political rort, and it has the built-in elements of a protection racket. It certainly could have taught Al

Capone a few things. Simply put, it is a system of placing pressure on business for financial backing, especially companies that are likely to get contracts from the Government.

I note also a report on 12 July 1979 in which it was admitted by the official fundraiser that a record was being kept, not only of those who gave money but also of those who refused to donate. We start to wonder why this would happen. From information provided to me it is also obvious that evidence clearly shows that people who have donated have benefited. Keith Williams is certainly one of these people.

Other information available to me shows that National Party heavyweights such as Sir Robert Sparkes and Ministers have personally approached business people in order to get money. This has also been admitted in the newspapers. I suggest that that is improper and that it raises the whole question of the propriety of members of Parliament and Ministers playing the role of bagmen.

We have heard the member for Callide say—I think it was the member for Caboolture who also said it—that pressure was placed on him to pay up in order to get anywhere in the National Party. It is quite obvious that the comment made by the member for Callide concerning a five-figure donation does not tell us something that is new. It was stated in the Press that Mr I. J. Gibbs, who now, strangely, is a Minister, made a donation of at least \$5,000.

Mr Kruger: Regularly, I believe.

Mr WRIGHT: A regular donation?

Another person who was appointed to Cabinet after a very short time, Mr Max Hooper—who formerly represented Townsville West but is now no longer with us—made a substantial donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr Smith: I understand he asked for his money back.

Mr WRIGHT: He may have done.

Those people were donors and were also able to obtain some benefit. The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is an example of extortion at its worst. It has been aimed at Government contractors, it has been used to obtain financial pledges from companies, especially near election-time, and it is based on an advertising con trick that should be investigated by the Trade Practices Commission.

The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation's activities are centred on a magazine titled "National Outlook", which is a National Party publication. From information that is available to all honourable members, it is obvious that the foundation is ripping off the taxpayers. If donations to the foundation are allowed

as tax deductions, it means that the Australian public are paying approximately \$1.2m of the \$2.5m that will finally be donated.

Sir Robert Sparkes is the one who engineered the whole scheme. He sent out the letters. He made a mockery of himself and his party by including in the letters a way to ensure that a donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation was a tax deduction. He is the very man who came out time and time again saying that we should close the tax loopholes at Federal level. Yet he sent out a brief on how to give money to the National Party and claim it as a tax deduction. He said, "We will make advertisements available to you in our magazine, 'National Outlook'. Here is a High Court judge's decision stating that such an advertisement is clearly a tax deduction."

Dr Lockwood: Mind you, the trade unions are doing that, too.

Mr WRIGHT: Not at these prices, I assure you.

This is certainly a fraudulent system of fixing advertising rates. If someone buys a 15 cm by 3-column advertisement in any one of the daily papers published throughout the State, he pays approximately \$2 a column-centimetre. If he buys such an ad in one of the national magazines, he pays approximately \$10 a column-centimetre. However, such an advertisement in the National Party magazine, based on the figures I have, would cost \$25,000. In other words, the advertisement costs approximately \$600 a column-centimetre, and that is a lot of money. In some areas the sum might be \$5,000 a centimetre and in others \$1,000 a centimetre. Nevertheless, it is a tax dodge.

Serious allegations have constantly been made not only by Labor Party members but by Government members as well. We have heard allegations of bribery and of having to pay money to get into Cabinet. We have heard allegations of having to pay to be given a knighthood. An example is Sir Justin Hickey. We have heard allegations of contracts that have been allowed, of approvals that have been given to all types of applications and of support that has been forthcoming, regardless of decisions against those contracts. We have also heard allegations of political intervention.

Mr Jones: What is the current price for a knighthood?

Mr WRIGHT: I do not know. One would have to go back to the days of Sir Bruce Small. I do not know what he paid.

Mr Jones: \$40,000.

Mr WRIGHT: He got ripped off.

The point I want to make—the Premier has claimed there is no evidence of this—is that links between people who have donated and the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation are clearly beginning to emerge.

Recently, in a speech, I raised the link with the Bexley Corporation and the Hudson Conway Corporation. I mentioned also our “friends” the Kern group, and I shall talk about them right now. When I raised the matter the other day a gentleman by the name of Barry Paul dissociated himself from everything I said and tried to twist the whole argument on what was happening in other little places and nothing to do with Toowoomba. The allegation was that the rezoning application in Toowoomba was opposed by the Chamber of Commerce, consumer groups and local shoppers but Mr Hinze, with all of his Solomonlike wisdom, put it through.

It was discovered that a local Liberal alderman, who happened to be a Liberal candidate, had shares in the Kern group. This was cast aside. On a television program, Mr Barry Paul tried to make out that I was wrong in what I was saying and, when he finally got down to it, it was found that he was arguing the number of shares. I have documents here, if honourable members want to see them, that show clearly that the Liberal candidate had 6250 shares between himself and his wife. But that is not the only point.

Since that time I have been trying to establish what I call the Kern connection—the connection between the Kern Corporation Limited and the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and the National Party Government. I think I have finally found it. The connection has to do with the SGIO. I have some questions that I have been trying to ask for over a week and I will put them to the Assembly now by way of assertion. I hope that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police and also the Treasurer, who is in charge of the SGIO, might make ministerial statements at a later date.

I am prepared to table this information. In 1977 Mr Eric Riding, who was the general manager of the SGIO, acquired a parcel of shares in Kern Limited. Some time in 1977 or later Eric Riding was to become general manager of the SGIO Building Society. In 1977 Kern was building the Bundaberg Sugarland Shopping Centre, which just happened to be purchased by the SGIO. I am told there are lease-back arrangements but of that I am not certain. Later than that, Kern just happened to build the Gladstone Kiandra Shopping Centre and again it was purchased by the SGIO. Kern went on then and in 1979 built the Mackay Caneland Shopping Centre, and it was purchased by the SGIO for, I am told, \$15m. A massive profit is said to have been involved. Kern went on to build the Bowen shopping centre—and it goes on and on and on.

An Opposition Member: The same thing in Cairns.

Mr WRIGHT: At Cairns, too?

Mr Kruger: Sir David Nicholson, the former Speaker, is connected with it.

Mr WRIGHT: I intend to mention that, because it is very interesting.

I think we finally have the link, because here is a person in a decision-making role within the SGIO making determinations affecting a company in which he has a financial interest. It is a company that, a few years ago, it was suggested was broke, or so close to it that it did not matter. Suddenly, during the past five years, it has become a very wealthy company. It seems to have tremendous power. It can break through all the opposition of local authorities. It can beat chambers of commerce. It can defeat all the environmental and economic impact studies required by law.

Dr Lockwood: Economic impact studies were not required then—they have been since—so they could not meet them then.

Mr WRIGHT: I accept the interjection on that point. But when an application is before a Government and a new law comes in, it is normally made retrospective to ensure that, if a matter has not been determined, it should be determined under the new law. That is normally what prevails, but in instances such as Toowoomba and Mooloolaba it did not work that way. Instead, the Minister for Local Government intervened.

It is also more than interesting that a past SGIO general manager not only held shares but was also on the board of directors of Kern. I believe I have found the connection and I believe that the connection is a sordid one. It is costing the people of this State millions of dollars.

I want a full and proper inquiry. I want to know exactly when Kern became involved with the SGIO, what sort of shares Riding has, how long he has had those shares and how many other people in the SGIO and in some of these other decision-making areas, such as the Department of Local Government, have shares in Kern, because decisions are being made that are not in the interests of the public; decisions are being made that are discriminating in favour of the Kern group.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: In short, what you are saying is that as far as the SGIO Building Society is concerned the Kern group is really only a smile away.

Mr WRIGHT: I believe there is a close link there.

But one can go further. I received a telephone call from a person in Townsville on Thursday. It was my intention to try

to speak to members from that area, but I did not get that opportunity. The call had to do with the take-over of what is known as the Pallarenda Quarantine Station, which is owned by the Commonwealth Government. It is to be handed over to Telecom, the parks and wildlife section of the Commonwealth Government and the State Government. But I have also been told on good authority, and this can be checked through the Titles Office, that Kern will get something like 44.6 ha of land in that area for a development project, probably for a housing subdivision.

Mr Smith: They will build a casino on it.

Mr WRIGHT: I do not know what they are going to build on it. I was told originally that it was to be a housing subdivision. I am also told that no-one other than Kerns was offered this land, and they are the ones who will get it. I am also told that it will mean the destruction of a beautiful building that was erected at a cost at something like \$200,000. It will just be bulldozed.

I have also had allegations made to me about the role of a fellow named Morton in this matter. Apparently he was the National Party candidate who stood against the member for Townsville at the last election. He just happens to be an executive member of the Kern Corporation, so obviously there is another link there. But one can go even further about what Kerns are doing around the place. I had a phone call and then a letter from Atherton because Mr Barry Paul said there were no problems there. A firm wrote to me and said that it had been in contact with the Minister but that he was not prepared to help. Apparently the firm entered into an agreement on 4 May 1979 to sell some land to Kerns for the construction of a shopping complex. The option was to expire on 4 November 1979. But the real estate representative who handled the transaction, a fellow by the name of Kel Griffiths—I think the Minister would know him, he is a National Party member from up Townsville way—

Mr Smith: Vice-president.

Mr WRIGHT: Is that right? He happens to work for Cain Real Estate. The firm claims he organised it so that the option was changed, and Kerns now have an option until two weeks after the rezoning is published in the gazette. It has still not been published. The land was originally priced at about \$100,000, but I am told it is now worth something like \$150,000 to \$200,000. But when this was raised with the Minister for Local Government he said he could not see fit to intervene. I am also told that Kerns have done a deal with the Atherton Town Council, that they will buy some land that is not very valuable but will pay over \$100,000 for it because the council is prepared to approve this shopping complex.

It occurs over and over again. We find that 23 shops have been built in the Tannum Sands area recently, but now Kerns have been given approval to build another shopping centre at Boyne Island, barely a quarter of a mile away. We find that the same thing has happened at Mooloolaba, except that this time it is a high-rise building. On this occasion the Minister for Local Government is involved. Regardless of the environmental studies that have been carried out, the Minister has intervened. I was hoping to put him on the spot about this, but I will read what appears under his signature—

“I reverse the Council’s decision to refuse the application dated the 21st January, 1980 by Kern Land (Brisbane) Pty. Ltd. for the erection of a multiple dwelling on land situated at the corner of Parkyn Parade and River Esplanade, Mooloolaba and described as . . .”

It was signed “R. J. Hinze”. Now, why did the Minister reverse the council’s decision? Why is it that when the people of Toowoomba—

Mr Hinze: Don’t take it out of context. Tell the full story.

Mr WRIGHT: I am prepared to table all of it. All I know is that the Minister intervened. All I know is that Kerns tried to get this 17-storey complex approved and were knocked back by the council. It is now going ahead with the construction of a 15-storey building.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is apparently trying to indicate to the House that there is something irregular about my decision in this matter. All that I did—

Mr Prest: Don’t make a ministerial statement.

Mr HINZE: Don’t interject, I am trying to make a sensible statement to the House.

Mr Prest: You take your point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Akers): Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is no provision for the Minister to make a statement at this stage that I know of, and if there is something in the Standing Orders that he wishes to cite to me I will listen to it. But in the meantime unless he wants to take a point of order—

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. I referred the matter back to the council because, in discussions with my own Director of Local Government, he said he believed that this was the correct procedure to adopt, and that is exactly what happened.

Mr WRIGHT: Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker: Are you saying that you did not send any telexes when you were out West and people approached you about it? In

fact, Barry Paul approached you. Are you going to tell me that Barry Paul did not have private discussions about the applications that he presented to you and that you never invited him to come and talk before the decisions were made? Are you prepared to say that that is not true?

Mr HINZE: Mr Deputy Speaker, you see the position that the honourable member is trying to put me into. He is provoking an argument. I have to reply. You have to give me the latitude to reply.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am taking it as an interjection.

Mr HINZE: I have indicated quite clearly in this House that I have discussions with responsible people, such as Kern Bros, who would make representations to any Minister. Of course I am in consultation with the Kern group and many other groups weekly, and there is nothing wrong with that—nothing at all.

Mr WRIGHT: Let me put it clearly so that it is on the record: Did you invite Barry Paul to have private discussions with you about their applications on the rezonings for shopping centres and for building projects prior to the decision being made? Yes or no?

Mr HINZE: In reply to the honourable member, I did not invite anybody to have private discussions with me at any time whatsoever. Any discussions that I have had were official.

Mr WRIGHT: Thank you. That is all I wanted to know. In a television interview that "Nationwide" conducted the other night—and Jane Singleton was the one who carried the interview—I put it on Mr Barry Paul about whether he ever met you. He said, on camera, that you invited him for personal discussions about that subject.

Mr Hinze: You said prior to the discussions.

An Opposition Member: What's the difference?

Mr Hinze: If you don't know the difference you are too stupid to understand.

Mr WRIGHT: Well, I do not unnecessarily want to cast aspersions on the Minister.

Mr Hinze: Don't you cast aspersions here.

Mr WRIGHT: No, just a moment. What I am saying to you, Mr Minister, through Mr Deputy Speaker, is that Mr Paul has already dobbed you in. He has already got you, hook, line and sinker.

Mr Hinze: It might be in your phraseology "dobbed in".

Mr WRIGHT: Well, he has. He has got you. He has dobbed you in. I don't think that he meant to do it, but he has admitted it. I suggest that the Minister has been involved in too many of these matters, and I am not sure of the reason, and maybe we ought to try to find out. That is the reason I want to be positive about this whole thing.

The time has come for this Parliament to set up some type of a Resources-Contract Committee. In the past we have talked about public accounts committees and public works committees, but the time is coming when we ought to get together on an all-party basis and formulate some terms of reference so that we can clear up what is going on. I have just had handed to me—a document indicating that Kern was given some type of rebate or exemption on \$400,000 in stamp duty in Townsville. Why? How come that Kern is getting such privileged treatment? How is it that that group can go and build a shopping centre at Boyne Island when it is going to wipe out the shops at Tannum Sands? How come it can build another complex in Toowoomba and wipe out a shopping centre about 100 m away? How come it can fly in the face of environmental impact studies at Mooloolaba and simply destroy the whole idea of the strip there by building a 15 or 17-storey complex? It is going to tear up tennis courts and close down caravan parks. It is just not on, but it is doing it. It is happening everywhere, and I want to know why. I believe that the connection comes back to fellows called Eric Riding, Sir David Nicholson and some of those other Sirs. We ought to change the terminology to "Cur".

Mr R. J. Gibbs: "Cur" with a capital C.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes, it should be "Cur". Because of what it is doing, that is the way it should be. If the Minister is not involved, if he is not party to it and he is not the bagman—and that is what he is accused of—then he should start cleaning it up. He should set up the committee here. He should initiate it. Then we could have an all-parliamentary committee to start investigating these matters, including all the land deals that are going on. The Japanese are buying land near Gympie and buying land in the central region of Queensland. I am not referring to the Iwasaki project, but to other land. Americans are coming here and buying our grazing land. We do not know what is going on. We have a register of leased land, but we have no control over freehold land unless the Local Government Department tells us; the councils are the only ones who know. All we know is that this State is being taken over.

It is time that we, as members of Parliament, stood up and said, "We are going to put a stop to it." We will put a stop to it only when we have some power and rights. That will come about only if we

have an all-party select committee with proper terms of reference, so that when the Government enters into a contract we can see it. If Ministers know that that is going to happen, it will be a deterrent to them. Neither they nor departmental heads will dare engage in these sorts of rorts. If a company linked with the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is involved in a contract we will know about it.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member referred to the Government's being in some sort of a rort. I take exception to the statement. On behalf of the Government I deny that. He specifically referred to my department; I deny that there are any rorts or rackets whatsoever. I ask that he withdraw and apologise.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Akers): Order! There has been no specific mention of a member of this House, therefore there is no method by which the member can be asked to withdraw the statement.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a further point of order. For the time being I am the Minister representing the Government of this State. The honourable member for Rockhampton has said that the Government is in rackets and rorts. On behalf of the Government I take exception to that. I say that a statement derogatory to the Government has been made, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister will resume his seat. I have already ruled that there is no provision for a withdrawal in these circumstances. Unless a member of this House is specifically referred to, there can be no order for withdrawal.

Mr WRIGHT: I am sorry to upset the Minister because that was not my intention. I want to try to get to the truth. I would hope that the Minister might lend his support and use his position as Minister for Local Government to find out who now owns Queensland. I ask him to approach local authorities in an effort to set up a register so that we will know exactly who owns our farming and grazing lands and to support the publication of all donors and donations to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. If the companies motives are honourable, they shouldn't mind.

If the Minister wants to talk about problems and corruption, in closing I will deal with a local issue, but one that involves the Government through the Prisons Department. Some time ago I asked for an inquiry into Etna Creek Prison, because of the circumstances surrounding the escape of two prisoners, and because of allegations against the prison administration such as that the administration knew of the escape plans before it occurred. Since that time, because of the pressure that has been placed on the

State administration for an investigation, there have been numerous examples of victimisation, including the transfer of one officer. I now want that inquiry to be a judicial one because I believe I was conned by departmental heads.

In this matter I did the responsible thing. I first of all contacted the department and went to see the Comptroller-General (Mr Collins). I also spoke to the Deputy Comptroller (Mr Lewis) and I personally saw the previous Minister, Mr Doumany. At a meeting with him, Mr Johnson and others and I were given assurances that action would be taken. They promised to investigate these matters. I listed 60-odd different allegations or charges, and I was assured that something would be done. I was assured that such incidents as the superintendent of Etna Creek Prison bashing a prisoner until he could not stand on his feet, and medical care having to be brought to him, would be thoroughly investigated. I was assured that a blackmail attempt on a prisoner called Exell, who took hash oil into the prison, would also be thoroughly investigated. I was told that all these matters would be cleaned up but nothing has been done. Instead, officers who have tried to fight back have been victimised. Since that escape seven officers, some having service up to 11 years, have resigned. They left the system because they could not cop it any longer.

Dr Lockwood: Who gave the assurances?

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Doumany was the first one. He did it personally. In fact, he made comments about a senior officer. I will not reveal them because they were of a private nature.

By his observations I was convinced that something would be done, but nothing has been done. The superintendent has put on parties that have lasted from 24 to 36 hours. Young lasses have been running around the prison with flowers in their hair. I see some Government members nodding; obviously they know what has been going on. There have been wild drinking parties; prisoners have returned at 6 o'clock rotten drunk from the farm. Nothing has been done about that. A houseboy—some honourable members might understand what is meant by a "houseboy"—has been living in with the superintendent and working for him in his home. Nothing has been done about that! There have been parties at the superintendent's home where lasses have been running around in bikinis. One of the rules is that the prisoners who are locked in their cells should not be upset too much yet the superintendent has paraded women in front of them. Some of the things that have been going on there are just shocking. They are corrupting for the prisoners.

There have been all sorts of other problems when rifles have been taken from the armoury without being registered. Two prisoners escaped without difficulty despite the

fact that the administration was prewarned. One prisoner has been locked up for six months in a special security cell, but no-one can say why. The superintendent has gone into a hotel in Rockhampton and employed people over the bar—I have the names of four of them. Why hasn't there been an investigation or an inquiry? What are Mr Collins, Mr Lewis and the new Minister (Mr White) doing about it? It seems that the answer is, "Nothing". It seems that they are prepared to cover up what has been going on for a long time. I suggest the time has come to clean the matter up; so in this instance I want a judicial inquiry into all past events and the present administration.

Mr Prest: Tell us about that houseboy and the girls in bikinis. You have Mr Frawley up on his seat.

Mr Frawley: I don't want the Woodford prisoners to hear about that; otherwise they will be escaping to go up to Etna Creek.

Mr WRIGHT: I did not want this to turn into a flippant debate because it is a matter of great seriousness in my own region. I am sure that other members in the area would appreciate that.

Prisoners have escaped and local residents have been bashed. We have had all sorts of complaints about the security of this prison. It is supposed to be maximum security, but it has certainly not been that. It took months and months for them to close gaps where the bars had been twisted above a gateway. There have been many problems. Prisoners have been found with screws in their pockets that had obviously come out of the sections around the windows, but nothing has ever been done about it. Then there was the shocking spectacle of two prisoners going into a court and speaking on behalf of the superintendent and accusing some nine or 10 prison officers of undermining the administration.

There has been blackmail, there has been alleged promiscuity and there has been drunkenness. Rules have been blatantly broken, but nothing has been done. The question is—why? I believe it is because the administration is afraid. For some reason, it seems Mr Collins and Mr Lewis are afraid to act. It is almost as though someone has something on them. I do not want to get personal about it, although sometimes in this debate it is pretty hard not to get that way; but I have tried everything. I have done it the proper way and almost sold my people down the drain. I kept saying, "No, I will wait. I will wait because Mr Collins said this will happen."

Lewis even came to my parliamentary office and met three prison officers. We sat there and he took down in his own notes every point that was being made about victimisation. He gave us all the total assurance—me, as the member, another officer and these other fellows—that this would be investigated. Nothing has been

done. Officers from Brisbane apparently went to the prison. They said that they had carried out an inquiry, but they did not call any witnesses.

I have here a document that outlines some of the problems and it has been presented to the State Service Union. It speaks of one person—a senior officer. I will actually read the words. This is a statement to Borinetti, the superintendent. It says—

"Ron! I must commend you. You've had a very difficult job this last two years. You've had to work very hard to keep the lid on a tin of very angry worms."

To start with, fancy anyone calling prison officers "worms".

As to this Borinetti—he can never be found. He has been known to be rotten drunk in some hotel. This is his own personal life; but, when it starts interfering with his role as superintendent of that prison, when he starts employing people over the bar against the regulations, when he starts victimising prison officers, when he starts allowing people into the prison illegally, when he condones the use of firearms to go on pig hunts in the middle of the night when his prison officer friends come from Brisbane, something is wrong.

I suggest it is time Etna Creek Prison was cleared up. I suggest that Borinetti ought to be investigated. The whole Etna Creek situation has to be the subject of a special judicial inquiry. The Minister says there is nothing wrong in Queensland. I suggest that there is a lot wrong, and it is a pity the Governor did not rewrite his speech, because I do not think he would have started off the way he did had he known what I have disclosed.

Mr JENNINGS (Southport) (3.18 p.m.): On behalf of my constituents in Southport, I congratulate Mr Speaker and the Chairman of Committees on their election and appointment.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: This couldn't be described as a maiden speech, could it?

Mr JENNINGS: I think the member has his maidens mixed up.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member will be heard.

Mr JENNINGS: I would like to express my loyalty and also that of my constituents to the Queen and compliment the Governor and Lady Ramsay on the great job they do for Queensland. I am certainly surprised and proud to be representing the seat of Southport. I appreciate the support and vote of the people and also the efforts of the many people in the party and their good ladies who

helped and worked for us. A little while ago we heard the member for Callide address the Parliament.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It's not his maiden speech.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I regard this as the honourable member's maiden speech in this House and I ask that the usual courtesies be extended to him.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I point out that the honourable member has had considerable experience in the Victorian Parliament. Consequently, he would be the best-worn maiden in this Chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I warn the honourable member under Standing Order 123A for disputing a decision of the Chair.

Mr JENNINGS: A short while ago we heard the honourable member for Callide address the House, and we also heard him address the meeting on the night on which the senator was chosen to go to Canberra. On that occasion he mentioned a Mr George Robinson. It was a derogatory reference, and it was very unfortunate. I have known George Robinson, to whom he referred, since the 1960s. I have bought cattle from him, and he is a fine man, a man of integrity. It is most unfortunate that that reference was made during that debate.

I should also like to jog the memory of the honourable member for Callide, because a number of honourable members have mentioned to me that two weeks ago he put in a letter of resignation to the party secretary. The party secretary took that letter to the Premier and the Premier handed it back, because it was his intention to do everything possible to assist the honourable member for Callide. I remind the honourable member for Callide of that because it is very important and, unfortunately, he did not refer to it in his speech.

A number of unfortunate references have been made during the debate this afternoon, one of which is particularly insulting to many fine people. I refer to the substitution of the word "cur" for the word "sir". Irrespective of what anyone thinks of knighthood, it is part of a system that we were born with and under which we have grown. Many fine people in all walks of life have been knighted, and comments made do not do anyone justice. They certainly do not do justice to the honourable member who made them.

Many allegations and scurrilous attacks have been made—and I have heard them this afternoon—about the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I ask for a ruling on this point, Mr Deputy Speaker. If a member, in his maiden speech, refers to other members and in some way provokes comment, are you going to rule that no action can be taken by those members by way of interjection?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I have made no ruling on that matter. I have reminded all honourable members of the provisions of Standing Order 120, which relates to personal reflections, and I ask all honourable members to pay due regard to that Standing Order.

Mr WRIGHT: With all due respect, that is not my point. You made a reference by asking a member of the Opposition and almost forcing him to leave—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not. I warned him once under Standing Order 123A.

Mr WRIGHT: All right, you warned him.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: He was not asked to leave.

Mr WRIGHT: The honourable member who has been speaking is now beginning to develop some comments around a speech made by me and comments made by others. I now ask for your ruling. Are we allowed to interject on him if he becomes provocative?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, you would be allowed to interject if he becomes provocative. However, once again I ask all honourable members to observe the courtesy usually extended to a member making his maiden speech, and I ask the honourable member making the speech not to provoke other honourable members unduly.

Mr JENNINGS: I thank you for your advice, Mr Deputy Speaker. I regard this as a normal speech. Honourable members can forget that it is a maiden speech if they wish.

As I said, some scurrilous allegations have been made this afternoon about one of the worst diseases of a democracy. I refer to bribery and corruption. Allegations have been made without one shred of evidence to support them. I have lived in Victoria under a Government that is riddled with bribery and corruption. A royal commission that began in June 1979 is still continuing. The Government has spent \$1.5m on it to date and 12 000 pages of evidence have been taken.

Certain honourable members have made allegations about rezoning procedures, and so on. There are certain rezoning procedures in Queensland, and people in this State have certain rights that are not available to

people in other States. If a person's property is rezoned and it is devalued, he has a right to compensation. That exemplifies private enterprise and gives a great advantage to property owners.

Before leaving the allegations of bribery, I say straight out that I think one of the greatest disadvantages of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is its name. It has nothing to do with the parliamentary party.

Mr Scott: It has that purpose though, hasn't it?

Mr JENNINGS: No. Members of the Opposition know very well about the John Curtin Foundation in Canberra.

Mr Scott: That's totally different.

Mr JENNINGS: The same methods were used to raise money for the John Curtin Foundation in Canberra.

As I was saying, the most unfortunate aspect of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is its name. Something that will stick in my mind forever is that back in June 1974 the worst examples of bribery and corruption were exposed in "The Age". When the spring session of Parliament came—the Labor Party was in Opposition—not one question was asked about those Press reports. Why did the members of Parliament bury their heads? I know why no questions were asked. Opposition members here make allegations about bribery and corruption. They make allegations without one shred of evidence. That is absolutely shameful. They are showing the public what they really are. What I am saying is that Opposition members will have to bring some evidence forward.

To turn to my own area—Southport is an exciting electorate. It has high-rise development, it relies on tourism and has beautiful residential areas. It contains beautiful waterways, The Broadwater and the Nerang River. Some of the highest of high-rise buildings, such as Focus and Golden Gate, are in my electorate. Many people think that they are all in Surfers Paradise. They are in my electorate, too.

A number of people have opposed the construction of high-rise buildings. They forget that back in the 1970s certain people had the foresight to zone the area for high-rise development. At that time, no-one objected. People who have moved into the area since did not have to come to it. Some magnificent buildings are being erected and I congratulate the developers on the job they are doing.

It is only relatively recently that we have seen a boom in high-rise development. New residential areas are on Chevron Island, Cronin Island, Sorrento and Paradise Waters. Most people who live in my electorate regard it as an incredible area. I agree with them.

As I have said, the electorate contains the beautiful Nerang River and The Broadwater. Hundreds of boats, including a fleet of 36-odd trawlers, use the waterways.

This morning an announcement was made to the effect that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was embarking on a plan to develop The Broadwater and to construct training walls at the entrance of it. The authority controls an area from the bridge at Southport to the Brisbane River. It has a big job to do. It has the problem of silting in the waterway and of providing permanent moorings for boats. It is faced with the problem of pollution from boats at busy times of the year. I am sure that the new plans will be accepted by the people who live in the area.

Southport contains a large number of industries such as boat-building, sophisticated laser technology, sand-mining and manufacturing industries. The area also contains a clothing factory, Crossie Clothing, which employs 200 people. Those in the local work-force are extremely happy because they like living and working in the area. There is very little industrial strife.

The area also contains many new housing estates and developments. The sales techniques that are adopted on the Gold Coast are not to be seen anywhere else in Australia. Where else in Australia would one see signs in a real estate agent's window showing prices that have been crossed out and increased instead of decreased, as one usually sees? This is done to encourage people to get in quickly and buy before the prices go higher.

People are coming to the Gold Coast thick and fast. When 100 families move into the area, they create jobs. The area contains the magnificent Gold Coast hospital and many beautiful retirement villages. Over the past three months, SEQEB made 500 house and unit connections each month. It is engaged in future planning to cope with the increased growth. The growth of Telecom connections in the area is three times the Australian average. The annual increase is 24 per cent. Whereas four years ago some primary schools had an enrolment of 200 pupils each, today they have an enrolment of 900 pupils each, and the figure is steadily rising.

Of course, because of this growth, we have problems. We have problems with traffic, school requirements and, in some areas, high-rise development. But Southport is certainly a delightful place to live. I have been elected, as we all have been, to do the best possible to overcome those problems.

Our responsibility is to set an example. Every member of Parliament, no matter what his political persuasion, has a contract with his electorate to see that the traditional and constitutional rights of the country are maintained.

I thank the honourable member for Port Curtis for his best wishes on my recent marriage. I express my appreciation to the staff at Parliament House and other honourable members. It was really great to come up here. It is certainly a very pleasant place to work.

Many people have asked me to compare this Parliament with the Victorian Parliament. There must be some good salesmen up here to have provided this building. The facilities, including the gymnasium and the pool, are excellent and there is no doubt that they lead to better work being done. First impressions are often important.

There are some funny things said in the South about the Queensland Parliament, but this Parliament has a broad depth of talent and basic common sense. The reason for that is that so many honourable members on both sides of the House have both suburban and farming areas in their electorates while others have almost everything—rural, cattle, sheep, grain, big mining projects and tourism. Sometimes that basic common sense is somewhat obscured by the occasional ding-dong fracas.

Another point mentioned early in the piece, when Mr Speaker was elected, concerned question-time. Some members said how unjust it was. After listening for a few days it became quite clear to me that question-time in this Parliament appears to be most efficient. A lot of questions are put through. The results are there to see. Every couple of days I found that 45 to 50 questions were asked and answered. I went back and made a check. I found that 4 611 questions were asked and answered in this Parliament over the past two years whereas 3 419 questions were asked and answered in the same period in Victoria.

Mr Kruger: It is not the number that is important.

Mr JENNINGS: That is right because in Victoria 1 089 questions were unanswered in that period. Once a question appears on the notice paper, if it is unanswered it remains on the notice paper and that question cannot be asked again. Here a question is asked and the answer is given the next day. So our question-time is most efficient. In addition, Mr Speaker allows a lot of elasticity in some of the questions that are asked. They are so long that they are more like speeches. Some of them have 10 different sections.

Mr Underwood: That's because we don't get many opportunities.

Mr JENNINGS: That is another point. But where else can a member ask three consecutive questions and nominate whether they are upon notice or without notice? Whichever way it is looked at, it is a good question-time. It is democratic and efficient and I do not think we should alter it in any way.

In the South the Press tries to treat Queensland as a bit of a joke. It was a joke a few years ago, but it is no longer one. We are the only State with a growth market for new cars, for example. It is up by 4.8 per cent whereas in every other State it is down an average of 2.1 per cent; in other words, Queensland is just on 7 per cent better than the other States. In the 1960s, when I was in the Gulf country, Frank Nicklin said, "Queensland has the slowest growth rate in Australia." Over the previous years it was 7.53 per cent. The next lowest was Tasmania, with 19.4 per cent. Now we have the fastest growth.

During the last financial year 3 000 people left New South Wales, 5 800 left South Australia and 14 500 left Victoria. Queensland's population rose by 17 300. The age of the people leaving Victoria ranged between 20 and 34. We are experiencing a boom that will never end. I do not think anyone would deny that the most important reason why this influx is occurring is the political stability over the past 23 years during which the coalition Government has been in power. I have not served in a coalition Government before and I compliment everyone concerned on the way it works. I believe the joint party committees work extremely well, and provide in-depth studies. I did not attend meetings of such committees in Victoria, simply because none of them ever discussed specific planning or anything like that. They just wanted to cover everything up.

The founder of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Menzies, appreciated more than anyone else the importance of the coalition Government. Right from start he fostered the coalition, as did John McEwen, Arthur Fadden and others. Each party contributes a lot and neither will replace the other. That is important for political stability, and it creates the right climate for good business, which is important for the community, the economy and increased employment opportunities. As members of Parliament we all have a responsibility to our electorates, our branches, our parliamentary party and our oath of office—above all the oath of office, which is all about what is right and what is wrong. Each of us has to consider all these responsibilities, and any organisation, party, business or club is only as good as the people running it.

In Australia very few people take an active interest in politics. Last year when Herman Khan was investigating the Asian region, he was asked what he thought about Australia. He said, "I think it is typified by a bumper sticker I saw on a car down in Sydney. It said, 'I'd rather be sailing.'" I think that is true of a lot of people. The behaviour of our society permeates down from the top. One of the greatest things ever said for this country was said by Arthur Caldwell when Sir Robert Menzies retired. He said—

"While he has been Prime Minister of this land there has never been any shadow

of a doubt or hint or sign of graft or corruption in the administration of the government of the day."

We had a world-wide reputation for honesty, and it should never be forgotten. This country was not built by Governments, bureaucrats, socialists or pessimists; it was built by people prepared to face up to a challenge, work hard and achieve a result. That is the pioneering spirit. There are many examples: small businessmen, farmers and even our Premier. So much has happened because of him, and no-one could argue with that. He is one of those people who has the incredible ability to say what most people think and then go out and do it.

Mr Hooper: Turn it up! You can't understand him. He never completes a sentence. He's almost inarticulate.

Mr JENNINGS: One of his greatest advantages is that he is a cartoonist's dream, and so was Henry Bolte. Our basic philosophy is simple. First, and most important, is the security of the nation. Second is our international alliance, because that affects our security, and third is that we have a strong private enterprise economy, and with a strong private enterprise economy we can provide better social services than anywhere else in the world. That is what it is all about.

Our biggest problem today is that we are the most overgoverned country in the free world. A few years ago the ratio of the Public Service to private enterprise employment was one in four; now it is almost one in three. In the United States it is one in 12 and in Germany and Switzerland it is one in 14. There are 1 530 000 public servants around Australia at the moment with only 3 500 000 private persons to pay for them.

The growth of Government expenditure has outstripped private growth. In the 1970s the total expenditure of all Governments rose by 298 per cent while private expenditure rose by only 132 per cent. In other words, the Government's growth rate has increased 2.3 times. Government capital expenditure has risen by 150 per cent whereas private enterprise expenditure has risen only 90 per cent. Governments have employed 26 per cent more people, private enterprise only 1.4 per cent. We have 2 250 000 people on welfare and social security. I am not criticising them in any way, but they cost \$10 billion a year, and that excludes family allowances. The simple fact is that we have to have profits to pay for that. We have to be proud of the word "profit", and we have to promote a strong private enterprise economy. We have to put a freeze on the Public Service. We have to reduce its functions. We have to get the proportion back to one in six over a period of years, or we will never do any good with the economy.

A lot of claptrap is talked about less work and earlier retirement. Some people

talk about quality of life. The most important aspect of quality of life is to have a decent job so that a man is able to look after his family and bring his children up properly. We are fortunate that our fathers and grandfathers thought along those lines; we would not have been here if they had not.

If we add the Public Service figure of 1,500,000 to the figure for social welfare, we get a total of 3,750,000. That number must be sustained by the 3,500,000 people in the private work-force. That is a ratio of about one for one. No wonder the economy is in a mess! No wonder the fuel levy has been imposed by Canberra! The nation-wide strike of public servants in February was a straw in the wind for the future. We have to reverse the cycle, and alter it. We have to slowly cut down. We have been living off the sheep's back for a long time. Now, as everybody knows, we are living off the motorist's back. A total of \$3,000m will be raised by the levy this year, and \$2,200m was raised by the levy last year. But they still want more and more in Canberra. The bloated, protected bureaucracy in Canberra—I call them the "Canberra casuals"—wants more. As the rate of inflation increases, money becomes worthless, and it will end up destroying our system. We can remedy the situation only by cutting down and altering the balance. One could never run a business with the number of chiefs that we have today. We simply have to have more workers.

We are the luckiest country in the world. We are the only nation that consists of one continent. We are the only nation that has come about without wars or revolution. We have more natural resources than any other country and less with which to defend it. We have more land per head of population than any other country—about four persons per square mile in Australia, against 54 in the United States and 732 in Japan. I respect decent unions and unionists. I have dealt with them in both the building industry and the beef industry. Most Australian working men have self-reliance. They respond to opportunity and incentive. But, as I see the matter from my experience, many labour problems are overcome by the simple policy of payment by results: good results, good pay; no results, no pay.

Has any honourable member ever heard of a major strike in the housing industry? No-one could refer me to a major strike in that industry since way back in the '50s. Why is that? It is because each house builder has a little gang of carpenters and a little gang of brickies, and they work for themselves. They are not interested in going on strike, and the union leaders will not try to get them on strike because they know they will not get away with it. Some union leaders are against incentives. They know that they cannot control the men if they are given incentives. I would like to see a national incentive plan under which

companies would be induced to provide incentives by being given special taxation reductions.

From my own experience I would say that most genuine—and I emphasise that word—industrial disputes can be sorted out by management and the men before there is a strike. But many disputes are not genuine. John Halfpenny has said, "You have got to have political strikes in this country to change the system." They are the strikes that cannot be stopped by negotiation. Most strikes do not occur because of lack of negotiation and discussion between management and workers. The provision of incentives makes workers a part of the system, and that is the way to beat strikes.

I can remember when I was up in the Gulf in the 1960s. Everyone remembers the Mt Isa strike. What happened in that strike? All the men went on strike. Who was left in Mt Isa? Not the men on strike; they went away working. Mt Isa was left in an economic mess. The same happened with the copper fields and with the big strike at GM-H in Victoria. A person could get his car serviced anywhere in those days. If people want compulsory unionism, let them have it. They have compulsory unionism now. But once workers go on strike, it should be compulsory for them to remain on strike and illegal for them to seek another job elsewhere or be employed. That would make union leaders a bit more responsible. At the moment some strikers are not on strike at all; it is a confidence trick, and everybody knows it. When people talk of emergency legislation, that is one of the most important aspects of it.

In all walks of life there is a line of tolerance and a line of insistence. In a political party everybody knows we can go to a certain line and we have to tolerate certain things. There is a code of behaviour. There is also a written law and an unwritten law. Everybody knows that a solicitor can quote written law from 100 years ago, but that is not what counts. What counts and is so important in politics is the unwritten law thought of by the man in the street.

Private enterprise responds to opportunity. The mental attitude in Queensland is so important. I have lived interstate and I know from figures that people are moving out. Because people in Queensland have confidence in the future and a sense of purpose, they will try to do things. That confidence has been brought about by political stability, and let us not do anything to stop that. It is not a case of promising something new or giving things away, but a case of promising to fight to retain what we have and providing opportunities and incentives for others to achieve a better standard of living.

Only a few years ago the right to own property was under attack in this country. Everybody in this nation has the incentive

to own property. In his report in 1975, Justice Elsie Mitchell said that there was a growing opinion that people should not be able to buy land outright; there should only be tenants. That is when the Albury/Wodonga fiasco was set up, and I will mention that shortly. Karl Marx said much the same thing—that the abolition of the existing property system is a pre-condition to the establishment of the new social order. So Justice Elsie Mitchell, Karl Marx and many others were against property ownership.

The most important property ownership that must be considered is the first home of newly-marrieds. They have to be helped in every way possible. The help does not have to continue for long, only for the first three years to help them get a deposit to buy a bit of dirt in this country. That is what will secure this nation against any totalitarian order.

I would like to see special homes savings deposit accounts started in schools with a premium rate of interest. As savings bank interest fluctuated, so would the interest rate in those accounts, but it would always be a few points higher. In that way young people would be taught the importance of home-ownership, and that is the first rung on the ladder of affluence for young couples.

An artificial shortage of land is caused in most cities by stupid planning regulations. Everything possible must be done to correct that. Freehold ownership rights are absolutely sacrosanct. They are (1) the owner of property can always sell to the highest bidder; (2) people can be assured that their property will not be devalued by independent bureaucratic action without appropriate compensation; and (3) the freedom for people to do what they like on their own properties as long as that freedom does not impinge upon the freedom of others.

A lot of tripe is talked about planning difficulties. Albury/Wodonga is a classic example of that. Planning is basically about what use land can be put to, whether it be rural, urban, etc. The size of subdivisions and uniform building regulations have to be considered. That is all planning is. However, the most important thing is that planning be done well ahead. If that is not done a lot of problems arise because people do not know what is going on and rumours become rife.

The member for Peak Downs mentioned Albury/Wodonga. It has been a fool's paradise for eight years. It is out-and-out socialism and the most destructive way of life that legislation ever introduced to this country. It is not a matter of party politics, because five Governments are involved—a Liberal and a Labor Government in New South Wales, a Labor and a Liberal Government in Canberra and a Liberal Government in Victoria. All of the problems have been put into the too-hard basket. In June 1973 the Town and Country Planning Board said

that the only way to get it going was the expenditure of large sums of public money. To date enormous amounts of Government funds have been put into the project. The figure I have is \$170m, but on television recently someone from the Albury/Wodonga corporation said that it was \$115m. That corporation is well-known for its ability to deviate slightly from the truth.

In June 1977 the Victorian Minister for Industrial Development (Digby Crozier) said that the Albury/Wodonga Development Corporation had borrowed over \$100m from the Commonwealth since 1973 and at the long-term bond interest rate the interest was capitalised at over \$10m annually. In addition, State and local government of Victoria have poured another \$55m into Albury/Wodonga. In June 1977 this represented a current commitment by the States to the growth centre of approximately \$250,000 per week just to meet the interest bill in respect of their borrowing. Not bad!

Apparently the Government was so embarrassed about it that it tried to do away with the interest. The chairman of the corporation (Gordon Craig) said in August 1976—

"We do not have to begin repayment of loan funds for ten years, by when at the present rate of borrowing the principle and interest funds employed will total \$800m."

Not one advantage to Albury/Wodonga was gained out of this complete waste of Government money. I appreciate what the member for Peak Downs said about it and why the Premier says, "No, we do not want any cuts in taxation refunds. They are wasting so much of it down there."

Some of Mr Craig's other statements are quite incredible—

"No other planning organisation in the world has achieved the growth and production rate of the Albury/Wodonga Development Corporation."

So said Mr Craig. He said that a world record had been achieved for the efficiency and speed with which the growth centre construction had been initiated. Claiming a world record is not a bad piece of self praise. The basic concept of the whole scheme—that growth can be achieved by spending large amounts of taxpayers' money—is simply not practicable. Any fool can spend large lumps of someone else's money. Anyone here could do it.

Back in February 1976, Ben Hills in "The Age"—he was the initiator of the exposes of corruption in Victoria—said—

"After analysing over 500 deals that the corporation have signed, at least \$20m has been mis-spent on useless land or absurdly high valuations."

I will give a couple of examples. For 600 acres that could not be sold for \$15 an acre, they paid \$120 an acre. They paid \$1,350

an acre for 600 acres on a flood plain at West Wodonga. That is not bad for flood land. For 250 acres at Beams Hill, behind the Bandiana army camp, with a Defence Department building prohibition, they paid \$3,762 an acre. There is another one, the D. A. Wallace property "Bathanga Park", some 15 miles out of Wodonga. He happened to be a client of Smith and Emerton, which is the firm in which the Premier of Victoria is a partner. They paid him \$960,000 cash for his 1 200 acre property, which had an 80-square home on it and he leased it back for \$1 an acre—\$1,200 per year. They have altered that since, but that is what they did. On the other hand, there are small people around Wodonga who cannot even get paid.

The other important point is that Mr Ellicott, the then Federal Attorney-General, stated that the Government's land acquisition procedures in Albury/Wodonga could be proved unconstitutional. Dr Robert Birrell, the population expert, stated that the Government should scrap the Albury/Wodonga scheme, as the whole thing was misconceived.

Currently down there 80 000 acres of good grazing land is lying idle, rotten with weeds and Paterson's curse. In the Baranduda and Leneva Valleys 2 000 dairy cows have gone out of production. Every dollar spent at Albury/Wodonga is a dollar down the drain. It is absolutely scandalous. It is nothing more than a massive public relations exercise to try to justify a gigantic mistake which was turned into a great money-spinner for those in the know.

On 2 March 1978, when I was challenged to, I called a Press conference down in Melbourne. I gave the Press folders with 140 documents, which provided a prima facie case for a royal commission—and I call for that royal commission again today. It is going to come sooner or later, because it cannot go on the way it is. Ben Hills was responsible for the first disclosure and no-one did anything. No-one did anything about Ben Hills's article in "The Age" in 1974 until I fell into Parliament by mistake and exposed it. All I did was state the facts that everyone else knew, but no-one else was prepared to do it. So I would like to compliment the member for Peak Downs for raising it. He is right and the Premier is right in aggressively resisting the Commonwealth attempt to cut down or slice income tax refunds so that more can be wasted on these useless schemes.

There are many other topics, but I will just touch on them quickly. During the election campaign, some allegations were made that I was a renegade, a rebel and all the rest of it. I will not go into the full details except to say that there is a personal explanation in the Parliamentary Library headed, "Personal Explanation to the Parliament of Victoria by D. B. Jennings, Member for Westernport, September 1978." There are other "Hansard" references. Before anyone calls me a renegade and a rebel, let him go and check what really happened.

The biggest land deals that had ever been handled in this country were made. As I said at the time, Watergate was chicken-feed to what happened in Victoria. Let me give one example. My electorate chairman in Flinders was involved with another man, and it was written up in "The Age" that, out of the blue, they had made \$2.5m in three weeks. That is not bad! There are many other examples, but I will not go into them in detail.

While I was in Parliament, two deals were put through. One concerned Mt Ridley. Everyone in Victoria was told that that land would remain rural till the turn of the century. But what happened? Again out of the blue, Cabinet rezoned it for some people and they made \$9.2m cash profit out of the rezoning. That was Mt Ridley.

People were just getting over that stunning manoeuvre when, in the following May, the biggest Housing Commission contract ever—\$100m—was let to a fellow by the name of Peter Stirling, a former president of the Young Liberals. Of course, that is no reflection on the members of the Liberal Party of Queensland. He was a former private secretary of Hamer, and he obtained the contract although he had never built a house in his life. Because of my actions, both those deals were eventually killed.

In the field of social welfare, there is an important point that ought to be stated. We are obligated to do our best for the aged and the incapacitated, and there is one area that could be looked at very closely. Many older people like to be self-supporting. However, many of them face the problem of having an income that does not enable them to live as they have lived in the past. At the same time, they have most of their capital tied up in their home, something that they had obtained through thrift and years of saving.

Many of them would like some of the capital released without the obligation to repay. This could be done by a special financial arrangement under which the owners were paid an amount monthly, quarterly or yearly, with repayments deferred until death. The financial institution or the lender would be reimbursed from the estate with interest, or by means of a number of other alternatives to suit the client and the lender. This would assist the life-style of many retired people and make them self-supporting and independent. It would also encourage the young to be thrifty.

Many people talk about conservation, and I respect the views of genuine conservationists. Unfortunately, many are obstructionists. Only a fool would want to go out and desecrate this country, and I say to some conservationists, "What have you done to conserve anything yourself?" In Melbourne, I have seen many obstructions raised when old buildings are being pulled down and rebuilt. I agree that certain old buildings

need to be preserved. However, as time passes, some of them must go. In a way, I was rather pleased that the Hoffnung building was demolished, because I did not think that the Queensland Government had money to put into a building such as that when so many other things are urgently needed in the State.

Many people in my electorate have referred to the difficulties facing Aborigines. I respect Aborigines. I worked with them for seven years in the Gulf country. I employed them, and they received the same pay, they were provided with the same food, and they were in the same quarters as all the other men. At various times during that period I had two Aboriginal head stockmen who were in charge of white stockmen. Ironically, both of them left out of the blue and later returned and worked as ordinary stockmen.

It is very difficult to generalise on the Aboriginal question. Many people in the South tend to become over-emotional about it. One cannot really say that we are responsible for what happened 200 years ago. We have the responsibility to assist Aborigines now. However, I remind honourable members of what happened in 1975 when Aborigines in the Centre were given too much free money. Unfortunately, many good women there now find themselves in very difficult situations.

There is one other point that I wish to make. Some people think that I am a member of the firm Jennings Industries. When I left school, I joined the company because it was a family company. I worked for it for 13 years and I am proud of it. It is now the biggest construction company in Australia, and its turn-over last year was \$287m. But I make it clear that I have no physical or financial involvement with Jennings Industries. I am proud of the company; I think it is doing a fantastically good job.

When I left the company, I went out on my own. I had the Mt Surprise station in the Gulf country in North Queensland for seven years, as some honourable members are aware. It was the greatest thrill of my life. It was the hardest work and the best work. When the cattle were being stolen, we decided to open our own butcher shop. We thought it was better to sell the meat than to have it stolen. I have never begrudged a butcher his money since then. It is hard work.

Many honourable members in this Chamber—the honourable members for Flinders, Cook, Townsville West, Barron River, and Peak Downs—have mentioned the problems in North Queensland. All of them are right. Queensland is a big State and it has many good cities. Development has been held up to some extent by the leasehold system. Basically, a business is financed by its assets. Back in my day, leasehold land occupied 600 000 square miles; now it occupies 500 000

square miles. I am pleased to read that the Government is trying to convert other areas to freehold.

I urge the total conversion to freehold on the right terms and conditions. I put this resolution forward to the local government conference in 1964 and it received praise in the editorial in "The Courier-Mail" on 1 October 1964. There was not one speaker in opposition to my proposal. It is still on the books of the local government conference. A separate independent authority should be set up to work out conditions for the conversion of all leasehold land to freehold tenure. With such a conversion, the influx of capital into the northern and grazing areas would be enormous.

Private enterprise must be encouraged. If it is not, the bureaucracy will completely overshadow us and we will be swallowed up. I appreciate the nature of the problems confronting northern members. The National Party is a pro-private-enterprise party. I have never seen a party that is more pro-private enterprise. The problems created by bad roads and the lack of schools can be dealt with as the State obtains more income and more profits from its prosperity. Queensland is the State of the future, and I am thrilled to be back.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (4.2 p.m.): It is difficult to know what to say at this stage of the afternoon. Today the President of the United States has been shot and in this House we have witnessed the charge of the "Callide bull", the member for Callide; we have seen the greyhound of consumer affairs in the State pursuing the elusive hare; we have seen an exchange of some note under Standing Orders; and the new member for Southport has just treated us to an eye-witness performance of the Victorian Legislature. In the end result, it is best to start off, I suppose, in the traditional manner.

I pledge the loyalty of the people of Sherwood to the Crown in this important year for the Royal Family. We offer our congratulations to the Prince of Wales and to his charming bride-to-be on their engagement and offer our best wishes for their marriage later this year. The continued strength of the monarchy as an institution owes not a little to the personal and almost superhuman dedication to public duty that is consistently shown by Her Majesty and obviously is emulated by her son, the Prince of Wales. It is perhaps almost impertinent to make the comment that that example is followed so well in this State by His Excellency the Governor and Lady Ramsay, whose dignified and affable presence is both welcomed and well known throughout the State.

Having conveyed sentiments on behalf of the people of Sherwood, I want to publicly convey my thanks to them for their recent expression of confidence in me as their representative.

I want to take this opportunity also to set the public record straight—if one can use that phrase to grace a publication known as "The National Times". I refer to a recent article published by it, in which a journalist named Marian Wilkinson, in referring to Queensland, stated that the election results in Sherwood caused the Liberal Party great concern. She supported that statement by quoting a primary vote that was 20 per cent below the actual primary vote that was recorded.

In fact, the primary vote in Sherwood went up by 12 per cent from the vote cast at the by-election. Furthermore, on a two-party preferred basis, the Liberal Party vote went up by 12 per cent and from the last general election by 11 per cent to 71 per cent. It is a matter of some pride for ourselves that of all of the coalition-held seats in the State the biggest swing to a coalition party was registered in the seat of Sherwood, where the swing was approximately 2 per cent greater than that in any other seat in the State.

Two communications to that journal from me were totally ignored. It is bad enough to make false comments but to support them with false statistics one would have thought was completely unjustifiable and to be condemned. Apparently the members of the newspaper fraternity stick together and prefer to cover the gross incompetence of a journalist rather than accept the truth and publish a retraction.

I offer my congratulations to Mr Speaker on his re-election. I offer my congratulations to him for making statements which seek to reassert the authority of Parliament and offer a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee to review the whole question of the Standing Orders that govern the procedures in this House. Obviously the possibility of improvement in those procedures lies in the future. I support him in the statements that he has made and I know that he is supported by many members on both sides of the House.

The dilemma that one finds oneself in, in Parliament, is balancing the responsibilities and obligations of being a local representative and being a member of a party. No doubt it is true to say that many people vote for the party to which the member belongs, but equally it is true to say that people vote for the member who is attached to that label. So, in the same way that we have dual obligations which we should rightly have in mind, there are different categories of people to whom we owe allegiance and responsibility when we come to exercise our rights in this House.

From time to time we should examine the basic principles on which we direct our own lives and those on which our parties direct themselves. Consistency is a virtue. Consistency in any endeavour is clearly to be desired. Certainly in representing people there should be some consistency between

what we say to them when they contact us, what we say to them before we are elected, what we do for them and how we perform after we are elected.

There must be consistency by members exercising public responsibility. At times, if we honestly examine ourselves we will see that there is significant inconsistency on important topics from time to time. We should seek to rectify that inconsistency and live according to the beliefs that we claim to profess or the beliefs that we expound at election-time to gain the support of our electors.

We have felt, as some people have said in the corridors of this House, a breath of fresh air today; some people might also say some bursts of hot air. But there is something different about the mood of this Parliament today. The difference clearly is the situation in which the now Independent member for Callide finds himself. Perhaps there is every reason why he should express his reasons forcefully; and, of course, in private, he has done so on many occasions in the past.

There are, realistically, the obligations that come from being a member of a party and there is clearly an adherence to some basic forms of discipline, and they are imposed on members of all three parties in the House. I have noted that, on this side of the House, a number of members have professed their dedication to the coalition. That claim has come more from the National Party members of the coalition than from the Liberal Party members. It might be interesting to ponder why that might be.

Mr Davis: I wonder why.

Mr INNES: I shall make an observation or two.

The reality is that the coalition does impose extra constraints and pressures on matters of representation, both in the performance of one's local role and those conflicts that appear to have been intolerable in the case of the member for Callide, and in the pursuit of one's party's interests and platform which, as I say, is a vital component of that on which Liberal members are elected.

Mr Powell: There is a measure of self-discipline required, is there not?

Mr INNES: I mentioned discipline before, but it is easier for the people who seek to benefit by the exercise of discipline in one way to propound that as opposed to the people who, shall we say, on whom discipline can be excessively imposed.

Mr Powell: I used the term "self-discipline".

Mr INNES: The honourable member can use the term whichever way he likes. Our primary obligation is to be consistent in what we say when we are asking people to support us and what we do when they have given us their support. I think it has to be said, and should be said in the House, that the reality is that over the years there have been strains imposed on Liberal members and Liberal participation which go close to overwhelming one of the basic terms on which the two coalition parties come together. One of the basic terms is that neither party shall use its numbers to overbear the basic policies and commitments of the other party.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Be very careful, you could follow Mr Hartwig.

Mr INNES: My party has a view with regard to latitude—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You know that I think you are a nice fellow and I respect you, but you will be less than truthful if you say that.

Mr INNES: I believe that consciences are like muscles, they have to be exercised occasionally to keep their tone.

The realities are that there has been a change, possibly over the past decade. People who are familiar with these things—I cannot claim that personal familiarity—would suggest that there have been perhaps increased pressures on the relationship between the two parties. It is said that the former National Party Premier, Sir Francis Nicklin, never forced anything through the party room if there was a significant body of whatever political complexion opposed to it. He did not do a simple mathematical computation and say, "25 beats 24" or, "25 beats 20" because those numbers would suggest that there was sufficient disquiet to necessitate the continuance of the status quo.

We now have a new Parliament and a new coalition on new terms. It is my view that some of the pressures of the past could be eased if there was a return to or an observance of the Nicklin style; that is, if there is significant objection based upon the honest exercise of members' consciences, including such matters as their dedication to their parties' principles, then numbers should not be used to overbear that party's views or, indeed, the views of any significant group, whatever its basic party allegiance.

If it was done on a simple majority basis we could end up, and I do not suggest that this is the case, with a quite extraordinary distortion of the political process. If Cabinet worked on a majority basis, we could have the situation where a majority, being members of the National Party, would dominate a decision. We could have a situation where Liberal Ministers were all basically opposed to a decision. Then in the joint party room the simple addition of the votes of National

Party back-benchers to those of the Cabinet, who would be bound by Cabinet solidarity to support the majority view, would mean that the majority rule prevailed; that all would have to accept what might have been only the belief and conviction of some 35 members out of 82. So the beliefs of the minority could be converted into the beliefs of the majority. I cannot think of an instance where that has happened in this coalition but, unless we recognise these facts, there can be problems.

There have been problems with the coalition over the last few years. I believe that the coalition can work. Everybody in the coalition parties, and everybody in this Parliament, knows that, irrespective of the party situation, the majority of members of Parliament can work with each other. The majority of members of Parliament are perfectly capable of sitting down and considering objectively and with deference to another person's point of view what is the best course in any given situation. I am proud to be associated with the majority of the members of the coalition. I think that this is something that has to be said at this stage so that when we proceed on through the next three years we do so constructively and not destructively.

Mr Davis: They are good flowery words.

Mr INNES: They are flowery words, but they are relevant. They express my view in basic English, and if that is flowery to the honourable member he should blame it on the education system that existed in this State when he went to school.

The other matter that we can pay attention to is this conflict between the exercise of a private member's role and that of the Executive. As one of its basic principles my party's platform is that we are dedicated to democratic government, maintained by a Parliament in control of the Executive and the law applying to all.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Which it is not at the moment.

Mr INNES: Those are the words in the platform. I am not singling out the Queensland Parliament. The same thing applies in Canberra and in every other Parliament in the world. There will always be a jockeying to achieve a balance between parliamentary and Executive control. There has to be an Executive. It would not be possible in this modern, complex world to work without the Executive's initiating, its controlling and administering the Public Service and its setting the pace in the parliamentary forum—provided that proper rights are entrenched in the procedure of the Parliament for questioning and bringing to account the Executive for its administration, and with the greater wisdom of all members of Parliament being addressed to the question of what is in the best interests of the State by way of law.

5185—20

The provision for private member's Bills and days on which private members can initiate debate and discussion has been found, particularly after the advent of the party system, to be vital to a vigorous, active and constructive parliamentary process. Other Parliaments have indeed gone further than we have. We have to recognise the fact that, thanks to a Labor Government in 1922, we do not have an Upper House to provide a pause or a second thought on any particular proposal. I believe that the procedure of this House can, and should be, improved. Examples abound elsewhere in the Westminster system of small ways in which this dynamic can be improved and the participation of back-bench members of Parliament can be furthered.

Mr Davis: You will tell us shortly we should have a public accounts committee.

Mr INNES: I do believe that there should be a public accounts committee, an expenditure committee and a variety of standing committees. That is my own view, and any Government that honestly believes in accountability and openness should hold the same view.

The most substantial recent contribution made by this Parliament to public debate in this State was initiated by the committee headed by Mr Ahern. That, of course, was an all-party committee on an aspect of vital public interest in this State.

The question of accounting and the use of public monies will always be vexed. Indeed, there must be a degree of openness about the use of public moneys because the Government is only a trustee—it is not an owner—and trustees have always been brought to account for the exercise of their responsibility and discretion.

Apparently there is a question of privilege that is topical at the moment. I go back to my suggestion that it is desirable to be consistent. The Premier apparently announced yesterday that the Justice Department has been asked to look at the question of privilege in relation to persons who claim that their characters or reputations have been unjustifiably affected by statements made under privilege in this House.

Mr Vaughan: Has that been democratically discussed in the joint parties room?

Mr INNES: To see that proposed came as some surprise to me, if that obtusely answers the honourable member's question.

I personally believe that there is a great deal of merit in allowing a person to have the right to have his say when he claims that his reputation has been unjustifiably attacked and tarnished by the use of privilege in the House, if there was the safeguard, for instance, of his making a statutory declaration so that there was some solemnity about his response.

I do not believe in the abolition of parliamentary privilege. In crucial cases it could be what starts a public debate or public

inquiry that would lead to the rectifying of a lot of wrongs. I believe in parliamentary privilege, but I believe there is also a room to allow the record to be set straight.

I referred to consistency, and as one who has attempted to bring some balance and to defend people with whom I have no personal contact or truck but whom I believe to have been unjustifiably attacked by the Premier, I find it somewhat inconsistent that he now sees the necessity to make a claim when he did not see that necessity at some earlier point in time. I see members of the Opposition smiling, so perhaps I will give them a serve, too. Both their leader and other significant persons in their ranks in the last Parliament were condemned by a royal commission of the Commonwealth of Australia for the abuse of privilege.

Mr Mackenroth: The Premier was condemned by that same royal commission.

Mr INNES: I accept that. The Premier was also condemned by the same royal commission for unjustified attacks on other members of Parliament and abuses of privilege.

It is a shame that it is not until senior or prominent members of a political party are attacked that somebody sees the merits of seeking to defend those who are attacked under privilege. Indeed, one might say that persons in the position of party leaders and senior party trustees have got it coming to them because they voluntarily involve themselves in situations where political attacks are possible. However, if that is put forward in some reasonably acceptable form I will be delighted to support it because I believe it is right, and I like to be consistent.

An event has occurred recently in this State and it does not seem to want to go away. I refer to the decision made about a certain coal lease, namely, Winchester South. Why won't that decision go away? I suggest it is an illustration to the Government that it should think of reforms of Parliament and about the comments that have been made by many back-bench members of both sides of the House about the whole style and tenor of government. Government should be open; government should be accountable. Justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done, and the same principles apply in the exercise of Executive discretion in government.

I suppose one might say that there would be some embarrassment for a Government that has proclaimed a concern for Queensland—for a party that has called for Queensland being put first—when indeed the overseas interests were put first and Queensland and Australia were a long way second—equal last.

It would seem that something is wrong with the procedures. I am not buying into the rumour side. I am just looking at what is on the public record. What is on the public record? A decision about the largest contract ever let—the most valuable contract

ever let in this State—was put through in a very short period in the Cabinet (the Government) of this State. Haven't we heard exactly the same complaints time and time again of decisions being rushed through or rammed through; of decisions being not properly thought out or having the appearance of not being properly thought out?

Mr Davis: You would think some of those Liberal Ministers would be right on the ball.

Mr INNES: Let us look at that. I say that coalition imposes constraints and difficulties for any party to exercise all the powers it would like to exercise. However, apparently it was a recommendation under the present procedures which are adopted by the Executive, whereby merely the technical merits, we are told, of the decision were looked into. The Mines Department, it is said, has the relevant expertise to assess the technical merits, and it was its recommendation, and that was all that was necessary.

Mr Davis: Did all the Liberal Ministers in Cabinet say "Aye"?

Mr INNES: No. Indeed, in justification of the Liberal Ministers it can be said that quite clearly the Liberal Ministers, on the public record at least, have attempted to re-assess the matter or have that decision vetted, refined and improved in the public interest. Irrespective of how it is looked at, it would suggest that the procedures are wrong. The procedures are not seen to be responsible. The procedures are not seen to be balanced. There is no doubt that people are at the disadvantage of not knowing the merits of the competing offers or tenders.

Mr D'Arey: Are you calling for them?

Mr INNES: I cannot see any reason why tenders of this nature and their condition should be kept secret. I cannot see any reason why the details of the winner's tender and the conditions it has agreed to should not be made public. At the very least, I believe that people should know on what terms it is tendering. If there is to be security on the tender, then at least if they all go in knowing that, that is one thing. However, there should be no security about the winning tender. The reason why there should be no security is that the people of Queensland own those minerals and those resources. The people of Queensland are entitled to know on what terms they have been sold and the benefits that will accrue.

Mr Mackenroth: As a back-bench member of the Government don't you find out that type of thing? Don't they tell you?

Mr INNES: I don't know what the terms are. On that count, the Government has been quite consistent. It says it does not propose to release the details, and I do not know the details.

Mr Vaughan: But your Liberal Treasurer knows them.

Mr INNES: The simple observation that can be made is that something went wrong.

Things were not seen to be done in a proper and responsible fashion. What I am saying is that the procedures should be known. They should be assessed and vetted, and Parliament, tenderers and everybody else should know about them before the game starts. Indeed, they should involve accountability and openness to the people of Queensland.

Mr Davis: If you had been in Cabinet, do you think you could have handled it better?

Mr INNES: That is a hypothetical question. This matter has been attended by so much rumour and so much criticism and concern because the rules were ignored. It has not been open. If the details had been known and the assertion, which one must accept at face value, that it was the best deal for Queensland had been confirmed by the details being made public, there could have been no argument about it.

Mr Vaughan: But what about altering the tender afterwards? The Treasurer wrote conditions into the tender.

Mr INNES: One of the problems is that, apparently, after a technical assessment was made on mining grounds and considerations, it then went to other people whose concern about such projects was quite different. I assume that all the Treasury could do—and the Queensland Treasury has a very high reputation for being an extremely skilful and tough negotiator on behalf of the people of Queensland in securing the maximum financial benefit—after the mining recommendations and technical aspects were considered to be correct and, therefore, the authority to prospect should be accepted, was seek to impose financial conditions.

Mr Vaughan: The one point that you seem to be overlooking and that everybody seems to be ignoring is that it is still only an authority to prospect.

Mr INNES: I will come to that. Obviously, what has emerged in this case is a creature that is neither a genuine authority to prospect nor a genuine lease. Indeed, that is one of the errors into which the people who let out the tenders fell. It cannot be an authority to prospect if substantially the extent of the reserves are known. It is not a real authority to prospect in the sense of going into unknown land with all the obligations to drill and to determine what is there, nor is it a lease.

I have heard it suggested that there might be an obligation to disclose terms in relation to a lease, whereas there is no such obligation in relation to an authority to prospect. Legally, I think that is incorrect, and I do not accept it. Somebody has not sat down and worked out precisely what the nature of this creature is, and that is one of the complications.

Mr Vaughan: There is another one coming up. Gregory South is coming up, with tenders called in exactly the same way.

Mr INNES: I will come to that. What I am saying is that there are certain themes of consistency that apply to parliamentary processes and other things done by Governments. If they are not observed, trouble results. One is the openness of accountability; another is the consistency and openness with which the Government proclaims that it is going to do something, and the openness and the standards with which it applies certain rules to assessing things such as tenders.

Mr Davis: Without being unkind, would you say that Ivan Gibbs just hasn't got it?

Mr INNES: We are dealing with a very new Minister. He had to deal with a major contract a very short time after he was appointed. Unfortunately, the former Minister for Mines, who would have had a substantial amount to do with it, was attending to other duties. Obviously, it was not the best situation in which a decision could be made.

The reality is that people are concerned about this decision, and that is why the comments about it and criticism of it will not go away. The lesson for the Government is that it has to think about its procedures, and those procedures should be as open as possible. I, for one, do not accept that there is any need for security for a failure to disclose terms as essential as those associated with the successful, shall I say, sale of the biggest coal deposit in the history of this State. That must be open and the people of Queensland as well as competing competitors should be able to judge. If things were open and fully known, perhaps those competitors who no doubt feel disgruntled would find that the basis for their criticism and the suspicions that they apparently nurture was ill-founded. Perhaps, as a result, they would accept the decision more readily than they apparently do.

However, another aspect is involved, namely, the consistency of the Government's theme of "Queensland first" and its desire for local ownership and control. I see something totally inconsistent in the behaviour of a Government that, on the grounds that we must keep control in this State, is prepared on the one hand to intervene by buying shares in private companies to bolster them up and, on the other hand, when given a chance to sell the biggest resource we have—one that is always up for grabs—does not adhere to its policy of allowing that resource to be developed by interests that are substantially Queensland based or at least Australian based.

The reality of the situation is that many other companies of undoubted integrity submitted tenders. In fact, the Minister himself said that a number of other contenders had the ability to meet the obligations necessary

to open the mine. I see something quite inconsistent in the Government's decision not to accept a tender submitted by a company that is predominantly Queensland based or whose equity is based upon this State. Instead, it accepted the tender submitted by a consortium with 50 per cent overseas ownership and with only 25 per cent local ownership and 25 per cent other Australian equity.

It is right for a Government like the Queensland Government, which administers a developing and emerging State, to ensure that the control of our mineral resources stays within the State. We do not want Queensland to end up as an empty mine for the benefit of the rest of the world. We want the infrastructure, the consultancy and the other skills and services to be maximised in this State or at least in Australia. I cannot see any justification at all for allowing the majority shareholding in a venture such as this to go to an overseas-controlled company, particularly when it is an oil company that can play international ins and outs and unders and overs and can use one of its resources to the disadvantage of others as it sees fit.

This project should have been Queensland controlled and dominated or at least Australian controlled and dominated, provided Queensland or Australian consortiums possessed the necessary expertise and capacity to develop it. The authority to prospect should have been given to such a consortium. As we all know, if someone who has an authority to prospect complies with the conditions, the authority to prospect is converted to a lease.

As I say, I find something inconsistent between what this Government claims to stand for and what actually happened in this instance. I should like to see that inconsistency removed from any future sale of resources.

Mr Vaughan: What about Gregory South?

Mr INNES: We may well see an interesting comparison. It will be interesting to see how many tenders are submitted for Gregory South and whether the manner in which the Winchester South tenders were dealt with has any adverse reaction within the business community. It has been suggested that major companies that submitted tenders for Winchester South will not submit further tenders, as they are dissatisfied with the manner in which the tenders for Winchester South were vetted.

We do not want to go exploring Labor Party rumours and innuendoes. All we have to do is look at the public record and apply a few basic rules. Those rules suggest that the terms on which tendering takes place should be assured, that the criteria by which it will be standard should be set out and that the procedure should be attended by a certain amount of publicity so that people can assess whether the right thing has been done or not. I can see no reason for secrecy

on issues such as this; nor can I ever see the need for secrecy about the amounts that major aluminium companies are charged for electricity.

Mr Vaughan: What about rail freight?

Mr INNES: I do not see any reason why any of those matters should be secret.

Mr Vaughan: It is your Treasurer who does it.

Mr INNES: I differ with the Treasurer. I suppose it is a matter of precedents. We do not want to disadvantage one competitor against the other. If they all know that the rail freights, the electricity charges and the terms on which they tender for coal leases are to be made public, there can be no squeal.

Mr Vaughan: The trouble is there are too many deals being done.

Mr INNES: I do not accept that. The honourable member does not have the proof. All I know is that there is disquiet and criticism and I can see why it exists—because proper and responsible procedures were not adhered to in the assessment of this matter.

(Time expired.)

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (4.42 p.m.): I congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as a Temporary Chairman which allows you to occupy the high position of Deputy Speaker. It is a shame that extra pay does not go with the appointment but maybe that will come one day.

I thank the electors of Chatsworth for once again electing me to represent them. They displayed their confidence in me by increasing my vote from 51 per cent in 1977 to 58.2 per cent in the last election. That was an increase of 7.2 per cent.

During the election campaign there was an onslaught in my electorate by Ministers and would-be Ministers. We saw Edwards, Doumany, Greenwood, Lickiss—the last two have gone—and Hewitt, who has now been elevated to the Cabinet. They came continually into my electorate in an endeavour to convince the electors that they should vote for the Liberal candidate. I thank the people for not listening to them.

Mr Kruger: That may be why your vote went up so much.

Mr MACKENROTH: It probably is. If Dr Edwards comes into my electorate in future my vote might increase even more.

I place on record my thanks to the ALP members in Chatsworth. In the three years that I have been in Parliament, they have done a sterling job in supporting me. Throughout the last election campaign they did a tremendous job to ensure that I was re-elected. I name one person, that is, my

campaign director, Mr John Berndt, for the work that he did as my campaign director not only in 1977 but also in 1980.

What I should like to deal with today is a matter that I raised on 12 March last year in the Matters of Public Interest debate, when I outlined how a Queensland company was fleecing Queenslanders of their hard-earned money. On that occasion I called on the Minister for Justice to set up an immediate investigation and to follow that investigation with legislation similar to legislation existing in New South Wales.

The companies I referred to on that day were Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited and Intercapital Finance Corporation Limited. These companies are operating a mutual home loans scheme. I will once again outline briefly how the scheme operates. A person buys shares in a fund company. Each share is worth \$40 and entitles the shareholder to a \$100 loan at 2½ per cent interest. Most people buy 200 shares, which entitle them to a \$20,000 loan. Shares are paid off at 20c per month for approximately 17 years, so most shareholders pay \$40 per month.

The catch comes in actually getting a loan. Loans are allocated on a priority basis. When a person first joins the fund he is given a priority number. As I have shown on previous occasions in this Parliament very few people have actually received loans from these companies.

In my speech last year, I outlined various reasons why the Minister for Justice should investigate these companies.

One of the reasons I gave on that day was that Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited had lent \$369,560, of which \$205,996 had been lent without security to other corporations. In that speech I proved that \$37,028 of that money had been lent to a company called Rotashare which had directors in common with Federated Housing. I also produced evidence on that occasion to show that \$205,996 of the \$369,560 had been advanced without security. The question I raised at that time was how much of this money had been loaned to companies in which directors past or present had a pecuniary interest.

Since that first speech much has happened. Today I will outline what I consider will become the biggest corporate collapse in Queensland since the building society scandal of the 1970s.

The directors of these companies have now admitted to losing over \$1.59m of shareholders' money whilst the Queensland Government and the Corporate Affairs Office have sat around doing nothing. The proof of what I am saying lies in the annual reports of these companies for 1979-1980 which were released approximately two weeks ago. Page 1 of those reports is the chairman's report for 1979-1980, in which he outlines accumulated losses to 30 June 1980 for Federated

Housing Fund of Australia Limited of \$576,836 and Intercapital Finance Corporation Limited of \$761,990.

A breakdown of those figures reveals—

FEDERATED HOUSING FUND OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED

	\$
Accumulated trading losses to 30 June 1980	53,221
Provision for losses in—	
Investments	348,321
Loans	132,289
Intangible Assets	43,005
Total	\$576,836

INTERCAPITAL FINANCE CORPORATION LIMITED

Accumulated trading losses to 30 June 1980	135,303
Provision for losses in—	
Investments	466,569
Loans	114,279
Intangible Assets	45,839
Total	\$761,990

Added to these losses are losses made by subsidiary companies:

I.C.F. Management Limited ..	\$173,378
Federated Housing Fund Management Limited	\$75,834
Services and Management (Qld) Limited	\$1,782
Northern Mutual Loans Limited ..	\$860

This brings the total losses for the companies as at 30 June 1980 to \$1,590,680.

As the total paid up capital of the whole group of companies as at 30 June 1980 was \$2,862,457, this represents a loss of 55.5 per cent of shareholders' money.

If we deduct share calls in arrears at that date, the group of companies has a paid up capital of only \$2,776,668, which represents an actual loss of 57.2 per cent of shareholders' money.

The chairman stated in his report—

“Close examination has been made of balances relating to earlier years' transactions, particularly in the areas of loans advanced on an unsecured basis and investments made in what may have been loosely termed 'associated' companies in those years.”

I think we need to ask what the phrase “loosely termed 'associated' companies” means. From my investigations this term means companies in which directors had a pecuniary interest. I suggest that a lot of the money which has been lost has been siphoned off through companies such as Rotashare, Darlington Quarries and Hygrow Developments. If a complete investigation is carried out, I think the list will grow considerably longer.

As the directors of these companies change more often than the Liberal Party changes its policy on redistribution, in my first speech on this matter I incorporated in "Hansard" a list of directors.

On that occasion the directors were Barry Alfred Brown, chairman and Stephen Roy Coleman, Robert Lees Conroy, Walter William Strauss and Donald Robertson, members of the board.

Since then Barry Alfred Brown has resigned, allegedly because of a nervous breakdown, and Coleman, Strauss and Robertson have also resigned. The only surviving director from that occasion is Robert Lees Conroy.

Mr Yewdale: He has still got his hand in the till.

Mr MACKENROTH: Yes. I shall prove in a moment that the whole lot of them have their hands in the till.

The other current directors are Maher George Suliman and Alan John Robison, with John Ross Barnett chairman of the board.

A favourite trick of directors in the past has been to always blame previous directors for anything that goes wrong. I predict that John Ross Barnett's attitude to my speech today will be that everything is now all right and it was the blokes before him that made all the mess. Of the four directors who have resigned since 12 March 1980, according to my information only one has vanished from the scene. That is Donald Robertson. As far as I can ascertain, Barry Alfred Brown is employed by the companies as a consultant. Walter William Strauss, a Melbourne solicitor, is chairman of a company called Executive Counsellors Pty Ltd, which is selling home loan shares through a superannuation fund. Stephen Roy Coleman works for this company.

It is interesting to note that of the present directors, Robison and Conroy are directors of Executive Counsellors Pty Ltd and Suliman is the national marketing manager, which effectively places control of Federated and Intercapital under Executive Counsellors. Two of the directors who have faded into the background, that is, Brown and Coleman, were associated with three home loan companies in New South Wales, which lost approximately \$3.5m. When the \$1.5m lost in Queensland is added to that, is it any wonder that they have decided to play a low-key back-room role?

The saga of these companies has long been a matter of concern for the Queensland Government. Indeed, on 21 December 1972, Mr P. D. Connolly, QC, was appointed a special investigator of this Parliament to investigate the affairs of these companies. To his credit, the Justice Minister at that time (Sir William Knox), tabled the report of that investigation in this Parliament on 3 April 1973. The report was a lengthy document

totalling 76 pages, of various reasons why he considered that the companies should be wound up.

Following that report the Attorney-General petitioned the Supreme Court to wind up these companies. Unfortunately, the Attorney-General lost that case and the companies were able to continue operating in Queensland—that is, to continue their system of legal robbery. From reading the reports of that case it appears to me that the Attorney-General lost because a poor case was put forward by the Corporate Affairs Office. I firmly believe that the reason the Justice Minister (Mr Lickiss) failed to act on these companies last year was due totally to the influence exerted over him by the Corporate Affairs Office. Because it got its pride knocked about in 1973 it is just not prepared to act.

While speaking of Mr Lickiss, I consider that he stands condemned for his failure to act last year. It is unfortunate that he is not in the Chamber. If he were, he would certainly interject. He proved himself to be totally incompetent, a fact which did not go unnoticed by the Liberal leader when he was handing out the Cabinet guernseys after the last election. Perhaps if he had been prepared to act last year he would still be gracing the ministerial benches today.

Mr Yewdale: Can we expect anything better of his successor?

Mr MACKENROTH: I hope that we can. The present Minister for Justice and Attorney-General will have a look at this matter. I hope that he will act. We will just have to wait and see.

Throughout the whole of last year, the only action by Mr Lickiss was a ministerial statement on 11 September 1980, to which I will make some reference.

The first time that I raised this matter was on 12 March 1980. I have shown today that the companies had accumulated losses of \$1.59m to 30 June 1980. The Minister at that time stated—

"It would seem that the movement in Queensland, which was, and still is, operating within the provision of the Companies Act, was conducting its business in an orderly way until the arrival on the centre stage of the honourable member for Chatsworth."

Was the Minister suggesting that my speech of 12 March forced the companies to lose \$1.59m in three months? The Minister went on to state—

"The position with mutual home loans companies in Queensland is that the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and a number of his senior officers have recently undertaken extensive inquiries into those companies' affairs.

"The commissioner advises that the future of loan fund companies now incorporated in this State is that they are being integrated into a superannuation concept.

Henceforth, none of the companies concerned will be issuing further prospectuses seeking funds from the public, as the necessary funds to sustain their activities will be acquired as a result of the development of the superannuation concept. The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs has also advised me that the stated policy of the directors of the companies is that, as superannuation funds become available, they will be used to either buy out existing shareholders' priority numbers or provide those shareholders with the loans contracted for through previous prospectuses.

"The Commissioner and his officers, in the course of their inquiries, have spoken to senior Government officers in Sydney, Canberra and Melbourne. The commissioner has also had the advantage of examining the opinion of a Queen's Counsel in relation to the activities of these companies. This opinion confirms the earlier view expressed by him to me that the companies concerned are not operating in breach of the Companies Act or the Securities Industry Act. My attitude in this matter has consistently been that it was only proper to allow those who were recommending the mutual home loans companies as suitable investment avenues for superannuation funds to operate in some sort of stable environment."

One of the reasons given in that statement was that the company would not be issuing further prospectuses as a result of the development of the superannuation concept. That in itself is a reason why the Minister should have acted. Surely, he should have seen that the company would be able to sell shares without having to provide any documentation, thereby placing the companies further outside the supervision of the Corporate Affairs Office.

As a further reason, the Minister stated—

"The commissioner and his officers, in the course of their inquiries, have spoken to senior officers in Sydney, Canberra and Melbourne."

What Mr Lickiss did not tell us was that the senior Government officers in Sydney told the officers from the Queensland Corporate Affairs Office that they had fully examined the implications of the superannuation scheme proposed by Executive Counsellors Pty Ltd and had rejected it totally. Maybe the Queensland officers forgot to tell the Minister this fact when they reported to him.

The other point the Minister made in that statement was that the commissioner had the advantage of examining an opinion of a Queen's Counsel. What he did not tell us was why the QC had given an opinion. Was he asked for his opinion by the Corporate Affairs Office? If so, what documentation was he given to make that opinion—or was the QC working for the home loan companies or the superannuation company, in which case the opinion given would be expected.

I would like to expand my reasons for calling for a complete investigation into these companies by producing documentary evidence of what I consider to be a breach of the Companies Act, in that the directors have not acted in the interest of the shareholders. Earlier this year I received a phone call from a reputable businessman who asked me if I would like a copy of a letter that he had received from Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited, guaranteeing payment of accounts if another company called Darlington Quarries Pty Ltd failed to pay its account. Apparently the businessman hired a dozer to Darlington Quarries Pty Ltd in 1979. Before hiring the dozer he checked the company's credit rating and found it to be not good, so he asked for some guarantee of payment. In response to that request he received two letters. So that honourable members may realise the type of people they are, I will read the letters. The first is from Darlington Quarries Pty Ltd, dated 8 August 1979—

"Dear Sir,

RE: HIRE OF D9 DOZER

"As discussed with our Neil Cox we offer this guarantee of payment for the hire of your D9 Dozer at our quarry site.

"The maximum amount of \$4,500.00 should represent a hire period of 60 working hours and include the charges for transport and escort.

"Actual payment will be made on dockets properly signed by an authorised officer of this company.

"Yours faithfully,

"DARLINGTON

QUARRIES PTY. LTD.,

"N. Cox,

"GENERAL MANAGER."

Accompanying that letter was a letter, also dated 8 August 1979, from the Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited which reads—

"Dear Sir,

RE: HIRE OF D9 DOZER

"Further to a letter received today by your company from Darlington Quarries Pty. Limited, this is to advise that this company guarantees payment to you, should Darlington Quarries Pty. Limited not pay the amount of money due, when specified.

"Yours faithfully,

"FEDERATED HOUSING FUND
OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED

"B. A. BROWN

"General Manager"

Before payment was made Darlington Quarries Pty Ltd went into liquidation, so the hire company claimed its money from Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited.

To keep in line with the business practices of Barry Alfred Brown, when payment became due he had to pull a swifty on the hire company, and I will read letters, dated

19 November 1979 received by that company from Kinsey Bennett & Gill, solicitors for Federated Housing Fund. The first letter reads—

“Dear Sir,

“re: FEDERATED HOUSING FUND OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED

“We refer to our telephonic advice that we had been instructed to act for Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited in the matter of an alleged debt owed to your company.

“Our client denies that any moneys are due to your company.

“Yours truly,

KINSEY BENNETT & GILL
B. HAIDUK”

In the same envelope came another letter, which said—

“Dear Sir,

“WITHOUT PREJUDICE”

“re: FEDERATED HOUSING FUND OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED

“We refer to our open letter of even date and notwithstanding the denial therein, our client is willing to obviate litigation by paying to your company the sum of \$3,098.45 in full and final satisfaction of any alleged debt and upon receiving a suitable discharge to that effect.

“Without admitting that our client is responsible to pay any moneys under any guarantee, the alleged guarantee related only to the hire of a D9 Dozer for 60 hours at the rate of \$45.00 per hour, plus transport to and from the site, . . .”

They went on to outline the figures. The total was \$3,098.45. The letter concluded—

“We are further instructed that if the foregoing offer is acceptable our client’s cheque can be immediately exchanged for a suitable discharge.

“Yours truly,

KINSEY BENNETT & GILL
B. HAIDUK”

As a result of receiving those letters, the hire company accepted \$3,098.45, which was \$1,401.55 less than the amount agreed to be paid.

The point here, however, is not the hire company’s being ripped off, but was Barry Alfred Brown acting in the best interest of the ordinary shareholders when he gave the guarantee to pay these debts on 8 August 1979? Secondly, if Barry Alfred Brown, acting for the directors of Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited, gave this guarantee, did he give any further guarantees to pay the debts of Darlington Quarries or any other company? My information, which will be confirmed with a full investigation, is that he did.

A check of the company records of Darlington Quarries show amounts owing by Darlington Quarries to Federated and Inter-capital, as well as companies with which they are associated. These debts are—

ICF Management P/L.	\$2,909.45
Federated Housing Fund of Aust. Ltd	\$665.00
Federated Housing Fund Management	\$2,500.00
Intercapital Finance Corp. L.	\$1,309.75
ICF Management P/L.	\$3,086.00
Rotashare Pty Ltd	\$294,821.71
Rotashare Pty Ltd	\$4,108.51
	<hr/>
Total:	\$309,400.42

All of those companies are controlled by common directors and, remembering that Rotashare Pty Ltd is the company used by the directors to hide the way in which they were investing shareholders funds, this represents a considerable loss, as I understand Darlington Quarries will not be paying anything to its creditors.

Another point which should be looked at very closely is the last prospectus issued by Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited which was dated 14 December 1979. Before showing the outright lies told in that prospectus, I would like to quote a sentence from Mr Lickiss’s ministerial statement of 11 September 1980—

“No prospectus was cleared which did not meet the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs office requirements.”

In the prospectus, the directors, through a manipulation of the 1979 profit and loss statement, showed a profit for Federated of \$17,409 in an attempt to show the company as a viable proposition. The prospectus also showed paid-up capital after accumulated losses of \$893,229. In the additional statutory information required to be given in accordance with the Companies Act, the directors stated—and I quote from the prospectus—

“22. The Directors report that after due enquiry by them in relation to the interval between the date of the last accounts and a date not earlier than fourteen (14) days before the issue of the Prospectus:

(a) The business of the Company has in their opinion been satisfactorily maintained.

(b) No circumstances in their opinion have arisen adversely affecting the Company’s trading or the value of its assets.

(c) The current assets appear in the books of the Company at values which are believed to be realisable in the ordinary course of business.

(d) There are no contingent liabilities by reason of any guarantees given by the Company or its Subsidiary.

(e) There have not been, since the last annual report, any changes in published reserves or any unusual factors affecting the profit of the Company or its Subsidiary.

"There is no change to published reserves since the last annual report.

"Dated this 3rd day of December, 1979.

B. A. BROWN
S. R. COLEMAN
D. ROBERTSON
W. W. STRAUSS
R. L. CONROY"

By signing that document, the directors were in fact totally misrepresenting the facts—facts of which they were aware.

As I showed earlier, the group of companies was owed some \$309,000 by Darlington Quarries Pty Ltd, a fact of which the directors were aware 14 days prior to 3 December 1979, as Barry Alfred Brown, acting for the group of companies, filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court on 8 November 1979, one month before signing the prospectus.

In a speech that I made in this Chamber on 19 August last year, I outlined how Barry Alfred Brown, as chairman of Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited and Intercapital Finance Corporation Limited, promised to sell the shares of any shareholder who wished to sell and that they would receive their money by 30 June 1980. This promise was made on the ABC program "Nationwide". I showed in that speech that 76 shareholders informed Barry Alfred Brown that they wished to sell their shares and that he broke his promise by selling only three.

I also mentioned in that speech that a new offer had been made, which was to sell shares for 40 per cent of their value. As a matter of fact Mr Lickiss, the then Minister for Justice, used that offer as one of the reasons for not taking any action. I will quote from a letter the Minister sent to shareholders on 7 August last year—

"I am advised by my officers that an offer has been made to shareholders of the companies and that these offers are presently being considered."

The offer referred to was contained in a company newsletter dated 30 July 1980, and it was—

"For those shareholder members who wish to effect an early settlement a purchaser will pay 40% of the share payments actually made with settlement in six months from the date of acceptance.

"No interest is payable on the sale price.

"A secured certificate of deposit for the sale price will be issued."

Shareholders who wished to take up that offer were given 30 days in which to accept, which would have been by 30 August 1980. This meant that shareholders who availed themselves of the offer should have received

their money by 28 February 1981. However, in the normal run of broken promises made by this company, the shares were not sold and shareholders who attended the annual general meetings of the funds, which were held last Saturday, were informed that the offers made eight months ago had been withdrawn.

Also at the annual general meeting, shareholders were informed that the directors of Federated Housing Fund of Australia Limited and Intercapital Finance Corporation Limited intended to amalgamate both these companies into a new company to be known as Executive Properties Limited and that that company would make loans at 6½ per cent. Not that very many loans are ever made, but consider this: most people who joined these funds did so in the hope of receiving a loan at 2½ per cent. Some of them even realised that if they got a loan, the money they paid into shares would be worthless. However, this would be off-set by a 2½ per cent loan. Now they are being told that future loans, if any are made, will be at 6½ per cent. The question I pose is: How many of the present shareholders would have joined the fund if the interest had been 6½ per cent?

The points I have raised today are further proof of why the Queensland Government should take immediate action on these companies. The lies and deceit of the directors are shown in almost every new document that comes into my possession. I do not understand how the Corporate Affairs Office can believe any of the lies told to them by the directors.

The only solution left for shareholders of these companies is for the Queensland Government to take immediate action. I therefore call on the new Justice Minister (Mr Doumany) to immediately freeze whatever assets of these companies are left, pending a full-scale investigation. If the Queensland Corporate Affairs Office will not carry out the investigation, I suggest that the Minister ask officers of the New South Wales Corporate Affairs Office to carry it out. They have already proven that they can get back shareholders' money. In Queensland at present, shareholders have already lost about 57.2 per cent of their money.

When the New South Wales Government took action, it introduced legislation to appoint a Director of Home Loan Funds. As a result, most of the shareholders in the New South Wales companies opted for a return of their money.

As recently as last week I spoke to the Director of Home Loan Funds in New South Wales, and my information is that the average pay-out to these shareholders is approximately 60 per cent. That is 20 per cent more than the shareholders in the Queensland companies would get if the Queensland Government were to act today. If the Queensland Government does not take action, the 40 per cent that the people would now recover will become even less.

The scheme that these companies are trying to operate is unworkable. It is like a pyramid scheme and can operate only if new people continue to put money into the fund.

The new concept that the then Minister for Justice (Mr Lickiss) spoke about last year involved a superannuation scheme set up through a company that is located in Canberra and has as its managing agent a company that is registered in Melbourne. It has to use Queensland companies because no Government in Australia other than the Queensland Government will register home loan funds or allow home loan companies to operate. The Queensland Government is the only Government in Australia that will still allow mutual home loan companies to start up and to publish prospectuses in order to sell these loans. These companies are relying on the Queensland Government to keep the funds going so that they can start to sell their superannuation scheme.

They sell their scheme by promising people that they will get a cheap home loan if they take out a superannuation scheme with the company. A person who takes out a superannuation scheme with the company has to take out an allotment of home loan shares. It has already been shown that very few people actually receive loans through these companies. Generally speaking, it is Victorians who are starting to buy this superannuation scheme. They are paying their money in for their retirement and in the hope that they will get a cheap home loan. Of course, they will never get it.

Even if a person was to be given a cheap home loan, to enable that to remain as a superannuation payment he has to start renting his own house. As well as paying off the loan on the house at the low rate of interest of 6½ per cent, he has to rent the house from himself. In other words, he has to pay rent into his own superannuation fund, and each year that rent increases in line with the rate of inflation.

An average person will not be able to take out a loan, because he is paying interest and rent plus the money that he is paying in home shares. That will never be repaid, because after 17 years all that that person receives is a share certificate. All that that does is entitle him to go around telling his friends that he owns \$20,000 worth of shares in Federated Housing. He will not be paid any dividends and no-one will buy his shares. Would anyone buy shares from someone if after 17 years those shares have not received a loan? Even if the shares had received a loan, would anyone buy \$20,000 worth of shares that do not pay a dividend? Surely no-one would be as silly as that.

The people who presently are opting for this scheme—most of them are ordinary people who have between \$8,000 and \$10,000 locked up in the scheme—need some way of getting out. I realise that if the Queensland Government takes action, those people will get only 40 per cent of their money

back. However, they will not then be responsible for making the remainder of their share payments. They will be better off with 40 per cent of whatever they have paid in than with paying in the rest of their shares over the next eight or nine years and then getting none of their money back.

The Queensland Government should immediately investigate the legislation which was introduced in New South Wales. I should like our legislation to go a little further than that. Unfortunately, the New South Wales legislation lets the past and present directors off the hook. The Queensland legislation should make past and present directors responsible for any money they have lost in companies in which they have had a pecuniary interest. I look forward to the Minister's early action on these crooks.

Last year the Minister for Justice (Mr Lickiss) would take no action. He proved in this Parliament and to the people of Queensland that he was a totally incompetent Minister. He would not act for the people of Queensland or the people who had been paying money into these funds. I hope that the new Minister for Justice (Mr Doumany) will take some action and will not be snowed by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs as I suggest Mr Lickiss was continually last year. That is all I wish to say on the mutual home loans scheme.

I am glad, Mr Speaker, that you have resumed the chair, because I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your re-election. I guess I would have to admit that I did not vote for you. Last year you and I did exchange some words. I guess it could be said we had a few fights. I criticised you in your job. I congratulate you on the way you have fulfilled your office since the new Parliament has commenced sitting. If you slip backwards, of course, I will criticise you. I consider that you have done a better job this year than you did last year.

My final point relates to the facilities in this building. Much has been said during the Address-in-Reply debate by a lot of Government members about the squash court that is to be built. I have not heard one Government member say that he supports its provision. Many have said that they do not support it. I do not support it. I think it is a complete waste of money. It could be built in the QIT complex, and any member of Parliament would need to walk only a few hundred yards to play a game of squash. The students would be able to make far more use of it than if it were provided on the seventh level.

A Government Member: We don't see you up there too much.

Mr MACKENROTH: I go up and work out in the gym when it suits me. Because the Government decides to put it there does not compel me to use it. The honourable member should not be so stupid.

When the Parliament is not sitting, very few members of Parliament frequent the building. Those who do come in for a short time to attend a meeting or to pick up their mail. During that period, the facilities on Level 7 go to waste. I suggest, Mr Speaker, that you consider making the facilities on Level 7 available to members of the staff out of session. They are tremendous facilities and we should not hog them. The people who work in this building all year could make use of those facilities. There are many sportsmen on our staff. Some of them play football. They have to go outside the building and pay for the use of gymnasium equipment. I should like some members to criticise me for making that suggestion.

Mr Moore: Of course you're wrong. It's a members' House.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is a people's House and the only reason the honourable member is here is that the people elected him.

Mr Moore: You won't be here very long. You will be back on the dole.

Mr MACKENROTH: I have not collected a day's dole in my life.

I ask you to consider that suggestion, Mr Speaker, because the facilities are being wasted. There is nothing wrong with the staff; they are ordinary Queenslanders like me and the honourable member for Windsor. Perhaps one day when the honourable member loses his seat he might wish to come back here and use the facilities, and as a former member, he certainly could. But I see nothing wrong with the suggestion that the staff be allowed to use the facilities of the House when Parliament is not sitting. Certainly I can see certain conflicts arising if that were to occur when Parliament is sitting, but when it is not, members are just not using the facilities.

Mr Moore: How do you know?

Mr MACKENROTH: The honourable member does not even use the facilities, so why should he criticise that suggestion?

Hon. J. W. GREENWOOD (Ashgrove) (5.21 p.m.): The opening of a parliamentary session is a good time to take stock, to see what progress we have made since the previous session and to look again at our goals and see where we are heading in the future. This Address-in-Reply debate is doubly significant; it not only marks the opening of a new session but it heralds the beginning of a new parliamentary term.

The Forty-third Parliament meets when Queensland is beginning its most dramatic growth since the Gympie gold rush. The investment that is about to take place is measured not in tens of millions or hundreds of millions but in thousands of millions of dollars. There is no doubt about the opportunities ahead of us and, of course, it is

heresy to suggest that there is any doubt about our capacity to take advantage of them.

When looking at the problems and opportunities of the immediate future, there are a few facts on which we can all agree. The first fact is that this development will not take place without thousands of millions of dollars being found as investment capital. The second fact is that investment capital will not be forthcoming for Queensland projects unless there is reasonable expectation that long-term profits will at least match those to be earned in alternative investments in other parts of Australia and in other parts of the world. The third fact is that the development will not take place without the work of thousands of highly skilled men in a wide range of trades. The development that we are talking about is over and above the present level of economic activity, so the large numbers of highly skilled tradesmen that we must seek are over and above the work-force that exists today.

To put the problem in perspective, I would invite the House to compare Queensland with 10 members of the European Economic Community—the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Norway, Denmark and Ireland. All told, these nations have a combined area of 714 000 square miles. Queensland has an area of 667 000 square miles. Distances are roughly comparable. The Queensland Government, for example, can readily understand the financial problems of building and maintaining a system of roads, railways and port facilities to service a land mass of that size. But that is where the comparison begins and ends. Last December Queensland had a population of only 2.16m; the EEC had a 1979 figure of 260m. Last year Queensland's work-force was 877 000; the EEC's is in excess of 106m. The EEC has a population more than one hundred times larger than ours, so when we are considering the tax base available to Governments, the opportunities for saving and capital creation or the availability of skilled labour, it is clear that we are at a considerable disadvantage.

Against this background I refer to my initial point: it may be heresy to suggest that we will not be able to cope adequately with the investment opportunities opening before us, but surely we may be permitted to remark in passing that there will be a few difficulties along the way both in the creation of capital and in finding enough skilled tradesmen.

As we approach these problems there are a few things we should bear in mind. The first is that Queensland will need to import capital. There is nothing to be ashamed of in that. The United States did it for a long time with the greatest success. The US had outstripped Britain as the world's largest trading nation by about the turn of the century, yet she was still a net importer of capital throughout the next decade. If the United States had not been prepared to

import the savings of Europe and put that money to work; she could not have grown as quickly or as successfully as she did. That is the key to it.

How quickly do we want to grow? Do we want to take advantage of the opportunities of the 1980s? If it was necessary for the world's largest trading nation to import capital in order to achieve a satisfactory rate of growth, we should not be surprised if it is necessary for Queensland.

The second point concerns overseas investors. It is a legitimate ambition for Australians to try to retain control of their economy. Wherever possible, we should try to raise debt finance rather than equity finance. Where strategic minerals such as coal are concerned, the Commonwealth Government is insisting on 50 per cent local equity. There is nothing surprising or unacceptable in this. It is an attitude taken by many nations all over the world, and one with which investors are familiar.

The third point we must bear in mind—perhaps it should be the first and not the third—is Queensland's capacity to find tradesmen. How will we find the boilermakers, metalworkers and electricians that the country needs? How will we find the men to make the highways and bridges, refineries and smelters, mines, machinery and the thousand and one other things into which the investment dollar is transformed by the skill of Australian tradesmen?

Concern has been expressed for some years at the falling numbers of apprentices. One cause is obvious: very large increases in wages paid to apprentices—seventy-five per cent of a tradesman's wage in the third year and 90 per cent in the fourth—coupled with long periods of absence on block-release training schemes, have made it uneconomic for many employers to take on apprentices.

Many palliatives have been tried. All sorts of Government subsidies and inducements are in operation. We must watch them closely. If they do not succeed, then I believe that we must tackle the root cause of the problem, however difficult, and ask ourselves whether we are really doing apprentices a favour by putting up their wages so high and making their educational leave so generous that they can no longer get a job.

Above all, we must ensure that the development that takes place in Australia over the next decade is for the benefit of Australians. The worst possible indictment of political leadership would be a situation where skilled tradesmen are brought in as migrants from overseas while unskilled Australians remain unemployed. That is a situation that could easily arise, and it is our duty to see that it does not. At the risk of being repetitious, I say again: if the subsidies and other schemes for increasing the number of apprenticeships do not work, we should look again at the primary cause—wages and study conditions, which act as disincentives.

In conclusion, as the last speaker in this Address-in-Reply debate, may I pledge the loyalty and allegiance of the constituents of Ashgrove to Her Majesty the Queen, and it may not be inappropriate on such an occasion as this to express our best wishes to the Prince of Wales and Lady Diana Spencer on their recent engagement.

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

AYES, 24

Blake	Prest
Burns	Scott
Casey	Shaw
D'Arcy	Smith
Davis	Underwood
Eaton	Vaughan
Fouras	Warburton
Gibbs, R. J.	Wilson
Hooper	Wright
Jones	Tellers:
Kruger	Hansen
McLean	Mackenzie
Milliner	

NOES, 49

Ahern	McKechnie
Akers	Menzel
Bird	Miller
Bjelke-Petersen	Moore
Booth	Muntz
Borbridge	Nelson
Doumany	Powell
Edwards	Prentice
Elliott	Randell
Fitzgerald	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Scassola
Glasson	Scott-Young
Goleby	Simpson
Greenwood	Stephan
Harper	Sullivan
Hewitt	Tenni
Hinze	Tomkins
Innes	Turner
Jennings	Warner
Katter	Wharton
Kaus	White
Kyburz	Tellers:
Lane	Neal
Lee	Gygar
Lickiss	
Lockwood	

PAIR:

Yewdale	Gunn
---------	------

Resolved in the negative.

Motion—That the Address-in-Reply be adopted (Dr Lockwood)—agreed to.

SUPPLY

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

PRESENTATION

Mr SPEAKER: I propose to present to His Excellency the Governor, at Government House, tomorrow morning at 9.30 o'clock, the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech agreed to on this day, and I shall be glad to be accompanied by the mover and the seconder and such other honourable members as care to be present.

STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 25 March (see p. 518) on Mr Bjelke-Petersen's motion—

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

Mr CASEY: (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (5.41 p.m.): When the Bill was introduced by the Premier, he stated that it was a simple Bill, one that was very advantageous to the people of Queensland and supposedly of advantage to the local authorities of Queensland. In fact, a study of the legislation shows clearly that it is exactly the opposite, that it is one of the most sinister pieces of legislation that has come before the House, particularly in view of the political climate in this State and the manner in which the Government has been operating over such a long period.

Not only is it one of the worst pieces of legislation that I have ever seen; it is also a clear example of the type of Government that we have in this State. It is a continuation of the constant move to take away from the Parliament of Queensland its rights and powers, and, indeed, its duties, because the very resources of the State are involved, and hand those over to the Executive, to the Governor in Council.

The Bill is one of the greatest confidence tricks that we have seen. A surprising aspect is that the legislation has reached the House with the full support—indeed, I could probably use the word “connivance”—of not only the Liberal Party Ministers but also the Liberal Party back-benchers in this Parliament who, before the recent election, said that they wanted to fight to ensure that

the authority of the Parliament was never undermined and that we got away from Executive Government in this State. It has received the support of the joint Government parties, so both Liberal Party and National Party back-benchers have accepted it. But what does one find? As one goes through the Bill, one sees that it is another sell-out to Executive Government in Queensland.

If the Bill is passed by the House, it will mean that no more agreements such as that relating to the Rundle oil shale project will come before the House; that no more Central Queensland Coal Associates agreements will be brought before the House; that agreements such as the International Tourist Corporation agreement (otherwise known as the Iwasaki Bill) will not have to be brought before the House under any conditions. They will merely have to receive the approval of the Governor in Council in this State.

The Government will be able to pass down the line to whoever it chooses, without the authority, support, or, indeed, scrutiny, of this Parliament, the very great assets of this State. More and more deals of the type that we have seen recently will be perpetrated. All that this Government has to do is have the Executive Council declare a development a “prescribed development”. Once those words are used to describe a scheme, Parliament will see nothing more of it.

The Winchester South deal is a classic example. Comments have been made about it and criticism has been levelled at it, even by some Government back-benchers. For three weeks the Government has been questioned constantly concerning the smelly Winchester South deal. Members have endeavoured to obtain information from the Executive Council, which, up to this stage, has been happy to hold all the responsibility in its hot little hand. Members have tried to obtain answers for the people of Queensland, but their efforts have been thwarted by the Executive Council.

Under the Bill the Government merely has to declare the Winchester South deal to be a “prescribed development” to prevent the whole smelly deal from once more seeing the light of day. It will remain locked away with Executive Council, or, in other words, with the Cabinet gang of 18, as the Ministers were christened last year. Never again will the Winchester South deal come before this Parliament. Never again will a similar type of agreement come before this Parliament. But, of course, this is the way in which the Government has operated since the National Party gained a complete stranglehold on this Government.

We have seen it so often. Today an ex-member of the National Party referred to the way in which the National Party operates. It is a case of, “Pay your money and you will get your way.” That is how future operations will be conducted in Queensland.

That is the way in which the assets of this great State will be passed over to goodness knows who if this Bill is passed.

The Premier told us that the Bill was designed supposedly to cover merely the development of mineral and energy resources in this State. Certainly that aspect is mentioned in one part of the Bill. However, obviously the term "prescribed development" refers to something of major economic significance. Previously in this Parliament we have heard those words used. We heard them used in relation to the Iwasaki project. It was claimed to be a project of major economic significance.

Anything goes in this Government's rape of the assets of this State. Any Japanese mogul or Arabian sheikh can come into Queensland and do a deal with Cabinet—or, at least, with the National Party component of Cabinet, because the National Party has the numbers in Cabinet as well—and bang go the assets of the State without the people of Queensland having any chance to scrutinise the project and without their having any opportunity through their properly elected members to debate it on the floor of this Parliament.

Is it any wonder that the National Party has grabbed all the economic portfolios in Cabinet? Is it any wonder that the Premier has gagged the Liberal Ministers over this little bit of documentation? They meekly follow him in perpetrating farces such as the one that we are witnessing this evening.

Certainly the Bill provides that matters can be referred back to local authorities. However, it also provides that matters can be taken away from local authorities and kept secure from them. That is the overriding principle that runs through the Bill. Even if a developer wants to go to a local authority, the local authority is required to place the application in the hands of the Co-ordinator-General's Department, which acts for and on behalf of the Government. Everything must be reported back through the Minister, who has overriding powers. And who is the Minister who is introducing this legislation? The arch-villain himself—the Premier of Queensland!

Mr Hinze: That's rude.

Mr CASEY: We know the Minister didn't try to be his 2 i/c.

That is the procedure that we will see followed in relation to this Bill.

It is very important for us to remember that this is another example of overriding legislation. The Bill will override every piece of legislation that has been passed by this Parliament. That power is specifically written into one of the principles of the Bill. It is clearly set out that regardless of the town planning procedures of local authorities, this Bill will override them.

What are the thoughts of the new National Party back-bench members who have recently been members of local authorities? For years they have been standing up and preaching about the local authorities having control of their own destinies. They will have to settle down and accept this Bill that is being introduced by their Government.

What about the various health Acts? They are being overridden by this Bill. The same applies to the environmental control Act. Those Acts are administered by Liberal Ministers but they will be completely overridden by the Premier and the Co-ordinator-General's Department.

A classic example is the very controversial matter of sand-mining on Moreton Island. Under this Bill the company concerned can approach the Minister for Mines and Energy, the Minister for Local Government or the Premier himself and say, "We want sand-mining on Moreton Island to be made a prescribed development." There might be other things it will say to go along with it, but at this stage I will give it the benefit of the doubt. If the Government agrees to the request, it does not matter about the opinion of the Brisbane City Council, the Minister for Environment, any department or any piece of legislation; it can be done. The total control of sand-mining on Moreton Island will be vested in the Cabinet gang of 18. There will be no report to Parliament.

Mr Frawley: What about the pulp mill at Beerburum?

Mr CASEY: That is another example. It does not matter what environmental control measures are required by the relevant local authorities, which are the properly constituted bodies to look after the health of the people in the area; the Bill will override them.

Winchester South is another classic example. There is already great secrecy about it. Under this Bill that project can proceed without any further scrutiny by this Parliament. Cabinet Ministers and other Government members like to talk about the great developments that will take place in Queensland. When we see this type of legislation, we wonder who will benefit and on whose behalf those developments are being created.

Another suspicious part of the Bill is the provision that the Governor in Council will have the power to act retrospectively in some aspects of developments. Quite clearly, they could be declared prescribed developments. Then anything that has been undertaken by this Parliament by way of an agreement can be altered. The Bill contains provision for agreements to be varied from time to time. Under the Bill the Government will be able to alter the Utah development, which has been going on for many years, Oaky Creek or the Iwasaki project. I am sure that the Premier would like to vary

that agreement. Variations or retrospectivity will not have to come back to this Parliament. There will be no reference to Parliament. Admittedly one clause provides that some aspects of the projects must be advertised so that objections may be lodged. But who decides the objections? The Governor in Council! Caesar unto Caesar unto Caesar! That is what then occurs, because it goes straight back to the Cabinet gang of 18.

Mr Hinze interjected.

Mr CASEY: The old Cabinet gang of 18 has changed following the election; there are a considerable number of new faces. The faces may be new, but the images are just the same. They have not changed in any way.

It should be remembered that this will be an overriding Act. It quite clearly states that no matter what sort of objection is lodged or no matter what other people might think or might want to do, as soon as the Cabinet gang has made its decision it shall be final and binding. They are the very words used in the Bill. There is no appeal whatsoever. There will be no recourse to the normal processes of the law because it will be an overriding Act. What a shocking thing it is when we see legislation of this type before this Parliament.

The next clause to which I wish to refer uses terms such as, "... shall have effect in law". The Bill clearly states that it shall have effect in law despite any town planning scheme, any ordinance of any local authority or any local body, because the definition of "local body" in the Bill covers not only the local authorities of Queensland but also harbour boards, electricity authorities, the Port of Brisbane Authority and any other authority one might like to mention. Any authoritative body that has been set up under an Act of this Parliament is covered.

Let us have a look again at the type of things that could happen. A controversy has been raging for a considerable period over the development of sand islands in The Broadwater at Southport. All the people concerned have to do is go to a Minister or the Governor in Council and say, "This is our proposal. Make it into a prescribed development and we can go from there." That will happen.

Mr Warburton: No debate in Parliament!

Mr CASEY: None whatsoever; no debate among the people of Southport and no opportunity for the Gold Coast City Council to lodge objections. In fact, a later part of the Bill says that once the Government has made a decision the local authority has to put that decision into effect in law even though, as regards The Broadwater development, the Gold Coast City Council has been fighting the idea for many years. A number of people in Southport consider this development to be of major economic significance,

as I think it is termed in the Bill. Of course it will be of major economic significance, because a number of people closely connected with the National Party in Southport propose to make a quid out of it. That is the economic significance to them of that development. So all they have to do through their local body, which in that case is the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, is tell Cabinet what they want to do, and away it goes. The proposal starts there, as long as they say it is of major economic significance for their area.

As I said earlier, the legislation even requires that the local body must secure compliance—in the courts, if necessary. The local body must take people who want to object to the proposal to court, contrary to its own rules or wishes. To be sure, the Co-ordinator-General has certain powers to obtain information in relation to a proposal, to gather the various facts from the people who want to carry out a prescribed development, but again there is an overriding phrase, "except if the Minister directs to the contrary." In other words, if the Premier does not want disclosed any information about what a group of people want to do, whether it be a mining proposal, an energy development, or something else of economic significance, the Co-ordinator-General does not have to disclose it. If the Premier says to him, "I don't want that information disclosed, just take the word of the people concerned", that is it.

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

Mr CASEY: Prior to the dinner recess I was referring to the terrible ways in which this Bill places complete and utter power over the development of this State in the hands of the Governor in Council, rather than where it rightfully belongs, and that is in this Parliament.

I give credit where it is due. There is only one aspect of this Bill that I accept as being reasonable, and that is the part of it that provides for the Co-ordinator-General's Department to provide a report to Parliament. Let us consider that matter in perspective. The report will firstly be presented to the Minister, and then at a later stage he will table it in the Parliament. It will be really only a summation of the development that has taken place in the State for the previous 12 months. It will cover a number of aspects of the operations of the State Government.

This amending Bill will do nothing but make the Co-ordinator-General's Department the plaything of the developers who want to come into this State and extract the assets of this State for their own economic pleasure. The department will not fulfil the role for which it was established. Recently I looked at the Act that was passed when the Co-ordinator-General's Department was originally set up in 1938. That Act set out the ways in which the department was to be used to really develop Queensland and

to make it a State of decentralisation. The Labor Government at that time set up the Co-ordinator-General's Department to develop all the areas of the State in such a way that the incomes of the people in the State would be reasonably equated, and all would be given the opportunity to work in whatever part of the State they chose to live. Over the years, we have seen a gradual whittling down of the operations of that department in that respect.

I have smiled when I have heard Government members assert in this Chamber that Queensland is the most decentralised State in Australia. I say here again, unhesitatingly, that no credit for that is due to this National Party Government, with its Liberal Party rump. The State was developed along those lines for a century or more.

Some alarming figures are available in the Parliamentary Library and elsewhere. They clearly show that centralisation has been to the fore under the present Government. Never again should any Government member talk about this great State of decentralisation or endeavour to claim any credit for the decentralisation that has taken place in this State.

I refer to the latest population figures for Brisbane and the south-eastern corner of this State, including the Gold Coast. In the mid-1950s, that area of the State contained 51 per cent of the population of Queensland. That figure has now risen to over 58 per cent. Then I look at the rest of southern Queensland, the Darling Downs, south-western Queensland and the Wide Bay/Burnett area which, I suppose, one could say was the traditional home of the old Country Party. That is the name by which the National Party was once proudly known by many people in Queensland. As we heard the member for Callide say today, that is no longer the case. That particular area of southern Queensland had 22½ per cent of the State's population in the mid-1950s, but that figure has now dropped to 16 per cent. That drop in growth has occurred in the Wide Bay/Burnett, Brisbane Valley, Darling Downs and south-western areas of Queensland.

Central Queensland, which is supposed to be the growth area of the State, the place where all the development is taking place, the place where so much is happening, as so many Ministers try to tell us, had 8 per cent of the State's population in the 1950s. Despite all the new coal-mines and townships about which we hear so much so often, by 1980 the population in that area had dropped to 7 per cent of the State's population.

North Queensland, that vast part of the State that contains approximately 42 per cent of the area of Queensland, had 18 per cent of the State's population in the mid-1950s, and this has in fact risen marginally to 19 per cent in 1980. Unfortunately, however, when the statistics of the various areas are

looked at it is seen that there has been a reduction in this area, with two exceptions—the city of Mt Isa and the area around Mackay, the area that I represent. Growth has occurred in those places for particular reasons: the development of Mount Isa Mines in the case of Mt Isa, and the growth of the sugar industry, with its closely settled farm areas, around Mackay.

When one looks at the western and country districts of Queensland—I exclude Mt Isa—one sees that the population of that area has dropped from 5½ per cent to 2½ per cent of the State's population. When one looks at the actual figures, one sees that during the term of this so-called Country Party Government or National Party Government, whatever it likes to call itself, virtually half the population of western and country Queensland, the remote areas of this State, have left those areas. Pious people such as the member for Balonne stand up here and speak about a redistribution so that he can represent the electors in the area, but most of the people from that area have left. The St George area, represented by the member for Balonne, is one of the areas that people have deserted in the greatest numbers.

Mr Neal: You have never been to St George.

Mr CASEY: I have been to St George on a number of occasions.

The member for Balonne, just like other members of the National Party, does not like to look at the harsh figures that prove that under the National-Liberal Government half the population of the remote areas of this State have deserted and gone to the cities. They have left those areas because they can no longer afford to live in them.

Is it any wonder that the National Party is now turning its back on those areas and now wants to get more representation in Brisbane? That is where most of its original supporters have come to. They have left the country areas and are living in Brisbane, so the National Party wants to regain their support. Because of the way in which they have been treated, there is virtually no-one left in the bush any more. In an earlier debate today the member for Balonne admitted that.

One aspect of this Bill that I would now like to refer to is that, irrespective of what else is contained in it, there is no way whatsoever that it will overcome the problem of past agreements. It cannot redevelop proper infrastructure in towns like Moura, which is an absolute planning disaster. Nor will it overcome the problems of Blackwater, a township that grew like Topsy, as the saying goes. Because a number of different mining companies have not provided the proper infrastructure, that town has a great many planning problems.

Of all the problems of past franchise agreements that this Bill will not overcome, the greatest is that there has never been a franchise agreement for minerals and energy prospects in this State that has done anything to develop the processing of those natural assets. One of the first of these that came to this Parliament was the Comalco agreement. After 25 years we find that we are now finally to get an aluminium smelter. That is where the real profit is.

The economic return to this State from the export of aluminium ingots is something like 31 times the return from exporting bauxite in its raw state. I recognise that over a period of time some of that bauxite has been shipped to Gladstone for refinement into alumina, which gives five or six times the economic return. But the big return from bauxite is in processing it right through to aluminium ingots. The biggest return of all comes from the manufacture of extruded aluminium products. But so far none of the franchise agreements has done anything to ensure that the primary asset is processed in Queensland.

Let us take steaming coal which, as I have said in recent times, will be to Queenslanders in future years what oil is to the Arabs today. However, we find no efforts being made by the State Government to set up blending-plant arrangements near the major ports of Hay Point and Gladstone, or the proposed port at Abbot Point, so that the companies, through the Queensland Coal Board, can mix the coals. Rather is the opportunity handed over to the mining companies willy nilly by this Government to allow them to rip out the best of the coals and leave the marginal coals in the ground for the time being. Instead of the cost advantages of having access to the better coals for our own electricity generation coming to us in Queensland, we will in the future be paying very high figures indeed for our electricity generation, because we will be working on the more marginal deposits of coal. All our good deposits will have been ripped off, put in ships and sent somewhere or other overseas.

That is not an exaggeration. All one has to do to realise that that is what is being done is to visit the town of Moura today to inspect the Moura mine and mines in the Kiangra area. The mining operations of the Dampier company are very marginal indeed. That company is having extreme difficulty maintaining the necessary quality to fulfil contracts with Japanese, European and other steel mills.

These are the problems of past agreements that will not be remedied by the amendments contained in this Bill. They will only be corrected by having these things pointed out to the Government of the day in this Parliament and by the Government's acknowledging the criticism and doing something about it. As long as these deals are continually locked away in the secrecy of

Cabinet, in the bags of the Cabinet gang of 18, there is no way in the world that Queensland will get a better deal out of it. We do not have agreements for manufacturing and processing, nor do we have proper agreements or infrastructure.

For a classic example of that, I need go no further than the city of Gladstone. Everybody in this Parliament—and more especially my colleague the member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest)—knows full well the planning disasters that have occurred in that town. Companies are not even prepared to look at the place now, because they do not know where to start. Government departments themselves do not know where to start. Everybody seems to be running around in circles up there.

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr CASEY: The Minister for Works and Housing would probably be the greatest offender. He and his Department of Works have just sat on their butts and procrastinated about the problems of Gladstone for such a very long time. The greatest complaints about school development proposals in Queensland come from Gladstone. The greatest complaints about public buildings that are required to provide the services that should be given by a State Government to the people of this State come from Gladstone. The man who is supposedly responsible for that is the Minister for Works and Housing. He should just sit there quietly, being as meek as he normally is under the Premier at Cabinet meetings. That is the type of thing he has neglected for such a long time.

Mr Warburton: Do you think, by the conversations over in the corner, that some people might be having second thoughts?

Mr CASEY: I said earlier that if the Liberal members of this Parliament, back-benchers and Cabinet Ministers alike, are prepared to accept this Bill, for ever more they will be completely discredited in the eyes of the people of Queensland. If the National Party back-bench members of this Parliament completely accept the Bill as it presently stands, they, too, will be absolutely discredited in the eyes of the people of Queensland. The Bill has one theme running right through it: to take away from this Parliament its responsibility and to place it in the hands of the Cabinet gang of 18.

Returning to the Gladstone problem—I feel quite sure that my colleague the member for Port Curtis, who will be speaking shortly in this debate, will give a full run-down on some of the real problems that have been created as a result of the planning disasters of this Government—problems that will not be overcome by this Bill. Because of the improper planning in the past, they will not be overcome. We are now seeing that the chickens are coming home to roost for the Government.

Talk of great regional development is a lot of nonsense if it is related to household income per head of population. That is a simple and easy exercise. If there is such great development in the country and provincial areas of Queensland, everyone should be really making a quid. But such is not the case. It will be seen that in 1954 the household income per head of population in Brisbane and the south-eastern corner of the State was the lowest for the whole of the State. In fact, it was by far the lowest of the whole of the State.

In 1980, it is the highest, and—would you believe?—one of the lowest income areas is Central Queensland, where most of the mining development and mining boom has taken place. It is the Central Queensland area which contains this so-called boom port of Gladstone, and Moura and many other mining towns.

We can see that as well as shifting the population of Queensland from country areas this Government has already succeeded, in its 22 or 24 years of government, in shifting the high level of income from the country people to the people in the cities. The Government stands condemned on both counts, and it will continue to stand condemned by the people in its own areas. This Bill will accelerate that shift of income advantage in this State into the hands of a few people. They are the people who are prepared to contribute to the National Party Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. That is one of the various ways in which that foundation finds finance, and one of the spurious ways in which it funds its operations under the protective cloak of Cabinet and by introducing Bills of this nature. During this debate my colleagues will bring out many other matters.

Mr Wharton: Bring them right out. You have not read the Bill yet.

Mr CASEY: I think the same could be said of the Minister. He has not read the Bill and certainly has not understood it if he has read it. He does not understand that the Cabinet, of which he is a member, has continued to take over this State as it has done for so many years. But now it is sought to put ultimate power into the hands of a few people.

Members on this side of the House will not support the Bill because of the underlying theme that can be read into it. We believe that no member of this Parliament should in conscience give the sweeping powers contained in this Bill to any Cabinet, and particularly not to the gang of 18 that we have in this State at present.

Mr HOOPER (Archerfield) (7.32 p.m.): This Bill is long overdue. It is obvious after reading the Bill that it is a paper tiger and typical of this Government's policies over the last 23 years. It is another classic example of closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. The introduction of this Bill has

no doubt been prompted in the main by the smell emanating from the Winchester South coal deal. The Government has been caught on the hop, and in an attempt to save face the Government has introduced an amendment to the Act.

The Winchester South coal deal has left a stench in the nostrils of all thinking Queenslanders. On reading the Bill, I am of the opinion that the main purpose for its introduction is to prevent another Gladstone fiasco. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to that in his speech. He has drawn out the problems that exist in Gladstone, and I intend to speak about Gladstone for a few minutes. The Leader of the Opposition said, "No doubt my colleague the honourable member for Port Curtis will raise in his speech the problems existing in Gladstone."

Mr Jones: In more detail.

Mr HOOPER: My colleague the honourable member for Cairns says that I will raise them in more detail, and no doubt I will.

Dr Lockwood: Small but eloquent.

Mr HOOPER: If you are looking for eloquence, you have got it. Speaking to the honourable member for Toowoomba North, I say that when I make a speech in the House at least members do not leave the Chamber. When the honourable member for Toowoomba North makes a speech, he is probably the dreariest member of this House. In moving the Address-in-Reply motion in this House, he droned his way through 40 minutes of drivel and trivia. When I rise to my feet, it is quite obvious from the interjections made and the expressions that I see on the faces of honourable members that they are quite interested in what I have to say. I do not want to waste time on the lightweight member for Toowoomba North. He has been a back-bencher since he entered Parliament in 1974, and he will be a back-bencher for as long as he remains in this House.

Regarding housing, we have seen people forced from their family homes in Gladstone because of the inability to pay the high rates that the local authority has been forced to charge. We have also had the spectacle of the Government providing Housing Commission homes at subsidised rentals to the multinationals for use by their employees, while the ordinary battler with a family has to pay up to \$120 a week for a caravan when a site can be obtained.

The Leader of the House, who is also the Minister for Works and Housing, is in the House. He has heard me make these accusations, and it is interesting to note that he has not taken a point of order to dispute what I had to say.

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is telling untruths. The companies have not taken on houses at subsidised interest rates. I ask for a withdrawal of his statement. He is a fibber.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to accept the Minister's denial and to withdraw his remarks.

Mr HOOPER: I do withdraw. I am not going to enter into a debate on Standing Orders, but I do feel that the Minister—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Unequivocally.

Mr HOOPER: I withdraw the remarks, but—

Mr SPEAKER: No "buts"!

Mr HOOPER: The Minister referred to me as a fibber. I find his comment grossly offensive and insulting and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the comment. It was in fact unparliamentary language.

Mr WHARTON: If the honourable member thinks that applies to him, I withdraw it.

Mr HOOPER: Recently "Today Tonight" on Channel 9 emphasised the problems confronting the people of Gladstone. They are immense. During the program a social worker referred to the problems in relation to housing. I am sure that my good friend and colleague the honourable member for Port Curtis will agree that a serious shortage of housing exists in Gladstone.

There is no doubt that at the hands of the Bjelke-Petersen Government some multinationals receive different treatment from that given to other companies. For example, in mining towns such as Moranbah and Dysart the mining companies build the towns, whereas in Gladstone and other places the multinationals come in and disrupt the town without contributing one cent to the new infrastructure that is required.

Mr Kruger: They should pay their way.

Mr HOOPER: Of course they should.

In years gone by it may have been OK for the local authority to provide a factory when a new industry moved into its area. However, that is not the case today. Over the years, the cost of the necessary infrastructure, such as roads, power and water supply has been recouped by way of rates. In places like Gladstone the local residents are called upon to fund these services even though they get no immediate benefit from the presence of the company.

What has also been overlooked is the terrific social upheaval caused by the arrival of some industries in what were formerly quiet towns. Overnight they virtually change from Sleepy Hollow to Dodge City in the best traditions of the old Wild West.

I suppose I could be accused of being a cynic if I suggested that the treatment of a company depends on whether or not it makes a donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. It is well known in Queensland that if a large company, particularly a mining company, makes a substantial contribution to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, it receives very favoured treatment for years to come. It is a very good investment.

Mr Powell: How about proving that?

Mr HOOPER: How can one prove it when the foundation is a private company that is not subject to the company laws of this State or to the provisions of the friendly societies Act? I challenge the honourable member for Isis to suggest to the management committee of the National Party, if he is brave enough—we saw what happened to the honourable member for Callide when he stood up to it—that it provide the House with an audited statement of accounts of the foundation. I am sure that we would find some very interesting reading in it.

Mr Powell: The onus is on you to prove the impropriety.

Mr HOOPER: As my good friend and colleague the honourable member for Brisbane Central has said, it is common knowledge and has never been denied in this House that the present Minister for Mines and Energy paid \$5,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation to secure a very safe berth in State Cabinet.

Mr Casey: He signed an undated letter of resignation, too.

Mr HOOPER: I remember that some years ago I referred in the House to the fact that some building societies required their directors to follow the same practice. A lot of odium attached to those directors. Now here we have the Premier requesting certain Cabinet Ministers to sign an undated resignation. This reeks of Tammany Hall politics at its worst. No doubt all decent Queenslanders would condemn these tactics.

Mr Jones: You know the member for Isis has not contributed yet, so he won't make Cabinet?

Mr HOOPER: With due respect to the member for Isis, he does not have a great deal between the ears.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to relate his remarks to the contents of the Bill.

Mr HOOPER: I accept your ruling, Mr Speaker.

It is a well-known fact that the National Party is owned lock, stock and barrel by the multinationals.

Mr Jones: Shame!

Mr HOOPER: Of course it's a shame. More so, it is owned by the multinational coal companies such as Utah and Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui. They are the companies that control the National Party in this State. Where would it get its money to fight an election campaign if it did not receive funds from the multinational companies?

Mr Kruger: Just like puppets.

Mr HOOPER: They are like puppets and they dance to the puppeteer's tune.

We all remember the frequent and regular visits of the former Minister for Mines, Energy and Police (Mr Ron Camm) to the Californian headquarters of Utah, no doubt, as the racing Minister (Mr Hinze) would say in his cups, to receive his riding instructions. It is to be hoped that all of the proposed large developments declared as prescribed developments are made to pull their weight.

Mr Moore: Why don't you write your own speeches?

Mr HOOPER: At least when I get to my feet I make a speech. I do not subject the House to a stuttering, stammering dissertation such as we hear from the honourable member for Windsor.

It is quite obvious that the companies I have mentioned contribute very heavily to the National Party funds through the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. It is quite obvious also that, during the election campaign, the money that the National Party had to spend certainly did not come from raffles or barbecues.

All of the multinational companies, particularly those in Gladstone, should be required to contribute heavily to upgrade facilities. I think most honourable members would agree that those companies will be handsomely rewarded for their investments. I am not over-confident that this will happen, because it is well known that political power is centered in the boardrooms of multinational companies. They pull the strings and the Bjelke-Petersen Government dances. The time is long overdue for the Bjelke-Petersen Government to put the interests of Queenslanders before the profits of the wealthy multinationals.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (7.42 p.m.): The Premier, in introducing the Bill, said that it was a very simple one. When the Premier said the word "simple" I think he was implying that the members of this Parliament were simple. I fully support the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. His comments were really an understatement of our fears about the intention of the Premier and the manner in which he intends to introduce powers to override all departments, in particular the local authorities and, above all, this Parliament.

If the Premier wishes to be able to place demands on any mineral and energy development of major economic significance by having it declared a prescribed development I would say that I agree with the Bill because major mining and mineral-processing operations, such as those in Queensland, must enter into agreements with the local bodies. Those agreements must include the financing of the infrastructure required to meet the demands of each project and the population increase caused by large development. The demands would include housing, welfare, schools, hospitals, transport, police, sporting and recreational facilities and everything else that is necessary.

State departments and most statutory authorities are able at present to make satisfactory agreements with large developers for the provision of infrastructure services so why not simply amend the Local Government Act to allow a particular local authority to enter into negotiations with the company or the intended developer? We should be giving the local authority the power to act on its own behalf. Then it could negotiate agreements to be placed before the Parliament for final approval. In that way the local authority would have the same power as most statutory authorities.

In the past, the agreements entered into between this Government and the companies have not been very successful. This Government, after years of bungling, has seen the need to introduce this Bill. The Government has been lax and has not done any forward planning. That is one of the major problems confronting the Government and the people today. The Government has pussyfooted around with multinational companies, and because it has not been firm in its demands on the companies Queensland citizens are suffering hardships.

We in this State receive very little financial gain. The great wealth being made from development by foreign companies is being exported. I have always advocated that development companies must make a financial contribution to the infrastructure of the area in which they operate. I represent an area where companies have not been compelled to subscribe to the provision of the infrastructure.

In the past the Government has not played its part in providing financial assistance to local authorities, nor has it provided sufficient welfare, housing, school facilities and accommodation, medical facilities or assistance for Gladstone's buses. Railwaymen are separated from their families and living in bondwood huts. The roads in the area are substandard. I could go on and on. Yet this Bill wants us to give the very same Cabinet Ministers who have not been able to cope with the situation in the past the sole say in making decisions on our behalf. We are also asked to give them powers to override all Acts and all statutory bodies.

Let me look at some of the development that has taken place in my area and the problems created because of lack of forward planning. I have a newspaper cutting here dated 11 November 1976 which refers to a \$90m Gladstone mill to be constructed by Queensland Cement & Lime. An agreement was entered into with that company, but I cannot remember any financial assistance being given to the local authority to help in the provision of infrastructure.

From the middle 1970s until 1979 we heard a lot about the alumina industry being established in Gladstone. Queensland Alumina Ltd finally set up its operation in Gladstone, and each year since it commenced operations it has made a record profit. On 7 August 1979 we saw a headline saying that huge growth was tipped for the QAL plant. We now find that QAL is on the verge of another major expansion in Gladstone. But what contribution has it made to the infrastructure of the city to alleviate the problems it has created?

On 28 August 1979 another newspaper headline referred to the aluminium boom and said that Comalco intended to double its spending on its project at Boyne Island at a final cost of \$1,000m. In the Gladstone area in the late 1950s and 1960s we were talking about development projects worth hundreds of thousands of dollars; then it was millions of dollars, and now we are talking about billion dollar projects. All the hardships that were visited on the ratepayers in the past are to be repeated. But now they are saying that they have had enough, and that if any further development is to take place they have to get some financial assistance.

On 2 July 1980 the former Minister for Industry and Administrative Services, Mr Lee, said that the State's industries were booming, that we had the world at our feet and within 10 years Gladstone would be another Newcastle. I do not think his prediction was anything to write home about, even though he is a Queensland-made product.

On 28 February we saw a headline stating that the QAL plant was to expand its operations. Only one month later, we read that Joh said he hoped that a \$2 billion steel mill would go to either Gladstone or Townsville.

On 27 March, just seven days after the Premier had announced that that consortium was coming to Gladstone, we read that the Lend Lease Corporation was talking about building a steel mill there. Then there was the shopping complex to be built again by Lend Lease, for about \$15m. Next it was announced in August 1980 that an oil-seed plant would be built on the Clinton Industrial Estate. On 29 October 1980 we read that the city of Gladstone was in line for a titanium plant. On 28 November 1980 it was announced that a soda plant would be

built in Gladstone for \$2.3 billion. That involved the chemical manufacturing firm of Occidental.

Then we read that overseas interests had moved in on the city coking plant. Of course, at that time it was announced that Australian Lend Lease would set up a plant to handle 9 million tonne of coal to produce 6 million tonne of coke. Then we heard about a twin \$1m coking plant. The CSR was going to set up that consortium. What did we get out of all that? We got a list of promises, but no assistance has been given to Gladstone so far. These are the people to whom the Premier is asking us to give the responsibility of obtaining the best deal from overseas companies in subscribing to the infrastructure of the city. That has not happened in the past.

The Gladstone City Council said that it needed some \$30-odd million to provide this infrastructure. Just before and after the last election the Premier stated that we needed \$159.5m to provide the infrastructure that is required for the massive development that will take place in the Gladstone region. Queensland Alumina, under its multi-million dollar expansion program, will build a caravan park and a hostel. In the past, instead of providing permanent accommodation for their employees, companies have been prepared to put down a few slabs of concrete and provide temporary accommodation. Fortunately, today the unions, in their wisdom, have said, "We have had enough temporary accommodation. We need permanent accommodation for the work-force."

It was announced on 24 March this year that a steel alloy works would be built in Gladstone by Broken Hill Coy Pty Ltd. I could go on and on. Because of this massive propaganda program about what was going to be built in Gladstone, prices for land have risen far beyond the prices paid for land in other cities and towns in Queensland. At the present time an inquiry is being conducted into the claim by the workers at the power-station for an extra \$81 a week to cover the high cost of living in Gladstone.

Mr Lee: Why?

Mr PREST: Because there is a great shortage of developed land. The department for which the Minister was responsible did not develop enough land to meet the demand. The developers are allowed to compete at the auctions. A little while ago the LAC put up 15 or 17 blocks of land for auction, with a reserve top price of \$12,500. Because demand exceeded supply, those top blocks brought \$33,500. A responsible Government would develop sufficient land to meet the demand. Once developers pay that price for blocks of land, they construct units and demand weekly rentals of \$100 or \$150 per unit. This Government has not lived up to its responsibilities. It has failed.

Mr Lee: Why?

Mr PREST: I do not know why it has failed. I suppose that like the honourable member it is incompetent. Of course, the honourable member was one of the unfortunate ones to have his head cut off when the last Cabinet was selected.

Gladstone has a staggering \$9,000m shopping list. That is the type of money that is spent there. However, what has the giant Comalco consortium, which is spending \$1,000m at Boyne Island, subscribed towards the infrastructure of the area? This Government entered into no agreement about infrastructure with Comalco. In the early days there was an agreement with Comalco in relation to bauxite-mining at Weipa and also for the supply of electricity to the smelter, but nothing for the infrastructure.

A Press article of 19 August 1980 stated some of the actions of the Calliope Shire chairman and the Gladstone mayor. The article was headed—

“Shire Chairman swipes at Comalco”.

It related to the very small amount of assistance that Comalco had given to the infrastructure in the area. On 28 March this year the mayor of Gladstone again attacked the smelter burden. A Press article stated—

“It’s time they paid their dues says Col.

“The Boyne Island aluminium smelter was placing a heavier and heavier burden on Gladstone’s civic facilities, Mayor Ald Col Brown said yesterday.

“The Mayor made the claims after conducting a vehicle count which showed what he said was an ‘alarming’ increase in the number of smelter workers living in Gladstone and commuting to the construction site.

“This is despite the fact that Comalco has claimed in the past that it would not have to contribute substantial infrastructure assistance to Gladstone because the great majority of workers would live in the Boyne-Tannum area.”

Earlier it was understood that the Housing Commission would construct a certain number of houses for Comalco workers. At the opening of the Boyne River bridge Comalco announced that it would pay for its own housing. That is to its credit. Although it will employ in the vicinity of 1 000 workers at the plant it is building a substantial number of houses in the Tannum/Boyne area. However, during the construction period the caravan park at Boyne Island is available only to certain persons who work on the plant, not to all construction workers, and that has caused problems.

I could go on and on about the problems created by the development that has taken place. Not very long ago the Gladstone City Council was incensed because no-one would

provide financial assistance. The Government had neglected the area for a long time so a deputation met the Premier who subsequently made a submission to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister replied that it was not the responsibility of the Federal Government, and that it was for the State Government to provide that massive amount of money. The Premier has asked for \$159.5m, which is a lot of money. If it does not come from the State Government, the Federal Government or the companies, then Gladstone will not be able to meet what is required for the development. The unions and the Gladstone City Council have said that unless assistance is forthcoming a halt will have to be called to the development of industry.

One of the reasons this Bill is being introduced is to take away from local authorities the power to say what companies can do. That power is being given to the Ministers and Cabinet. The final say, of course, is vested in the Governor in Council. When a project is announced that will bring with it 5 000 or 6 000 people, the local authority cannot just draw up a plan to provide more water and more sewerage. There has to be a long-range plan by the Government. It cannot be done piecemeal. The local authority cannot put a couple of feet on the wall of the Awonga Dam. It cannot do one-third of a sewerage treatment works. Such works have to be done en bloc.

The cost cannot be borne by the local authority. It cannot be borne by the Gladstone and Area Water Board. It has to be borne by the Government. Until industry arrives and development takes place, the interest and redemption—all the money that is owing on the projects—has to be borne by the State. As the projects come on stream, the State, the local authority, the water board or whatever instrumentality is involved, should be able to demand from those companies by the authority given to them a sufficient contribution towards the headworks.

This Bill is long overdue. However, responsibility should remain with local government. Local authorities are the closest to the man in the street. They know the needs of the area. They are aware of the infrastructure problems created. The people in Gladstone have had more than one experience of this. When QAL was first established in the mid-1960s, facilities had to be expanded to cope with the increase from 6 000 to 22 000 people. With the massive development that is to take place, the population is projected to increase from 22 000 to 60 000 or 80 000 by the year 1995.

When I say that the State Government has not played its part, I mean that. If the Main Roads Department would spend some money on the main highway out of Gladstone, which I believe is estimated to cost in the vicinity of \$8m, it could be completed in three years. The first stage would open up residential land, which would be of

great assistance. The second and third stages would be the construction of the three bridges that are required and the additional road-works to eliminate the Toolooa bends and link that highway with the Bruce Highway in the vicinity of the Boyne Island turn-off.

The getting of assistance from the developers for local authorities is long overdue. However, the Government is not going about it in the right way. We believe that it is taking power from local authorities. It is also taking power from the Parliament and placing it in the hands of Cabinet. I will not use the words my leader used, but I do not want to see the sole power placed in the hands of Cabinet. The Local Government Act ought to be changed to allow local authorities to make demands on and negotiate with developers, as is intended by the Government under this Bill.

Mr POWELL (Isis) (8.4 p.m.): Members listening to the debate tonight might be a bit confused about the Opposition's attitude to the Bill. We have had three speakers from the Opposition side. We could be excused for being confused about their attitude. First the Leader of the Opposition delivered a speech in his normal way, crying about various matters. We have just heard the member for Port Curtis telling us that the Bill is long overdue. It would be of assistance if at the beginning of the report of each debate in "Hansard" the amendment that was being discussed could be shown. People reading the speeches made by honourable members opposite could be excused for believing that they were debating a completely different measure from the one that honourable members on this side were debating.

If the wording of the proposed amendments were included in "Hansard", people who read that publication would have the opportunity of knowing exactly what the House was debating. The Opposition has strayed far and wide from the measures contained in the Bill.

Each of the spokesmen for the Opposition has said that there is a need for ordered development, and that is exactly what the Bill is all about. The Opposition spokesman on local government matters, who has just resumed his seat, said that there should be an amendment to the Local Government Act. That would not cover all the other authorities having a responsibility for the provision of infrastructure. It would not give the Co-ordinator-General an opportunity to negotiate on behalf of the local authorities concerned, the ratepayers and the taxpayers—and they are the people whom we are told we are serving—with declared industries for infrastructure development. The Bill refers to declared industries. They are large industries. One could be forgiven for believing that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about corner store development. It has nothing to do with that. It

deals with major development, and it is designed to assist local authorities. The local authorities that I have spoken to are delighted with the amendments now before the House, and I shall explain why they are delighted.

The honourable member for Port Curtis gave some examples of what has happened in his electorate. I believe that he just happened to be mayor of Gladstone when some of those developments took place, and, as mayor, he found that he was either incompetent or unable to negotiate with the companies and obtain from them some contribution towards the provision of infrastructure in Gladstone.

A Government Member: It would be an amalgam of both qualities.

Mr POWELL: It probably would be an amalgam of both qualities. It is quite clear that if the State is to be developed, the State Government should have the oversight of development. It also is very clear that more than one local authority and more than one local body is involved with major developments.

Perhaps I might refer to a development that will be taking place in my electorate later this year, when Alcan builds its smelter at Goodwood, which is in the Isis Shire Council area. Legitimately, that council would be the only local authority that could discuss questions of infrastructure with Alcan. Fortunately, the company is showing a sense of responsibility and discussing them with other local authorities as well. However, there is no legislative power compelling it to do so; there is no need for it to do so. The problem then arises that the local authority most likely to be affected by the provision of a smelter at Goodwood is either the Bundaberg City Council or the Woongarra Shire Council, and the smelter will not be built in either of those local authority areas. Therefore, logically, they do not have a say in what is going to happen.

The whole district will be affected by that development, just as the whole district round Gladstone has been affected by the development there. If both the Gladstone City Council and the Calliope Shire Council had had the protection of this Bill, the problems being faced by the Gladstone City Council at the moment may not have arisen. Of course, Gladstone needed a local authority with a little bit of foresight, but it did not have that.

Mr Prest: A National Party mayor took \$12,000 out of the till the first night. He was the National Party candidate for Port Curtis in 1977.

Mr POWELL: The point that the honourable member for Port Curtis is attempting to make to the House is a downright lie. It is about time that he stuck to the truth. As mayor of Gladstone, he was unable to

control the Gladstone City Council, and that is the reason why the council and the people of Gladstone face such a big problem today.

Mr PREST: I rise to a point of order. Those words are offensive to me. Acts of fraud and theft took place in the Gladstone City Council. I resigned on 30 May 1976. Those thefts were discovered. They began in 1976 and continued until 1978, and they involved a sum in the vicinity of \$72,000. Two of the men concerned were reprimanded and were taken to court, and they went to gaol.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! Does the honourable member find the words offensive and ask that they be withdrawn?

Mr PREST: I do.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis finds the words offensive and asks for their withdrawal.

Mr POWELL: I am not surprised that he finds them offensive. I withdraw the words he finds offensive. However, the fact remains that he was mayor of Gladstone and the person whom he named in his interjection as being guilty was not convicted. Therefore, what the honourable member for Port Curtis was attempting to bring out in this House is untrue.

The comments of the honourable member for Port Curtis are symptomatic of the type of speech that we have heard from the Opposition in this place tonight and in fact over the past few days. No wonder that of the 82 seats that were contested in the last State election the Opposition was able to win the magnificent total of 25! This Government represents the people of Queensland. This Bill will amend the Act in the interests of Queensland.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that projects would proceed without being subject to the scrutiny of the people of Queensland. That is absolute rot and misleading. That is why I suggest that a Bill should appear in "Hansard" prior to any debate on it. That would enable people who read "Hansard" to refer to the matter to which members are speaking. As elected representatives of the people, surely we are subject to the scrutiny of the people once every three years. It is interesting that in the last three elections the people of Queensland have had their say very effectively, and that is why we see so few members occupying the Opposition benches.

The Leader of the Opposition looked around for something to say about the Bill. I doubt whether he read the explanatory notes set out on the green pages accompanying the Bill. They give a very good explanation of the Bill.

Mr Casey: They're about as trustworthy as your Cabinet.

Mr POWELL: Again we hear the Leader of the Opposition trying to cast doubts on the integrity of Cabinet Ministers. His integrity is very doubtful in the extreme, especially in view of his past record in business affairs in Mackay.

It is about time that the people of Queensland woke up to the charade displayed by Opposition members. In looking for something to say, they attack the National Party part of the Government.

When the member for Archerfield made some comment about the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, I challenged him to prove his statements. He cannot prove them. I am sick and tired of seeing members of the Opposition stand up in this place and hearing them make statements as if they are in fact true. I am sick and tired of hearing statements such as those made today by the Opposition spokesmen who cannot prove their assertions. Surely if we are to have responsibility in government, we must have people who can speak the truth and who can prove their statements. That is why the Labor Party is in Opposition; it cannot prove its statements. Members of the Opposition are constantly and repeatedly proved wrong.

This Bill does not override legislation such as the Health Act and town planning Acts. The Bill does assist a local authority in the provision of infrastructure when a large industry comes into the local authority's area. Again I use the example of the aluminium industry, which is constructing a smelter in the Bundaberg district.

Mr Prest: What are they paying for electricity?

Mr POWELL: Once again the honourable member for Port Curtis makes one of his inane interjections. Already the company involved has to pay for a power line of 275 MW over a distance of 70 km. That is what the company has to pay for that line.

Mr Shaw: That's chicken-feed.

Mr POWELL: The honourable member for Wynnum butts in and says that it is chicken-feed. I should like to see him set up some business—I doubt whether he has the acumen—and have to pay the infrastructure costs that this company will be paying.

Because it is a State instrumentality, the Government can demand that a company do this. But when it comes to the roads, streets and other infrastructure facilities that the people need, the local authorities have no right to make any demands on the company. The Bill will allow them to do so, and surely that is the sort of logical and sensible planning needed in this State.

The Leader of the Opposition has not read the Bill. I doubt that he understands it. I doubt that any Opposition member understands State development. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the number of people in Mt Isa as a percentage of the total number of people in the State. It is quite logical that that percentage will decrease as an increasing number of people come into Queensland, because Mt Isa is not growing the fastest. That is a logical and sensible statement. To try to draw the conclusion that the Leader of the Opposition draws from that is absolute garbage.

Mr Warburton: Will this Parliament get an opportunity to examine the agreement? You won't answer that?

Mr POWELL: If the honourable member said something sensible, I would try to answer it.

It is quite clear that, under new section 45 contained in clause 4 of the Bill, advertisements will appear. The Co-ordinator-General must place advertisements in newspapers so that people may comment on any industry that is coming into their area. But Opposition members conveniently gloss over that because it does not suit their argument. It is about time that they, if they intend to criticise something, criticised it logically and sensibly.

Under new section 122 (2) and (3) contained in clause 7 of the Bill, the Minister shall lay the report of the Co-ordinator-General before the Legislative Assembly within 14 sitting days from the day on which he receives the report. It comes back to this Parliament so that it may have the opportunity of commenting on and approving the zoning that will take place and the industry that will be established.

There is a great need for State development. It cannot take place as a short burst, so that it merely comes and goes. It must be planned and must go ahead smoothly for the benefit of everybody in the State. This will occur only if the Bill is passed by Parliament and the Government is allowed, on behalf of individual local authorities and their ratepayers, to negotiate with companies so that the infrastructure required when a large company comes into a district can be provided. The Bill empowers the Government and the local authorities to have some say on what is to happen in regard to infrastructure in local areas.

Quite frankly, the people of Queensland are being duped by Opposition spokesmen who go off at tangents and, with great difficulty (and thank goodness so far they have not succeeded), try to fool the people of Queensland into believing that there is a surreptitious reason for proceeding with a certain Bill. They cannot tell us the surreptitious reason. They cannot prove what they claim are facts. They try to condemn by innuendo. It is about time they realised that the people of Queensland are not being fooled by their

innuendoes. It is time they raised the standard of debate in this Parliament and spoke to the Bill before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! Before calling the honourable member for Rockhampton, I again inform the House that, whilst I am in the chair, I intend to allow a wide-ranging second-reading debate. The honourable member for Isis referred to Opposition members going off at tangents. Every member has the opportunity to put before the House his own concern and that of his constituents. I intend to allow that to continue. Can I say, however, that I am concerned about the unbecoming and offensive words used by some people in this Chamber, and they have been used today. This place is a forum where members of Parliament can express their concern, and I hope this place will be used to express that concern rather than to abuse other members.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (8.20 p.m.): First of all, I appreciate the ruling you have given, Mr Deputy Speaker, as to the type of debate that will be permitted, because as we have lost the introductory debate it is important that we have a broad debate at the second-reading stage.

I would like to take the member for Isis to task on a couple of points. While I sat back and listened to him he reminded me somewhat of a doctor sitting by a patient with terminal cancer and saying, "Here, take this Aspro and it will be all right." It seemed that he was trying to present to the people of Queensland through this Assembly the idea that we have no worries because it is the National Party that is in control, and it is his Government that is doing it. He tried to make out that his Government represents the people rather than the Parliament. When we hear that type of statement I realise that it is time that members of Parliament started to think very carefully, because it is Parliament that is supposed to be the supreme body that determines what happens in this State. That is the real problem here. If we are to argue this Bill before the Assembly we must go back to the point of recognising that the Parliament will have no say, but I will develop that at a later stage.

The member for Isis said that we in the Opposition have made a number of accusations but that we have no proof. Sometimes one depends on past performance before one makes a judgment as to what one thinks a person will do in the future. If we are going to judge this Government and this legislation on past performance we probably ought to go back to the original Bill that was introduced in 1970. I want to read a number of comments from the introductory debate because it might just brighten up the evening. I want to put to honourable members the objectives stated officially in the record of legislative Acts produced by this Government interpreting for the people of Queensland exactly what that original legislation

was about. These comments were made on the State Development and Public Works Organization Act Amendment Bill 1970—

“The introduction of this Act highlights a new approach, a new outlook and a determined attitude on the part of the Government to plan for the preservation of the natural environment. The contents of the Act forms an integral part of the Government’s over-all policy designed to cater for a more comprehensive approach in planning our total environment.

“The Government’s environmental control programme will come under the direct control of the Premier and Minister for State Development.”

What a farce! Only the other night we saw that environmental control in this State is divided among a number of Ministers. The comments continued—

“This Act is the first major step to control actions and attitudes that are either destroying, or are detrimental to, our natural environment. It is also intended to determine and implement methods of a remedial nature where necessary. It is pointed out that three measures to control this threat have already been introduced. Firstly, the Country Party/Liberal Government introduced the Clean Air Act of 1963 to deal with air pollution.”

What a joke! If we are going to look at past performance and consider whether that type of legislation has overcome air pollution, is it any wonder we doubt what the Government is doing here tonight? The comments continue—

“Secondly, it provided the Beach Protection Act of 1968 to deal with beach and coastal erosion.”

What a joke! This is hilarious. When one goes to Lammermoor or some of the other beaches in the Central Queensland area one sees what is happening. There is no control over erosion. In other areas where industrial organisations are involved there is still no control. The Beach Protection Authority is a joke, and yet the member for Isis attempts to convince us that we can depend on what this Government says because it is interested in the people. It continued—

“Thirdly, steps were also taken in 1968 to commence the measurement and study of water-pollution problems in streams and this is still in progress.”

Oh, yes, it is in progress all right! We have allowed legislation to pass through this Assembly that gives the Governor in Council the power to extend applications by up to seven years. So industries can pollute; they can do what they like as long as the Governor in Council agrees. That is the whole essence of my argument here.

Instead of letting local authorities determine what is going to happen in these areas and negotiate infrastructure needs, then letting this Parliament say, “We ought to consider these points in detail”, we now have legislation that provides, in proposed new section

43, that the Governor in Council will decide whether the development application should be determined at State or local level. The Governor in Council is the one to consider these matters. Proposed new section 46 provides that the Governor in Council will be responsible for determining the development application.

Government members wonder why we say that we cannot trust this Government. Ten years ago this Government introduced a special Act of Parliament that was going to overcome all pollution problems, be they in the air or in the water. We know that that has not been done. At that time the Premier said—

“The Government envisages that a new Act for the control of noise will no doubt be needed.”

Government members should talk to the residents of Queensland and find what they think of the Government’s Noise Abatement Act. The fact of the matter is that the Government cannot be trusted, and it is no wonder that the Opposition is concerned.

The objective is sound; I do not argue about that. I do not think that anybody ever comes into this Assembly believing that the Opposition should totally oppose something simply because it is the Opposition. That is not our job; I believe that we are supposed to constructively and carefully consider the proposals before the Assembly. I am the first to admit that the objective stated here by the Premier in his explanatory note is worth while. It is sound. It reads—

“The purpose of this amendment is to enable the State Government to declare mineral and energy developments to be prescribed developments if they are of critical economic significance to Queensland or if their infrastructure requirements are likely to create a major strain on State financial resources or on local communities.”

There is no argument with that objective. We understand that there are many problems with local authorities trying to say to the mining industry and to big business, “Look, what you are doing here is affecting not only the shire in which you are situated, but also surrounding shires. We know there are regional problems.” I suggest to the Assembly that the problem here is not the objective; it is the way of achieving that objective.

What the Government is asking the Parliament to do is give virtually a blank cheque not to the Parliament or to some Minister who is responsible for a department but to a Cabinet that is controlled, unfortunately, by one person. Government members might say that that is a bit unfair.

Mr Wharton: It is unfair, too.

Mr WRIGHT: Well, let me take the point. We are saying here that this matter will be determined by Cabinet, because that

is what the Governor in Council is. Instead of local authorities having the say and a thorough investigation being carried out and discussions taking place at the local level, the Cabinet will determine the matter.

I bring to the attention of honourable members some of the attitudes that have been expressed by members of Cabinet to foreign investment in the mineral field in this State. If Government members want proof, let them look at past performances. An article in "The Sunday Mail" in 1977 carried the headline "Joh hooks the super rich Arabs". He came back from Kuwait, Iran and a few other Middle East countries and praised them for what they could do for the bauxite industry, the uranium industry and so on. He tended to give Queenslanders the idea that he was going to get all that Arab money—the petro-oil money.

Mr Lee: Who was that?

Mr WRIGHT: That was the Premier in 1977. The next day "The Courier-Mail" carried this headline: "Arab money possible for Queensland coal: Camm". At that point the Premier and the Deputy Leader of the National Party were saying how the Middle East investors could share not only in uranium but also in the Queensland coking coal projects. Now they are going begging.

Then there was another newspaper headline, "Uranium ore on land used by Brazilian millionaire". At that time the then Minister for Lands (Mr Tomkins) and the then Minister for Mines (Mr Camm) were involved in the matter. On 6 May 1977 this headline appeared in the Press, "We'll get millions," says Joh on overseas deals".

Mr Lee: The Premier, not "Joh".

Mr WRIGHT: I am not casting aspersions on him. I am repeating a headline.

Mr Lee: Why not use his correct title?

Mr WRIGHT: I am sorry, Mr ex-Minister, I have to declare it exactly as it reads.

The article states—

"We'll get millions," says Joh on overseas deals".

It seems to me that in this instance all the Premier was concerned about was not the environmental needs of this State, not what will happen to the resources supposedly owned by Queensland, but the fact that millions of dollars will flow in from overseas. He speaks of the discussions that he and Mr Camm had in their recent trip to the Middle East.

Another interesting article was published on 6 August 1978. It pointed out that the State's mines are 80 per cent foreign controlled. If that is so, one starts to wonder what this Government is doing to protect Queensland and to look after Queenslanders.

Mr Vaughan: Nothing!

Mr WRIGHT: As the member for Nudgee says, nothing.

The article also says that 65 per cent of Queensland's mining work-force is foreign-controlled. We know the attitude of the Premier and Mr Camm at that point of time, and it is also suggested that the Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs has similar views. They want the foreigners here. Can anybody really imagine that they will be hard on any of these groups? They went to the Middle East and Europe to try to get this money. They went to England to try to get money for Queensland to boost mining ventures. Does anybody really believe that they will be rough and tough, that they will require reasonable deals to ensure that the local authorities and the people do not have to pay? I certainly do not. I believe that past performance proves that they cannot be trusted.

Another Press headline reads, "Mission to seek Arab money". The article of 25 February 1979 continued—

"State Government officials will be encouraging oil-rich Arab financiers to invest in Queensland during a Middle East tour next month."

Again the Government goes looking for them. After searching for their money and giving them an invitation, can anybody imagine that the Government will make it tough for them to invest? Will the Government say that a certain development will not be allowed because there are very strict rules under a special Act of Parliament that was passed in 1981? No way in the world will the Government do that.

Mr Frawley interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: The Government may have done that, too.

I have a Press headline from 10 June 1979, and perhaps there is something in this one, as it reads, "Joh to 'sell' Queensland". One really starts to wonder how much is left. And so the Press headlines go on dealing with such matters as secret land sales, the sell-out of the State, Germans seeking to involve themselves in a steel mill site, and back-room deals by the Japanese on a coal project. All of this is encouraged by the Government, and particularly the Cabinet.

But tonight the Government is asking this Parliament to give total power, without any review or supervision, to that Cabinet to determine the rules and regulations under which these ventures will continue. I cannot accept that. Whilst the objectives are worthwhile, and while infrastructure co-ordination plans and some type of control are needed to ensure that the regional authorities benefit and are not harmed by development and that local authorities can co-ordinate their claims on industry, I do not believe that this is the way to do it.

The member for Isis said that we have to prove our case. I believe that past performance proves without doubt that this Government cannot be trusted when it comes to mineral investment—and big investment is what this is about. In fact, in his second-reading speech the Premier referred to big investors. He said that only projects which cost hundreds of millions of dollars, or which have infrastructure requirements affecting several local authorities, are expected to fall into these categories. That is at the moment.

Mr Lee: Have you ever heard about co-ordination between shires?

Mr WRIGHT: Yes. In fact, a Minister named McKechnie in a Government of the same political colour as the honourable member tried to do it. He set up regions and tried very hard but the Government refused to give the project any money; it was starved financially. It was also a Whitlam plan, the concept of which we agreed with, but the Government did not support it when it came to financial backing.

It is quite obvious that the whole idea of this Bill is to remove power from local authorities, from the Parliament, and to give it to Executive Government. I believe that this is simply another step in the extension of total Executive power in this State, and somehow that has to be stopped.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Before I call the honourable member for Rockhampton North, I want to quote from Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice". An honourable member on the Government side pointed out that the honourable member for Rockhampton used unparliamentary words and I now have to support that statement. Erskine May states that a member is not allowed to use unparliamentary words by the device of putting them into somebody else's mouth. I would like to think that in future members of this Parliament—

Mr WRIGHT: What is your reference, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am referring to the member's reference to "Joh". I am referring to "Erskine May". The honourable member for Rockhampton used the words from somebody's mouth. I would hope that in future we will try to uplift the standard of debate in this House and in future refer to the Premier as the Premier of Queensland.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I accept your ruling and think it is a valid one in the terms in which you have put it. However, when we quote from an article or any other type of reference, for the sake of "Hansard" we are required to quote correctly. Could I ask you, in your wisdom, how that could be turned into "the Premier" or anything else when it clearly says "Joh"?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I repeat that I am quoting from "Erskine May". Again I say that we are going to uplift the standard of debate in this House. Referring to "Joh" does not uplift the standard of debate. I have never been to any Parliament in Australia where the Premier of that State has been referred to by his christian name. I accept the point of order made by the member for Rockhampton that he was quoting from a newspaper. However, I would hope that in future the member makes the point that he is referring to the Premier of this State.

Mr YEWDALE (Rockhampton North) (8.37 p.m.): The reason I wish to speak briefly in this debate is that I am concerned about some of the connotations of the legislation before the House. The Opposition has justifiably expressed its concern that the Parliament of this State will not be afforded the opportunity to debate the agreements referred to in the Bill. That is a reasonable and justifiable criticism. It seems to me that a number of Government back-benchers have not bothered to study the legislation. It is only at this late hour that we see a number of Liberals prowling around in the lobby and the Treasurer talking to the Co-ordinator-General about matters that are being discussed in this Chamber. So it would seem to me that there is some concern about this measure.

Whether the Liberal members or the National Party members will say anything other than what was said by the member for Isis I do not know, but it would seem to me that the Government is attempting through this legislation to deal with a matter that is of grave concern to the State in terms of the infrastructure problems that are confronting the large provincial cities and towns as development occurs in a number of areas.

I agree with my colleagues. We are certainly concerned about this. However, we are concerned about the Government's having a closed door to this Parliament. The Government, which controls Parliament, will not give us an opportunity to debate these agreements. One Government member a few moments ago said that there would be a report tabled in this Parliament. That means nothing. In the few years I have been in this Parliament I have not had the opportunity to debate the contents of a report after legislation had been passed by the Parliament that a report was to be presented. I do not think there is any valid argument in the fact that a report is to be presented to this Parliament.

New section 47 says that a development application for a prescribed development, so determined by the Governor in Council, shall be final. They are the key words in that provision. That decision is reached and will be final. Whatever we say in this Parliament afterwards will not change that provision.

Mr Warburton: You won't get the chance to say it.

Mr YEWDAL: No, we will not get the chance to say it or to debate it. It would seem to me that the Government is trying to close the door.

I am concerned about how far the provisions of this Bill go when it deals with infrastructure. It says—

“‘infrastructure’ means those facilities, services and utilities that, in the opinion of the Co-ordinator-General, are required by or associated with a development or works and includes training schemes relevant to, and accommodation required for a work force related to a development or works and facilities, services and utilities required by or associated with such training schemes or accommodation”.

I have been suspicious of this Government for many, many years. The workers who are going to be associated with these developments, irrespective of their location, are going to be hamstrung to the degree that they will not, as an organised trade union, be able to negotiate as a work-force with their respective employers to obtain an agreement relating to a particular construction or a particular development. This has been the practice throughout this State and the Commonwealth for many years.

I am suspicious of that regard, and I want the Premier, or whoever else closes this debate, to tell the Parliament whether agreements between trade unions and employers on any construction site, or on any other work that might take place, are going to be subject to the authorisation of the Governor in Council, and whether if such agreements are not acceptable to that person or body, they are not going to be accepted. The situation could be that agreements would be declared null and void after being negotiated. It is clear that the Government has always been opposed to agreements between employees and employers.

The Government has always opposed sweetheart agreements, but the fact of life is that they happen in our society. There are agreements reached, and some that are acceptable to both parties develop a peaceful work situation in industry, in construction work, and in other works throughout the State. I am suspicious of that, and I want someone from the Government to tell this Parliament that that situation will not prevail, and that employees' agreements with employers will not be interfered with and subject to that approval.

The legislation also provides in new section 35 (2)—

“The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, approve of the plan and thereupon every local body and other person specified in the approved plan shall comply with the

requirements of the plan (so far as those requirements are the concern of that local body or other person). . .”

Right through the legislation “may” appears, but it is very definite that it will be the decision of the Governor in Council, and that that decision will be final.

Recently I read a statement by the Premier, that the supply of water to the Iwasaki project on the coast at Yeppoon will cause no problems whatsoever. This relates to what has been said tonight about this Bill. Recently there was some costing done in respect of a pipeline from the Fitzroy River to Yeppoon to supply water to this project. The answer from the Premier was, “We are not going to provide the money. We are not going to provide the water in that manner, and the ratepayers of Rockhampton are not going to pay for it.”

On the one hand, we have a situation in which everything is going well, and the Premier then backs down. He backs away from it because of the problems in local shires. We have a problem in Rockhampton with the boundaries of the Livingstone Shire and the Rockhampton City Council, and for years this Government has backed away from that problem. Local Government Ministers also have backed away from it. The Livingstone Shire Council is still gravely concerned about the water supply, not only to the Iwasaki project but to ratepayers within Yeppoon and the surrounding areas.

The Livingstone Shire Council is sticking hard and fast to its boundaries, because it believes that it is entitled to hold certain areas in the interests of its own shire. The Rockhampton City Council is also standing off. The point raised by the honourable member for Rockhampton in respect of local authorities and arrangements on boundaries is a valid criticism of this Government.

Before I resume my seat, I seek an assurance from a Government member that the connotations that I feel are evident in the legislation are not contained in that legislation, and that the Governor in Council will not interfere with any working arrangements or agreements made or to be made between employers and employees on any development or construction work.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (8.45 p.m.): I rise to enter the debate on this Bill because legislation of this type causes me some concern. We on the Opposition side have been caught before. On previous occasions we have been given assurances by the Government as to how honourable it is. However, in too many instances we have been taken advantage of. So I do not believe that we should accept this legislation at face value.

Personally, I would have liked more time to study the Bill. It was introduced only last Thursday and, because of its ramifications, it would have been advantageous for us to

have had more time to study it in detail. I have, however, read the Bill as best I can and have some criticism to level at it.

On reading the Bill I became very sceptical about it. I would have liked to believe that the provisions in the Bill would be applied in an honourable manner. However, as the honourable member for Rockhampton North has said, many aspects of the Bill leave a lot to be desired.

The honourable member for Isis challenged Opposition members to prove our assertions that the Government is not to be trusted. That is exactly what it boils down to; we on this side of the House just cannot trust the Government. I am concerned to see the extent of the powers that the Bill gives to the Government through the Governor in Council. As previous Opposition speakers have said, virtually the whole power is vested in the Governor in Council. Of course, the Governor in Council is the Cabinet with the Governor sitting in. Everything set out in the legislation comes back to the Governor in Council. I shall deal with that aspect later on.

To give an example of why we on this side of the House cannot trust the Government, I want to refer to the situation that arose at Redbank Plains. This involves the Minister for Works and Housing. I know this matter has been referred to in the House previously, but it bears repeating because it highlights the devious methods that the Government uses in order to achieve its aims.

In 1971 the Queensland Housing Commission acquired approximately 600 acres of land at Redbank Plains for housing development. In 1974 the Moreton Shire Council brought out its town plan. (Town plans are referred to in this legislation.) At the request of the Housing Commission, the Moreton Shire Council spent approximately \$300,000 on sewerage and water installation to service the proposed development. In March and April 1979, the Minister for Works and Housing introduced a Bill to amend the State Housing Act to enable the Housing Commission to sell commission land without auction or tender.

I want to refer to the statements made by the Minister when introducing that legislation. I wish the honourable member for Isis was in the House to hear this, as it gives a good illustration of the reasons why we in the Opposition cannot and will not trust the Government. As I say, in March and April 1979 the Minister for Works and Housing introduced a Bill to amend the State Housing Act, particularly with respect to the power to sell land.

Section 22 (1) (v) (e) was replaced by the following—

“(e) The Commission may, with the approval of the Minister, on such terms and conditions and subject to such restrictions, exceptions and reservations as the

Commission thinks fit, sell any land vested in or purchased or acquired by it under this Act, or set apart to be used for the purposes of this Act:

“Provided that the Minister shall not approve such sale unless he is satisfied that such land is not now required for the purposes of this Act or that such sale will serve a beneficial purpose with regard to the community in the locality of such land.”

Mr Lee: What is wrong with that?

Mr VAUGHAN: That is all very well.

Prior to this, section 22 (1) (v) (e) required that the land first be put up for public auction or public tender before being sold by private contract, unless the land was not more than 1 ha in area, in which case the Minister could, if satisfied that the land was not a desirable site for a house, authorise a sale by private contract without first putting it up for auction or tender. The amendment took away all restrictions on the power to sell except as per the further proviso I have mentioned.

The Minister, in introducing the second reading of the Bill, said—

“The disposal of surplus land is an obvious need for a business-type organisation. Needs change so rapidly, and consumer demand patterns are undergoing such rapid variation, that good forward planning today can be all wrong by 1981 . . . That is the nature of business. The Bill clarifies existing provisions which are a little cloudy.”

With all due respect to a Government backbencher—it was Mr Austin from Wavell—he did raise a query in respect of the particular provision. The Minister, in reply to that point, and trying to justify that type of legislation—

Mr Frawley: What has this got to do with it?

Mr VAUGHAN: The honourable member should be patient. We have to listen to all of the drivel he comes out with.

The Minister said—

“Talking of land generally—and I refer to buying and selling land—if we are able to sell some land to enable a church, a bowling green or some particular community facility to be built, why should we not do so? We are catering for a need, and I think it is very important to do that.”

In July 1979 the Housing Commission sold the whole of the land, by private contract, to Rylance Collieries & Brickworks. The Government comes before us and says, “We on this side of the House are honourable gentlemen. We are not seeking to deceive this Parliament. We are merely trying to have a provision inserted so that we can

sell off Housing Commission land to a church, a bowling green or a community facility." But what did it do? It sold Housing Commission land to Rylance Collieries & Brickworks. Not only that, it sold that Housing Commission land for \$620,000 on \$62,000 deposit over a 10-year period at 9.7 per cent, and the company did not have to pay a cent for the first three years.

This is why we on this side of the House cannot help but be a little concerned when the Government brings forward legislation of this nature and does not let it lie on the table long enough for the community to be able to digest its contents. I believe the Government is bringing it forward and will steam-roller it through for its own ends. I can appreciate the need for this type of legislation if it is applied in the spirit in which it is introduced. But I do not trust the Government and I do not believe that the Government is introducing this Bill for an honourable purpose.

A special issue of "Australian Urban Studies" was released in November 1980. It was headed, "Queensland resources—for richer or poorer?" One of the significant points made in that issue was—

"Despite superficial evidence to the contrary, the backlog in infrastructure works in Queensland, including roads, bridges and transport maintenance, is increasing."

I believe that the Government is looking for short cuts, ways and means of short-circuiting the system so that it can achieve its ends.

The point has already been made that when the Government goes out of its way to encourage people to come here by offering them all sorts of deals, there is no way in the world that it will screw those people. It certainly will not screw them as it did the BP consortium to try to get it to improve its tender for Winchester South. I do not believe that the Government will use this Bill to ensure that the people who come here to build an aluminium refinery at Bundaberg, which is probably one of the things in the Government's mind in introducing this legislation, do so for the benefit of the people.

In May 1979 the Government introduced a Bill to amend the Mining Act to circumvent certain town planning provisions and local authority provisions so that it could allow mining in certain areas.

In that case it was Moreton Island, although I recall that on another occasion the Minister said that it was not for Moreton Island, but so that the Government could allow Rylance Collieries & Brickworks to mine at Redbank Plains. But irrespective of the purpose, there have been too many instances where this Government has set out to deceive this House, and I for one cannot accept what it is saying in respect of this legislation. I do not believe that the Government's intentions are honourable at all.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North referred to the application of this legislation and the local bodies that would be affected. The term "local bodies" covers a multitude of sins. The explanatory notes to the Bill state that—

"The term 'infrastructure' . . . may include water supply systems, electricity generation and distribution, roads, railways, schools, workforce training facilities, hospitals and housing."

There has already been mention of electricity costs, and again I come back to the tariffs that are to be paid by the aluminium smelters. The member for Isis said, "Well, you don't have to worry about that, we will get the most out of them." He referred to the company that intends to build a 10km 275 kVA line, but the fact of the matter is that I believe that in the past we have had situations where electricity has been supplied to large industrial consumers at about half the price that the electricity distribution boards pay for their power. If members study the annual report of the Queensland Electricity Generating Board they will see that the QEGB supplies power to SEQEB at a price of 2.36c a unit—

Mr Powell: 70 km.

Mr VAUGHAN: It does not matter a scrap, it is still chicken feed when we are talking about a \$1,000m project.

As I said, the QEGB supplies power to SEQEB at 2.36c a unit, but the QEGB also supplies power to other large unnamed industrial consumers at 1.25c a unit—almost half! The point I am making is that if this legislation is passed it will give the Governor in Council the power to make agreements, and that is why we intend to oppose it.

We know what goes on. This morning the honourable member for Sherwood discussed what goes on in Cabinet. He was being airy-fairy about how democratic the Government is, but the fact of the matter is that the Cabinet decides to introduce this type of legislation and when it is before Cabinet the National Party has the numbers—

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: I had 10 years' training listening to a Labor Government; I am well trained.

Mr VAUGHAN: Sit back and get a bit more.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: I had a good apprenticeship under you people.

Mr VAUGHAN: I know the Premier has been well trained. He has carried on and done any number of devious things over the past 10 years. He has obviously learnt a lot.

As I was saying, a proposal goes before Cabinet and because of Cabinet solidarity it makes a decision which then goes before a joint party meeting, and presto it is a fait

accompli. We know what happens then. The legislation comes before the House and Government back-benchers are expected to support it. It is significant that tonight there has been a dearth of speakers from the Government side to support this legislation. We have had the member for Isis—

Mr Lee: That's not true.

Mr VAUGHAN: All the member for Yeronga has done is sit there and say, "Hear, hear!" I told him to clock off hours ago. He should have gone home.

I am concerned about this legislation. I will not go right through the Bill but, as I see it, it contains set procedures and they all come back to the Governor in Council. First of all, as I see it the Co-ordinator-General investigates a development proposal, as long as it is a large one such as an alumina refinery at Bundaberg, a coal/oil conversion plant at Millmerran or a coke plant at Gladstone, and immediately he sets about investigating the development the local bodies dealing with the land-use application are automatically suspended. So that puts them in their place! Then it comes back to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council declares the development a prescribed development. The Governor in Council then says, "Right, we have a development that is going to take place at the aluminium smelter at Bundaberg. We are going to declare that a prescribed development".

The next step is that an infrastructure co-ordination plan is developed and some guide-lines are laid down. Then the Governor in Council decides whether he or the local body will determine the land use application. If the Governor in Council, or the Cabinet, or, to take it to the extreme, the Premier, thinks that there could be some problems with land use, the Governor in Council can decide whether he or the local body will determine the land use application. That takes away all the rights of the local authority.

The Premier made the point that the Government would like to make the decisions because it gives it the opportunity to expedite the applications. That is very nice but, as I say, I do not trust the Government. The Governor in Council approves the infrastructure co-ordination plan. When the legislation refers to local authorities, it means those bodies dealing with water supply, power, hospitals and so on. The Governor in Council may allow the local authorities to negotiate financial assistance with the program's sponsor. But, having regard to what the member for Rockhampton said, I would bet guineas to gooseberries that the Governor in Council would handle the negotiations and make the decision.

The real sting is in the tail of the legislation where it says that the Governor in Council is to first approve any agreement. Even if the Government allowed the local

bodies to negotiate with the companies, they could get the Government's ear and say, "Look, we are being pressured a little bit too much by that local body".

The Governor in Council must first approve any agreement. As has been stated, it all comes back to the Governor in Council and, quite frankly, I do not like it. This Government's record stinks, and I am quite happy to support the Leader of the Opposition in opposing this legislation.

Mr BLAKE (Bundaberg) (9.3 p.m.): I wish to refer to some misgivings I have about the Bill before the House. My misgivings are not about the objectives that were stated by the Premier when he brought the Bill into the House. Considering the objectives that were stated by him, I think that the Bill would receive a very good hearing in many areas. Fast and large development has taken place in this State and tremendous infrastructure problems have faced local government. In many instances this has happened to the great detriment of the local authorities and the ratepayers in those areas.

There would be general acceptance of the objectives if this legislation protected local people from having to foot the bill to meet unreasonable demands by large companies for infrastructure. Gladstone is the closest example, but there are many others. There are many in Queensland and in New South Wales. I saw Port Kembla and Wollongong mushroom overnight and experience all these problems. I have seen it happen in Gladstone.

We do not object to the stated objectives of the Bill. The provisions of the Bill are particularly relevant to expected development at Bundaberg, and I say "expected development" because as yet it has not been officially confirmed. If a \$900m aluminium smelter project eventuates at Bundaberg the Isis, Bundaberg and Woongarra areas will suffer the same problems and pressures that have occurred in other places. Although I cannot give the exact figures of the projected increase in the work-force, a round figure for the construction period and the permanent work-force when production commences would be of the order of 1 200 employees. That figure will be increased by dependants and all in all will create a very great demand for housing in the Bundaberg area. That has already been evidenced in Gladstone, and if honourable members realised the amounts paid for rent, subletting, etc., they would appreciate the demands by certain sections of the work-force for incremental payments to offset the added cost of living there where it has ballooned with rapid development.

Port development in the Bundaberg area will require a great deal of work and a lot of infrastructure. At the present time the councils state that their funding and borrowings are completely inadequate to keep pace with the desired development of sewerage and water. Great pressure will be put on those facilities.

The Minister for Health was in Bundaberg recently. I do not know whether he would agree but I am sure it was forcibly demonstrated to him that hospital facilities in Bundaberg have not kept pace with development in the area. Without this infusion of about \$900m and the associated pressures, hospital services are badly in need of expansion.

I have been asked to speak to welfare organisations in Bundaberg which are hard pressed to accommodate the demands on their services in these times of very stringent economic measures. All of these developments impose further strains on welfare organisations. In many instances voluntary organisations carry out these worthwhile functions, and naturally they are very concerned at the increased pressures.

If the construction of the Alcan smelter proceeds, it is the company's intention at this stage to cart the ingots to the port and on the return trip to bring in some of its needs by road. Today's "Bundaberg News-Mail" states—

"Millions of tonnes of material would be carried over existing roads in the shire during the construction stage, said Cr. Maughan.

"The council might also have to build a new road and pressure would be put on the Port Road when ingot exports and raw material imports started.

"Alcan would have to cover these infrastructure costs, Cr. Maughan said.

"The study says that heavy transport between the smelter site and Port Bundaberg would use a route along Goodwood Road, Walker Street and Bundaberg Port Road.

"Each weekday 180 truck trips would be made along this route—90 return runs. Trucks loaded with aluminium ingots would account for 57 of the one-way trips, while 26 petroleum coke trips would be made and seven with fuel oil."

The article goes on to state that damage to the roads would be tremendous and that they would be very costly to maintain. That is an illustration of what large and fast development will bring to the area.

I share the concern of other Opposition speakers about this Bill. I do not worry about its objectives—they are admirable ones. However, the Bill appears to represent a removal of power, particularly the power of scrutiny and objection, from local government and the Parliament to the Executive by Order in Council. I admit that one part of the Bill refers to the tabling of a report for the previous 12 months as soon as possible after 30 June in each year. That is after the event. It is too late then to defend any of the powers or functions of local authority that might have been overridden in events leading up to that report. It is too late then for the Parliament to scrutinise and take

remedial action on something embodied in that report. I have particular objection to that part of the Bill.

The Bill was introduced on Thursday of last week. This is the first sitting day since then. I immediately sent to the Bundaberg City Council a copy of the Bill, the Act, and the Premier's comments. With the debate being resumed on the next sitting day we have had no time to get an opinion. The local authority has not had time to give me its reaction to the Bill, but I am certain that when the Premier's comments were read it would have been tickled pink and said, "This is exactly what we want.", or rather, "It is very much what we want." That was my initial reaction until I went beyond the Premier's comments and looked at the Bill itself.

I refer particularly to the decision of the Governor in Council being final and binding—I will not go into all the details—on all parties. We know that there will be no process of objection if a council finds that its hopes and aspirations about a significant matter are shattered. As the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) said, in many of these projects it is a matter of trading off one aspect of Government expenditure in return for one other aspect where certain benefits can be seen. This could well be done, with the local authority (representing as it does the people in that area) being left holding the bag on any deal. When I say "deal", I do not say it with sinister overtones. We realise that there are not clear-cut edges to some of these matters and sometimes it is necessary to have a trade of some sort. However, if something is to the detriment of a shire, we would certainly want to know that the council has some means of appeal, also through its parliamentary representative—not just through the Executive itself—for receiving justice.

It is the decision of the Governor in Council being final and binding on all parties that concerns me, in conjunction with the fact that I have not had time to get a clear reaction from the local authority that I represent in this Parliament. It is a disgrace that the matter should be legislated so quickly at tonight's sitting.

Mr AKERS (Pine Rivers) (9.13 p.m.): I support the objectives of this Bill wholeheartedly. When a development of any size takes place, it creates severe problems of delays for local government. There would not be one member who could not cite instances of developmental projects having created problems and enormous increases in expenditure. The objective of the Bill is to avoid these problems.

As usual the Opposition has gone beyond the scope of the legislation. It is exaggerating the effects of the Bill and, I believe, misinterpreting them. By talking about Iwasaki's development at Yeppoon, the smelter and all the other matters they have

mentioned, Opposition members have ignored the very clear provision in the Bill which says that it will apply to mineral or energy resource developments only. Very few of the projects mentioned by the Opposition would be covered by that provision.

The Opposition is playing on something that is a fault of this Government. It does nothing to establish its own credibility. It is totally wrong that inadequate time has been allowed for public perusal of the Bill. If the Bill had been allowed to lie on the table for the time that its importance warrants, the people of Queensland would have had a chance to see it and local authorities, as the honourable member who preceded me in the debate said, would have had time to study it fully and advise members of this Assembly how they were affected by it. We would then have been able to get interpretations of the provisions of the Bill, and if spokesmen for the Opposition had been provided with interpretations, they would not have said three-quarters of what they have said in this debate.

There are some matters in the Bill that concern me. I have doubts about its provisions not being abused in the future. In the past, legislation that has been passed with goodwill in this House has been abused by public servants and sometimes by individual Ministers, and I worry that similar abuse could take place in this instance. Parliament will have to watch the position closely and ensure that, if it does occur, it is not allowed to continue.

I am concerned, too, that the Bill overrules local authority town-planning schemes without making any real provisions for a local authority to make a positive input. It will have to rely on the goodwill of the Co-ordinator-General and his staff for that. If they do their job properly, no difficulties should arise.

My criticism is that the Bill should contain a provision forcing the Co-ordinator-General to take notice of what a local authority desires in its own area. The powers of local authorities have been reduced in a series of Bills that have passed through this Chamber, and that concerns me. The recent amendments to the town-planning provisions of the Local Government Act are an example of that. There is virtually a State planning authority under the Local Government Act without one being established in name, and this Bill will extend that type of provision. Although I do not believe that the Government as a whole believes that that is its policy, it is introducing such provisions. I ask all Ministers to give some consideration to that, because State planning in any form will be disastrous for Queensland as it has been for New South Wales.

As I said, if local authorities had adequate opportunities to make an input into the study done by the Co-ordinator-General's Department, it could be very advantageous for

Queensland. Many councils have neither the staff nor the wherewithal to consider projects of the size that are envisaged in this legislation. Because most of the mineral and energy projects are carried out in areas in which there are small councils with large areas, the councils have not the staff, the experience or the money to carry out or pay for the studies that are necessary. The Co-ordinator-General has the staff.

Although it is not spelt out clearly in the Bill, I hope that when the Co-ordinator-General carries out studies he will take into consideration more than the obvious things such as railways and water supplies; that he will also consider things such as rubbish tips associated with the projects, children's services and other social services that are needed, and certainly have discussions with the Queensland Housing Commission and ascertain its ability to meet the requirements of the project.

Because of the way in which the Opposition has interpreted the Bill, I have raised with the joint Government parties and with the Co-ordinator-General and his officers the question whether the Bill will apply only to mineral or energy resource developments. That is an extremely important point, and I will support the Bill in its present form only if it is limited strictly to such developments. The projects about which we are speaking are those that cost hundreds, sometimes thousands, of millions of dollars. Having that in mind, I believe that the Co-ordinator-General is the only officer with the staff, ability and finance needed to control such projects.

Finally, I certainly would have liked to see Parliament have the power to disallow agreements once they are reached, but I know that that would create tremendous difficulties. Therefore, because the benefits that will accrue to Queensland from the flow-on of this Bill's enactment are so great, it can be accepted in its present form. I would have liked to move amendments but I have not been successful in getting them drawn up, so I shall be supporting the motion for the Bill's second reading.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (9.21 p.m.), in reply: First of all, I thank those members who have contributed to the debate. The debate has been an interesting one, mostly because the couple of members on this side of the House who spoke to the Bill really understood it and were able to comment upon it, whereas although some members of the Opposition did know something about the Bill, most of those who spoke elaborated on matters that do not have anything to do with the Bill. It is a shame that that has occurred, because Opposition members have had since last Thursday to examine the Bill.

This Bill was not cooked up in Cabinet last week by the Premier or any other Minister. For many years local authorities have faced problems such as those referred to in the Bill. Even the member for Port Curtis admits that such problems have confronted local authorities for many years.

Mr Prest: \$159m in our area.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You support the principle in it, don't you?

Mr WHARTON: Of course he does. As I say, this Bill was not engineered over the past week and brought on tonight. Most members of Parliament, particularly those on this side of the House, know what are the needs of local government.

Mr Vaughan: What about us?

A Government Member: That is why you are over there.

Mr WHARTON: That is right.

Mr Vaughan: What about giving us the same opportunity as you gave Government members?

Mr WHARTON: All the honourable member for Nudgee could speak about was a housing Bill. He should forget about that; this is a different Bill altogether.

The Co-ordinator-General and his department are in close contact with local government, so they are aware of its needs. This Bill is a result of those deliberations. It was not cooked up overnight and just brought along here. I should imagine that most members would be able to discuss a Bill such as this, which contains simple principles.

For the sake of members of the Opposition who do not seem to know, I point out that the purpose of this amendment is to enable the State Government to declare mineral and energy developments of major economic significance to the State to be prescribed developments. This Bill provides that major mining and mineral processing operations in Queensland enter into agreements with local bodies. These agreements must include provision to finance the infrastructure required to service each project and the population increase caused by that development.

It is unfair to expect existing local authority ratepayers to finance urban roads, water supply, sewerage and recreational and social amenities required by major developers to service their projects. This problem is more keenly felt when the pressures on existing towns and cities are caused by large developments outside such towns and cities.

The Government considers that the provision of infrastructure for large mining and mineral processing projects and for the population generated by such developments must not (a) place an excessive financial burden on existing residents of an area of the State

or the State as a whole, or (b) significantly alter existing priorities for the provision of State and local government services and facilities.

The final cost of providing facilities and services for the project and for the population growth attributable directly to the project must be borne directly by the developers.

Now I want to reply in a little more detail to the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. He raised the matter of franchise agreements. They have been brought to this Parliament before and they will be brought here again. They are debated here and reasonable debates have taken place concerning them. They will come before Parliament again.

The prescription of a mining or mineral processing development will allow two things to happen. Firstly, an infrastructure co-ordination plan will be drawn up and the local authorities will be able to legally form an agreement with the developers. That is important.

Mr Vaughan: If the Governor in Council lets them.

Mr WHARTON: Why wouldn't the Governor in Council let them? The Governor in Council comprises all Ministers, not just one Minister. Why would't they want to do something progressive? They are not suspicious and frightened, as Opposition members are. Opposition members are too suspicious. That is why they are on the Opposition side.

The Governor in Council may decide that the land use application to the local authority should be referred to him for determination. Under existing franchise agreements, the supplementary agreements between local authorities and developers do not come before Parliament, and Opposition members should know that.

Winchester South will be prescribed if the consortium proceeds to a lease; at present it has an authority to prospect. Local authorities will then have the power to enter into agreements to obtain money from the developer for infrastructure. Isn't that what we are seeking? Only mining and mineral-processing projects and not any project can be prescribed. I think I made that clear in the first place.

Mr Prest: What about the big, multi-million-dollar projects that are outside the mineral and energy fields? What other big projects are you talking about that involve hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr WHARTON: I do not think I should waste the time of the House telling the honourable member. He does not know about Alcan, QAL, Weipa or the bauxite producers. The honourable member had his say. He spoke for 20 minutes and wasted our time.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to the powers of local authorities. Two important things must be understood. Division II increases the powers of local authorities. For a prescribed development, they will be able to form an agreement with the developers for the provision of finance for infrastructure. For major State development projects such as aluminium smelters, it is logical that the State must become involved in the land use decision in respect of that development.

The Mining Act already overrides the Local Government Act and Opposition members should be aware of that. The sorts of development that could fall into this category are bauxite refineries, smelters, coke plants and the like.

The amendment will not operate retrospectively. I make that point.

Mr Prest: It won't?

Mr WHARTON: No.

Developments which have received Government approval to date will not be prescribed, so we are only going forward.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr WHARTON: I would like the honourable member to listen for a moment. This is very important. All Opposition members raised it because the Leader of the Opposition raised it and they are all like a lot of parrots.

It should be remembered that all Orders in Council under this legislation will be laid before the Legislative Assembly and can be disallowed. Many Orders in Council come before the House and Opposition members do not even look at them. They are tabled regularly and Opposition members fail to read them. That is their own fault.

The Co-ordinator-General's annual report is always presented to Parliament. The Bill formalises this procedure. I pay a tribute to the Co-ordinator-General and his staff for the part they play in compiling the report and the important role they continue to play in the development of this great State.

If developments proposed for Gladstone were to be prescribed, the problems being faced in Gladstone city for funding the infrastructure would be largely overcome.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to the value of the State's mineral franchise agreements. They have resulted in the largest alumina refinery in the world, two aluminium smelters, a possible new refinery and probably the first and largest synthetic fuel plant in Australia.

I shall now refer to some of the statements of the honourable member for Port Curtis. I think he is having two bob each way. He said that he wanted to support the Leader

of the Opposition, and that left him out on a limb. Then he said that it was a good thing. I think we can take it that he thinks it is a pretty fair idea. Many of the problems that are present in Gladstone today could be overcome by the provisions of this Bill.

The honourable member referred to an amendment of the Local Government Act. That would be inadequate, because harbour boards and electricity boards as well as local authorities are covered. The Bill will enable local authorities to attract funds from developers. Infrastructure co-ordination plans must be prepared. Therefore, amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organization Act are the most appropriate course of action.

The Government is aware of the problems being faced at Gladstone, and one of the reasons for the amendment is to allow places such as Gladstone to legally form agreements with developers for essential infrastructure. That is important.

The honourable member said that we had neglected housing. He should be commending us on the number of schools and houses that have been supplied. Millions have been spent in Gladstone in the last three or four years. I know it was necessary, but it has been done.

Mr Prest: Millions more have to be spent there to catch up.

Mr WHARTON: Fair enough, but don't forget to acknowledge that a great deal has been done. The area is well endowed with schools, and we are catching up. I know there are problems, but the honourable member should at least be considerate enough to say that we have done a great deal and not condemn us for the housing situation.

I commend the honourable member for Isis for his contribution. At least he has studied the Bill and understands some of the problems. He emphasised the salient points of the Bill. He understood that if there are several local authorities involved with just one developer, the developer has the opportunity to play one off against the other. There will now be an opportunity for the Government to become part of the negotiations and ensure that the developer does contribute to the infrastructure.

The honourable member referred to Alcan, as did the honourable member for Bundaberg. The Alcan development will also affect my area. I am rather proud that a smelter will be constructed, but no doubt there will be infrastructure problems. This Bill will overcome many of these problems.

Mr Prest: We want them all overcome.

Mr WHARTON: Be patient.

I also acknowledge the contribution to the debate of the honourable member for Rockhampton. The policy of the Government

in relation to environmental control has always been to decentralise the activities of those agencies that are best able to handle such activities. Under this agreement the Governor in Council may make land use decisions for very large and important developments. In most other States the responsibility rests with only one Minister, but here it will be dealt with by the Governor in Council and so decisions will be made by a cross-section of Ministers.

Mr Casey: Which Minister is actually handling it, you or the Premier? It is the Premier's Bill.

Mr Wharton: This is under the Premier's jurisdiction.

In reply to the honourable member for Rockhampton I make the point that if tough infrastructure packages are not negotiated, it will be impossible for some developments to occur. Without infrastructure, many proposals are not viable. For instance, if a consortium cannot house its work-force, it will not get one.

In reply to the honourable member for Rockhampton North—all Orders in Council must be tabled in the House, and they can be disallowed under Section 119 of the existing Act. That is the point—Orders in Council must be tabled and can then be debated. The honourable member knows the procedure. He also raised the matter of trade union agreements, but they are not matters that could remotely be regarded as infrastructure agreements. They have nothing to do with it.

The honourable member for Nudgee made a long speech about not trusting anybody, but he could not expect people to trust him if he will not trust them. But that is not the point. The honourable member made a long speech about housing at Redbank Plains and criticised the Housing Commission. In 1971 quite a lot of land was bought at Redbank Plains for the purpose of housing. After investigation by independent people from the University of Queensland, it was found that it will be another 20 years before we use that land. Is the honourable member going to say that we should allow that land to sit there for another 20 years when even then it may not be used?

The council was compensated for the money it spent, and the money is being well used. It received a good price. It was a commonsense business deal that anybody would have undertaken. Rather than have welfare housing money tied up for 20 years or so, it has been put to good use providing housing for people in necessitous circumstances.

The Government is not looking for short-cuts. It is looking for a rational way to plan for large industrial developments that are critical to the State's development. The Governor in Council will determine land use applications only in the case of mineral

processing plants that are important to the State in terms of economic development and job creation.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers raised some other issues about mining development. He understands the position, and he spelt it out pretty clearly.

I do not want to neglect the main point made by the honourable member for Bundaberg. I thought that he made a very fine speech until he started to express doubt as to what might happen. He would know what the local authorities in the area think about these matters.

Mr Blake: I do not know whether they have seen the Bill.

Mr Wharton: They know what is in the Bill because they are the people who suggested the amendments. We did not pull this Bill out of the hat. The local authorities raised these matters with the Co-ordinator-General, and then they came through the Cabinet to this Parliament. They know generally what this Bill is all about. Copies of the Bill have been available. They would probably know as much as the honourable member about it.

I thank all honourable members for their contributions.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Akers (Pine Rivers) in the chair; Hon. C. A. Wharton (Burnett—Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of s. 5; Meaning of terms—

Mr Casey (9.38 p.m.): Mr Akers, may I ask through you whether our queries on this Bill are to be directed to the Minister for Works and Housing, who replied to the second reading debate, or to the Premier?

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: To Claude.

Mr Casey: Oh, I see! It is a bit like the passage of the Essential Services Bill, in that the Premier is abdicating his responsibilities.

I refer to proposed paragraph (d) in section 5, which gives the definition of "prescribed development". I refer to the following clause, which seeks to add a new clause 30. It reads, in part—

“ . . . for the development of the mineral or energy resources of the State . . . ”

I ask the Minister: Why have not those words been included after the word "handling" in the definition of "prescribed development"? If that were done, that would clarify the point there and then.

Unfortunately, we have not had sufficient time to look at the Bill, and a number of consequential amendments could be needed all the way through it. Everything refers to "prescribed development".

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: That has been made quite clear right from the beginning.

Mr CASEY: That may be so but, with respect, it is not specifically written into the definition clause.

The definitions are all important, particularly the definition of "prescribed development". Unless the words, "of the mineral or energy resources of the State" are included after the word "handling", in the future there will be doubt on other projects.

In my second-reading speech I mentioned other possible projects in the future, projects of major economic significance. Similar projects of major economic significance have been introduced into this State in other ways and under other Bills. If there is to be an all-powerful amendment to the State Development and Public Works Organization Act to cover any future prescribed development, there is no doubt that, with the way this Government operates, they will never come before this Parliament as franchise agreements, particularly if the present Cabinet has anything to do with it. I therefore believe that the definition should be clearly spelt out. Perhaps the Minister may be able to explain to me why the words "of the mineral and energy resources of the State" are not included in the definition in the Bill.

Mr WHARTON: I feel that the Bill covers this matter in clause 3 (d), and if the honourable member reads the Bill further he will find that clause 4 deals with "Declaration of Prescribed Development". That states whether the development is for mining or anything else.

Mr CASEY: Unfortunately the Minister has not given a satisfactory explanation, nor is my point clarified in any way. Because there is nobody presently available from the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to see if any consequential amendments are required, it is impossible to pursue the point. However, I point out to the Committee that the definition does not specify only mineral and energy resources.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—New Part V—

Mr CASEY (9.43 p.m.): This clause virtually covers all aspects of the remainder of the Bill. It inserts a new part into the State Development and Public Works Organization Act and states how the "prescribed developments" will be dealt with. It is all very well for the Minister for Works and Housing to say in reply on

behalf of the Premier that there are no problems, just as has been said by other Government speakers.

The Opposition certainly recognises that there is a need for legislation to assist local authorities to provide proper infrastructure development for these projects. Indeed, that we have such a Bill before us points clearly to the fact that the Government has not acted responsibly in the past when franchise agreements have been dealt with in this Chamber. Certainly much more satisfactory deals could have been included in those agreements.

When the Bill dealing with the Rundle oil-shale agreement was before this Assembly the member for Port Curtis pointed out that, although it mentioned all the things that would be done for and on behalf of the Calliope Shire Council, it certainly did not lay down any proper guide-lines for what could be done for the Gladstone City Council. That could have been done then to help overcome the problems that exist in Gladstone. That Bill was before this Parliament only 12 months ago. Even before that Bill I can recall references being made in other Bills to the problems at Gladstone. We have finished up in this great pickle because the Government has not properly covered itself.

I mentioned a moment ago that the Bill can be classified as a "not only but also" Bill. It is the "but also" part with which the Opposition is greatly concerned. The Opposition is concerned at the way the Governor in Council can act with regard to all projects. I will lay it bluntly on the line again: it is not just us but also you, Mr Akers, who have expressed that opinion. Prior to the election many other Liberals were expressing the opinion—and certainly the people of Queensland are now expressing the opinion—that this Government cannot be trusted in the decisions made by Governor in Council.

Mr Hinze: Oh, hog-wash.

Mr CASEY: The Minister deliberately misled the House in a statement this morning. It was only when a letter was tabled clearly showing that he misled this House that we found him backing down.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr CASEY: The Premier is endeavouring to interject, too. Suddenly he has come to life in the debate on his own Bill. The Premier has been misleading people for a long time. The member for Callide clearly pointed that out earlier today. We heard some Ministers in the previous Parliament pointing that out.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Akers): Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There are accusations by the Leader of the Opposition about statements misleading the House. There are

accusations by the Minister of lies being told. I ask both honourable gentlemen to treat this Assembly with the respect that it deserves.

Mr CASEY: With respect, the terms that I used in relation to misleading the House are parliamentary terms and quite able to be used by any member of the Parliament. Certainly the words being used by the Minister are the unparliamentary ones. Available reference books would certainly indicate that.

Let us look at some of the provisions of clause 4. It is an all-embracing clause. It puts an additional Part into the original Act. Despite the comment by the Minister for Works and Housing that there is no retrospectivity, I submit that it could well be that a prescribed development could be made now of a previous franchise agreement passed by this Assembly without its coming back to this Chamber for amendment.

It is all very well to say that the local authorities are to be given the additional powers or the additional opportunities to get infrastructure moneys from developers. It sounds great. Clause 38 of the new Part introduced by clause 4 quite clearly provides that a local authority must override its own powers, provisions or ordinances if it is directed to do so by the prescribed plan. That again is terminology used in the Act. Once the plan has been approved by the Governor in Council, whether the local authority likes it or not—whether it overrides town-planning provisions, health ordinances or controls in relation to the environment—it must accede to what has been the plan of the prescribed development. That is quite clear in the Bill; so quite clearly the local authority is overridden.

Further, the local authority itself has to enforce it in law even though it may be unlawful according to its own ordinances. That again is the terminology of the Bill. If that is not tying the Government into a knot, nothing is. If that is not making a rod for the Government's own back in its future relations with local authorities, nothing is. The other detrimental aspect is that the effective determination simply means that there is no appeal whatsoever. There is no appeal against the decision of Governor in Council. Any person, group, body or company feeling aggrieved by a plan has no right of appeal to a higher authority. Surely that is a fundamental principle of justice.

When it is all boiled down, the only place to which people normally have a chance to appeal against a decision by Governor in Council is this Parliament. It is only through the Parliament itself that people have the opportunity to raise objection. That is so with this Bill. It is overridden in section 47 of the new Part. It says that the determination "shall be final and binding". The determination "shall have effect in

law", irrespective that it is "contrary to any town planning scheme or any by-law or ordinance relating to the use or development of land." It is quite clearly written in there. One can go on and on in that clause and see that there is no chance whatsoever—

Mr Powell: You go on and on.

Mr CASEY: Of course, the member for Isis gets himself completely boxed up in all these things. We know that he is endeavouring to put on a show this evening for a few guests.

Quite clearly the new section is a double-edged sword. On one side it can be used for good and on the other side it can and certainly will be used detrimentally to the people of Queensland. More importantly, this new section takes authority away from this Parliament. That must be pointed out clearly to the people of Queensland, and I am sure they will feel that they cannot trust the Bill.

These are points that the Minister has not answered in his reply. He has skirted around them and gone into other aspects of the Bill. The Premier has been very quiet, because he also realises that there is no responsibility whatever on the Governor in Council to report back to Parliament on any of these matters.

The Winchester South deal was mentioned by me before. The Minister tried to skirt around it by saying that it is only an authority to prospect at the moment. We know that, but we also know that once this Bill is passed the Minister will get to the gate as quickly as he can to make that project a prescribed development, and by doing that it will not come before this Parliament. We will never get the answers to the questions asked about Winchester South.

Mr WHARTON: I know that the honourable member has a fairly good record of writing a lot of things into a lot of things, and of talking a lot of people into a lot of things, and tonight the honourable member has given us an exhibition of that. I do not think he really knows what he is trying to define. I will try to put it succinctly so that the honourable member can understand.

The definition of "prescribed development" does not need to mention mineral and energy development, because the new section 30 allows only mineral and energy development to be considered. The new section 38 provides that local authorities may negotiate an agreement; they do not have to. The Bill gives that extra power to local authorities.

Mr PREST: I support the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition regarding clause 4. It is very obvious to us on this side of the Chamber that the intent of the Government

is to hoodwink the Parliament, to take away the power of local government and also the power of this Assembly, and to give that power to the Cabinet and to the Minister. Of course, the Premier mentioned the franchise agreement with Rundle when introducing the Bill. That agreement was drawn up by the same people who drew up this amendment to the Act. The Rundle agreement was so good and so clear that the Gladstone City Council now has the great expense of sending someone to Brisbane to seek the advice of a barrister in an effort to salvage something out of the Rundle agreement. That agreement is so cloudy that even the barrister is having trouble in seeing what good is in it for the Gladstone City Council. If it was so clear-cut any layman in the local authority or a highly paid town clerk would have been able to point out its worth to the council. Is the Minister basing his opinion on what was done in the Rundle agreement? We were told tonight that the Bill does not have retrospective application to companies that set up operations in Gladstone in the past, and did not pay or subscribe towards the infrastructure. What members of the Opposition are looking at, and what the Premier is looking at, is the fact that Gladstone is looking for \$159m to make up for the past mistakes of this Government.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr PREST: It has nothing to do with the local authority in that regard, because those approvals had been given.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Does the honourable member want us to take industry away from Gladstone and start somewhere else next time? Is that what he is driving at?

Mr PREST: The Premier knows why the situation has developed. His Government has allowed it to develop. He knows that he is in a spot with the Gladstone City Council, which is a National Party council. It has said that it will not allow any more industry to come to Gladstone. It will not give approval, so the Premier is going to take away the power of local government and put it in the hands of his Minister. Local Government will not have a say and Opposition members will not be able to speak on behalf of local government in Queensland. The Premier is taking away the rights of the Opposition and the rights of members of Parliament. He is giving those rights to Cabinet, where approval will be given.

It is no wonder that Opposition members are the only members who care for the local authorities in Queensland. Without us where would they be? Over the past few years the Minister for Local Government has been eroding the powers of local government. It has almost got to the stage where local authorities are nothing more than a rubber stamp.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Akers): Order! The honourable member will come back to the clause under discussion.

Mr PREST: The problems have been created by this Government, and that is why we are opposing clause 4. As I have said, the very people who advised the Premier in relation to the Rundle agreement—the officers of the Co-ordinator-General's Department—are his advisers in relation to this Bill. We will end up with the same sorry state of affairs as we had in relation to the Rundle agreement.

Mr WARBURTON: I simply want to direct one question to the Minister who is presently in charge of this Bill. I ask him this: In relation to a prescribed development, is it true that this Parliament will have no right to debate matters in relation to such a project? That is all I want to ask him. Is that true?

Mr WHARTON: Which clause is the honourable member referring to?

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. I think you called the Minister, Mr Akers, and I was wondering whether the Premier was going to stand to speak.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr WHARTON: I can answer the question by the honourable member for Sandgate. The answer is simply that it will come before the House by regulation and Opposition members will have ample opportunity to debate it.

Mr CASEY: The very proof of what we have been saying is in the words that the Minister has just used. It is government by regulation. That is the way this Government operates, and that is the way it will operate from now on in relation to prescribed developments that will come within the ambit of the Bill.

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I meant to say "Order in Council".

Mr CASEY: A rose by any other name still smells as sweet—despite the fact that it is a stinking roger rather than a rose. It is still government by regulation or government by Order in Council—call it what you like. The point is that it comes back to this Parliament after the event, with no opportunity given to members of this Parliament to do anything about it.

The confession that the Minister for Works and Housing has just made highlights the reason why the Opposition is strongly

opposed to this clause. It is taking away from this Parliament any powers that it has in relation to the matters covered by the Bill and it is placing those powers in the hands of the Governor in Council. That has been admitted by the Minister.

The Minister said earlier that this may be done or that may be done. Quite clearly, the clause provides that once a plan is approved by the Governor in Council every local body and other person specified in the approved plan shall comply with the requirements of the plan. It is mandatory; it is compulsory once it has been passed by the Governor in Council. It stinks to high heaven and it is another instance of abnegation by the Government back-bench members of their responsibility to look after the interests of the people of this State.

Mr WHARTON: Might I just repeat that local authorities may negotiate agreements; they do not have to. The Act now gives extra powers.

Mr Casey: Everybody shall comply. Have another look at the Bill. You do not know what is in the Bill, regardless of whether it is your Bill or the Premier's Bill.

Mr WHARTON: Never mind whose Bill it is. The honourable member does not know anything about it, that's for sure. What I want to say to him is that the local authorities may negotiate with a developer, and that will be a great help to them. Opposition members are knocking local authorities. Don't they want local authorities to take part in this development? Then the matter will come, through a Minister, to Executive Council and then it will come here as an Order in Council. The Parliament can debate an Order in Council laid on the table in relation to a prescribed development.

Question—That clause 4, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 45

Ahern
Austin
Bird
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Doumany
Edwards
Elliott
Fitzgerald
Frawley
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Greenwood
Gunn
Gygar
Harper
Hewitt,
Hinze
Innes
Jennings
Lane
Lee

Lickiss
Lockwood
McKechnie
Menzel
Moore
Powell
Prentice
Randell
Row
Scassola
Simpson
Stephan
Sullivan
Tenni
Tomkins
Turner
Warner
Wharton
White

Tellers:
Neal
Nelson

NOES, 25

Blake	Scott
Burns	Shaw
Casey	Smith
D'Arcy	Underwood
Davis	Vaughan
Fouras	Warburton
Gibbs, R. J.	Wilson
Hooper,	Wright
Jones	Yewdale
Kruger	
Mackenroth	Tellers:
McLean	Eaton
Milliner	Hansen
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 5 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

RACING AND BETTING ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 26 March (see p. 567) on Mr Hinze's motion—

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

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (10.11 p.m.): The Bill that was just discussed attracted some criticism from a number of Opposition members. If I recall correctly, the honourable member for Pine Rivers made some comments about the time that members of Parliament had to discuss and examine the proposals in that Bill. I understand that that Bill was introduced last Thursday and debated today. The Bill currently before the Chamber is at least twice the size of the Bill that the House has just dealt with, and the same situation arises. When the new Sessional Orders were introduced I was of the firm belief that the Government was giving serious consideration to allowing members of Parliament sufficient time in which to examine Bills so that they could approach them in a sensible and realistic way. That matter was raised during the debate on the previous Bill, and I think it is appropriate that those views should be restated at the commencement of debate on this Bill.

Mr Davis: Another broken promise.

Mr WARBURTON: That is for sure.

One of the main thrusts of the Opposition's criticism of the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill was directed at the way in which the State Government, through the Treasury, had milked the sacred cow of racing to the extent that the racing industry, being the earner and provider of millions upon millions of dollars of revenue for this Government and its Treasury, has been denied a return that could properly be described as fair and

reasonable in the circumstances. There were other deficiencies in the 1980 Bill that both I and other members of the Opposition brought to light. It is pleasing to note that, if this legislation has a successful passage through this Parliament, a number of those matters will be rectified.

The previous Minister in charge of racing went to some pains during his second-reading speech on the 1980 Bill to suggest that the level of Queensland Government taxation on betting turnover was not excessive by Australian and world standards. It would seem to me that the present Minister in charge of racing tends to agree with my contention rather than that of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Dr Edwards). It is to be hoped that the present Minister will be able to meet the many commitments to all levels of the racing industry, including the punters, that he has made over the short period that he has been in charge of racing.

The Minister has constantly spoken of a betting turnover of approximately \$200m by Queensland starting-price bookmakers and the benefits that would flow to the State if this enormous amount of money was channelled through legal betting sources. I think that the Minister is perhaps pipe-dreaming when he professes that his new penalty proposals will end illegal betting in Queensland and result in additional revenue to the extent that he has indicated. The suggestion that the extremely high penalties contained in the Bill for contravention of sections 214, 216 or 217, together with the expectation that a District Court judge will play a tougher role in dealing with offenders, thus stamping out starting-price bookmaking, is certainly hypothetical, to say the least.

The penalties contained in the Racing and Betting Act of 1954 were at that time certainly regarded as quite substantial indeed. Under the provisions of that Act, offenders dealt with for second and third offences were subject to terms of imprisonment. That was also the case on the last two occasions on which amendments were passed by this Parliament. In 1954 the penalty for a first offence was a fine of from \$300 to \$400. The penalty for a second offence was a fine of from \$500 to \$1,000, and imprisonment from 14 days to three months. The fine for a third offence was from \$1,000 to \$1,500, with imprisonment from 28 days to six months.

Further amendments were made to the Act in 1975 when the penalty for the first offence was increased to \$3,000 and included a provision for up to two months' imprisonment. For a second offence the penalty was increased to \$6,000, with imprisonment of up to six months. Imprisonment of not more than two years was the penalty for a third offence. The penalties introduced 16 years ago were then regarded as being the answer to the problem of unlawful book-making.

When the Act was last amended in October 1975, Sir Gordon Chalk was the Minister in charge of racing. At that time he said he considered that higher penalties should be introduced. He also said there was a need to strengthen these particular penalties in an endeavour to eliminate the SP operator who takes from the racing industry money which otherwise might be ploughed into racing. It is more than coincidental that the words of Sir Gordon Chalk echo the words of both the previous and the present Ministers—the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—when they supported the introduction of higher penalties in their respective Bills, that is, the 1980 Bill introduced in early April by the Deputy Premier and this Bill being introduced by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police.

It is very strange indeed, but certainly not unusual, for this Parliament to be confronted by inconsistency on the part of Ministers. On the one hand, we have Liberal Ministers in charge of racing arguing at great length about the need for higher penalties, including imprisonment, and on the other hand the present Minister suggesting to us that the complete answer to the SP problem is to force starting-price bookmakers into bankruptcy by imposing fines that they would find it impossible in many cases to pay. The argument goes on ad infinitum, as does the inconsistency of this Government's approach to the matter of penalties for starting-price bookmakers.

Not to be outdone, the previous Minister in charge of racing (Dr Edwards) in the Racing and Betting Act of 1980, which I think we all appreciate is as yet unproclaimed, saw fit to make further financial adjustments to the penalties for unlawful bookmaking and common betting-house operations. The penalty for the first offence was up to \$10,000, or imprisonment for 12 months, ranging to \$50,000 or three years' imprisonment, or both, for a third or subsequent offence.

I can well recall his saying with all the sincerity he could muster at the time that the Government intended to take a firm stand on the issue of unlawful betting and deal severely with persons found to be engaged in illegal betting activities. They were almost the exact words of Dr Edwards when he was responsible for racing. He emphasised that the increase in the range of penalties was designed to restrict as far as possible the flow of betting money through illegal networks. He said that the answer to the elimination of starting-price betting was an efficient TAB, effective police surveillance and prosecution, backed by the penalties that he proposed, and a concerted and continuing campaign by Government and the industry alike. That was his solution at that time. Whilst there was quite a degree of argument in this Parliament about the nature of the penalties, the degree of the penalties and the manner in which the Minister wished to impose them,

nevertheless that provision passed through this Parliament by way of the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill, which I repeat is as yet to be proclaimed.

Mr Davis: What a farce!

Mr WARBURTON: I suggest that the member for Brisbane Central is absolutely correct. It was a farce. That Bill arose out of many, many months of consideration by the Treasurer after lengthy discussions with all sections of the community. He informed the House that that was so. Since that time I have had the opportunity to establish that what he said was in fact the truth. Now here we are at this late stage after 10 p.m. debating another Bill for racing and betting in the State of Queensland.

April 1980 was when the first Racing and Betting Bill was introduced by Dr Edwards. Before the ink has had time to dry, we now have the new Minister (Mr Hinze) presenting another penalty conglomeration without giving the 1980 provisions, acclaimed by Government members one after the other in this House and passed by this Parliament, the chance to succeed or fail.

A procession of Ministers has come forward with what were regarded by them—they argued vigorously about the provisions at the time—as harsh penalties designed to stamp out SP bookmaking. If one goes back through "Hansard", from the very time the Racing and Betting Act came into being, the arguments were put up by a string of Ministers that they had the answer to stamping out SP bookmaking. That answer was in the penalties and the way they were going to impose them. This evening we are considering a Bill introduced by a Minister who says that he has the answer, even though his predecessors thought that they, too, had the answer.

We often hear the saying that the punishment must fit the crime. Whilst we as a Parliament are being asked to give our imprimatur to the penalties contained in the Bill for persons involved in illegal gambling, it is difficult to reconcile that with records which show that crimes against society, and regarded by society itself as being much more serious, have attracted penalties that are, by comparison, merely "peanuts". I remind the Minister and other honourable members that I went to great lengths to compare a number of penalties that were imposed by District Courts in this State with penalties expected to be imposed on people conducting what is, by law, illegal betting. To date, there does not seem to be any credibility in the argument put forward by any Minister that the degree of penalty fits the crime.

The Minister responsible for the Bill was the only Minister other than the then Minister in charge of racing, Dr Edwards, to make a contribution to the debate on the

Racing and Betting Bill in 1980. He made no criticism of the penalties suggested when he spoke to the Bill in April of that year. He said that he could only heap praise on the Deputy Premier and offer congratulations on the preparation and presentation of the long-awaited Racing and Betting Bill. Therefore, it is difficult to understand the Minister's motives in changing what in 1980 he was acclaiming and applauding.

We are being asked to agree to increase the upper limits of penalties while still giving the District Court power to impose lesser penalties in "special circumstances"—whatever they may be. We also are being asked to accept that the ultimate act of forcing an offender into bankruptcy is a better proposition than giving the Court power to imprison the offender. The Minister is certainly out of step with all the other esteemed Ministers who have moved amendments to the penalty section over the years. Only time will prove whether or not he is correct.

In today's society, one sees numerous people in high places going bankrupt; one sees white-collar criminals going bankrupt. Honourable members are aware of the methods by which such people transfer money to members of their family and other people. As the Minister said, probably the only way in which we will find out what effect the provision will have is to watch what happens in the future.

The Opposition wishes to express its gravest doubts and concern about the way in which the clause relating to prosecution and penalties for unlawful bookmaking or opening, keeping, or using common betting houses is intended to operate. That is the whole purpose of my contribution on that point.

The fact that section 244 of the 1980 Act is to be left unchanged must also cause concern. The matter was raised this morning by way of a question from the Leader of the Opposition to the Minister. Section 244 relates to the protection of and payment of informers, and it provides that the court shall order one half of the penalty to be paid to the person who supplied the information that resulted in the conviction of the offender. If the Government is trying to breed a nation of informers, pimps and bounty-hunters within the racing industry, I suggest that it is going about it in the right way. A 50 per cent return on the new fine of \$50,000 for being an informer or pimp institutes a substantial pay-off for activity of such a doubtful type. One wonders what the Government's reaction would be to a suggestion that similar pay-offs be made to informers who are able to come forward with information that leads to the conviction of people for assault or robbery or murder or rape.

My purpose in raising these matters is to show the inconsistency among Ministers who introduce penalties into the various Acts for which they are responsible. Whilst we on this side of the House have no truck

with people who break the law, I hark back to the fact that we have stated consistently that the penalty must fit the crime. I cannot for the life of me see how any Minister could put forward any concrete argument to show that the fines or penalties that are to be imposed on SP bookmakers meet the situation or fit the crime when they are compared with the penalties that are imposed in the District Court for very serious crimes against society.

The previous Minister for racing, Dr Edwards, saw fit to publish a White Paper as a lead-up to the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill. Less than 12 months after assent was given to the Racing and Betting Bill 1980, which as those honourable members who were here at that time will recall was acclaimed as the panacea of all racing industry problems, we are again involved in a debate on the very same issues. Whether or not the provisions contained in this Bill are better—I have already admitted that some of them are—the fact that we are again debating those same issues is an indictment of the Government's ability to do the job.

Last year, the then Minister for racing, Dr Edwards, introduced a major Bill concerning racing. He and other members told us what a great Bill it was and what a great thing it would be for Queensland racing. Tonight, on the second occasion within 12 months, and without the previous Bill's ever being proclaimed—it was assented to in June 1980, I think—we are faced with a situation where it is all up for grabs again.

I have carefully read the "Hansard" record of the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill debate. All Government members who entered the debate were ecstatic about the provisions contained in that Bill. It will certainly be interesting to see the reaction of Government members to these changes, a number of which bring about significant improvements. In fact, during the 1980 debate, other Opposition members and I argued for those improvements.

I want to quote from the speech made by one Government member in 1980 and then to advise the House which Government member it was. In referring to the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill, a Government member said—

"I believe that the Bill will be accepted by the racing industry as a whole. It is one of the best Bills ever presented to the House. As was said tonight, the White Paper left us in no doubt as to what was intended. I must admit that in the past few weeks I had some anxious moments when I could not get my hands on the Bill. However, it has changed little from what was proposed. I repeat that I believe this measure to be one of the best Bills ever to come before the House."

Mr Davis: Can I have a stab at who that was?

Mr WARBURTON: Yes.

Mr Davis: Russ Hinze.

Mr WARBURTON: No, it was not the Minister. In fact, it was the member for Toowoomba South, Mr Warner, a member of the National Party. I quoted from his speech to show how Government members saw the Racing and Betting Bill of 1980.

An examination of the Consolidated Revenue Fund receipts by way of State taxation for the half year ended 31 December 1980 reveals that totalisator and betting tax, together with bookmakers' turnover tax, amounted to \$12.4m. If the amount of \$26.2m that the Government collected for liquor licences and permits is included for comparison purposes, racing rates as the Queensland Government's fourth highest tax revenue earner. It is no wonder that the Minister and the Government are keen to completely corner the gambling market for Queensland racing. As a matter of interest, the highest tax earner is pay-roll tax and stamp duty, with a combined six-month total to December 1980 of \$243.3m, which is \$38.6m over and above the total for the same six-month period in 1979. Could I suggest that that rather dispels the claims about Queensland's being a low tax State?

Getting back to the provisions of the Bill—the betting turnover figures for totalisator operations is nothing less than astronomical. When we talk about racing and the racing industry, there is a need to ensure that people understand how big the racing industry is so that they, in turn, can appreciate the need for the expenditure on facilities foreshadowed by the Minister and facilitated by certain provisions contained in the Bill. That is important because they have to understand the magnitude of the money involved so that they, in turn, can be careful when they cast certain aspersions or level any criticism at the expenditure that I consider could be forthcoming.

In 1979-80 the combined on-course/off-course totalisator operations turnover in Queensland amounted to the staggering figure of \$292m, whilst licensed bookmakers' turnover exceeded that at \$410m. That is the sort of money that we are talking about. The total betting turnover was \$702m in Queensland alone.

Mr Hinze: Plus the SP.

Mr WARBURTON: As the Minister says quite correctly, plus the turnover for starting-price bookmakers.

An amount of \$231m is in fact the amount above the total betting turnover for the 1974-75 period. What I am saying is that that turnover has increased by \$231m since 1974-75. By comparison, the turnover in 1979-80 for soccer pools was only \$17.3m, and for the Golden Casket, \$41.8m. I suggest that those two figures would pale into

absolute insignificance in comparison with the sort of turnover that we are talking about in the Queensland racing industry. As the Minister and other honourable members interested in the racing industry would know, the turnover figures in this State in turn pale into insignificance when compared with the New South Wales figures.

Mr Hinze: And Victoria.

Mr WARBURTON: And Victoria.

I shall conclude my remarks on this aspect of the industry by suggesting that the advent of other forms of gambling in Queensland must give concern to those on the receiving end of moneys earned from the racing industry. We surely cannot escape that. The Treasurer is reported as saying that Lotto will eventually generate \$35m a year for the Government, and that money must obviously come mainly from the pockets of Queensland gamblers.

A recent report by Tattslotto, which was introduced into Victoria eight years ago, showed that only 23 per cent of the community had punted on the TAB but a staggering 85 per cent had subscribed to Tattslotto; 30 per cent of TAB punters punted regularly on a weekly basis while 75 per cent of Tattslotto players played it every week. Whilst the Minister in charge of racing is on record as saying that a higher income from racing will be an inevitable consequence of his activities, it must be obvious to all that the gambling barrel in Queensland can hold only so much and that there must be an effect on, for example, the TAB turnover if any more forms of popular organised gambling are fostered by the Queensland Government. That is just a problem I introduce into the debate, because I know the Minister is counting on the improvements that he is suggesting in the Bill, and future improvements I understand he has in mind, to bring more money into the racing industry coffers. I suggest he will certainly have a difficult job if we are to see these other forms of organised gambling introduced in this State.

I now intend to refer to the present controversy surrounding the proposed amendments to the Anzac Day Act. It is true that the Racing and Betting Act 1980, resulting from a Bill introduced into Parliament early in 1980, does contain a section, namely section 128, relating to restrictions on race meetings on Anzac Day. It reads—

“(1) A meeting shall not be held on Anzac Day to commence before 30 minutes after midday or at which a race is to start before 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

“(2) For the purposes of this section, a meeting shall be deemed to commence before 30 minutes after midday if betting with a bookmaker or investment on a totalisator occurs before that time at the racing venue at which the meeting is or is to be held on that day.”

This Parliament agreed without dissent to that provision which applies solely to racing venues operating on Anzac Day. The former Minister in charge of racing, Dr Edwards, said in part in his second-reading speech at that time—

“The times at which a meeting is deemed to commence have been more explicit than the previous provisions . . .”

That is the only reference made by the former Minister to race meeting commencement times in any of his contributions to the debate on the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill. It is being suggested that the Returned Services League, through representatives of the Anzac Day Trust, fully supports the amendments proposed by the Minister. It is my understanding that the four-person trust did receive a confidential letter from the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations, Sir William Knox, concerning the proposed amendments to the Anzac Day Act, but it is also my understanding that the RSL, which, of course, we all understand is a body completely apart from the trust, has never been involved in any discussions with either the trust or the State Government or its representatives on the far-reaching proposal to amend section 4 of the Anzac Day Act which refers to places of public amusement.

I repeat that that is the understanding that I have gained from discussions that I have had with senior officers of the RSL in Queensland. I refer to a letter that appeared in this morning's "Courier-Mail" under the name of Mr Mervyn Clark, who is chairman of the Anzac Day Combined Parade Committee and president of the South Eastern District of the RSL. Those people who understand what the RSL is all about would appreciate the importance of the South Eastern District as it applies to the RSL. Mr Clark said—

“The South Eastern District RSL strongly protest over the proposed change which is to be placed before Parliament concerning Anzac Day.

“This is to allow ALL places of amusement to open at 12.30 p.m. instead of 1 p.m.

“This means that all places of amusement will be allowed to open while we are still conducting the Anzac Day Commemoration Service which is attended by the Governor of Queensland, Sir James Ramsay, State government and civic dignitaries.

“Anzac Day is set aside for the people of Queensland to honour our fallen and departed comrades.

“After changing under pressure, from a full day to 1 p.m. in 1966 we thought that the Act would never again be amended in our time.

“Mr Bjelke-Petersen as Premier and chairman of the Anzac Day commemoration committee, should surely protect Queensland from any change in the Anzac Day Act.

"If this 'time of change' becomes law, then how long will it be before 'Anzac Day' becomes just another holiday and create a precedent for further erosion at a later date. Where is our national pride?"

"Not one of the service organisations who are connected with the conduct of Anzac Day received any notification of a proposed change.

"We strongly object to any move which will erode the significance of Anzac Day and hope that ex-servicemen and women—widows—children and people of Queensland will not be forgotten when our politicians debate this amendment to the 'Anzac Day Act' and ensure that it is defeated."

Section 4 of the Anzac Day Act defines places of amusement, and I think it is important that I read it into "Hansard". It states—

"... the term 'place of public amusement' means any building or any part of a building, or any enclosure . . . to be used as a theatre, dancing hall, or music-hall, or for athletic entertainment or boxing, or for a circus or a cinematograph exhibition, or for any public entertainment, amusement or entertainment whatsoever . . ."

It also states—

"It shall be unlawful for any person, except with the permission in writing of the Minister . . . to open, keep open or use . . . any place of public entertainment on Anzac Day before 30 minutes after 1 o'clock in the afternoon."

So what we have here is the Minister in charge of racing taking the carriage of an amendment to an Act for which he is not responsible. The Act is administered not by him but by the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations (Sir William Knox) who, to this time, has remained strangely silent about the whole affair. The Minister in charge of racing is in fact using the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill as a vehicle to alter section 4 of the Anzac Day Act.

Mr Hinze: By request.

Mr WARBURTON: As I said before, I have no argument about the fact that the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill, which was assented to last June, did in fact contain a provision that applied to racing, but I have an argument with the Minister about what he wants to do here. What is happening is that the Minister, by pursuing this amendment that he is putting forward, is changing the position not only for racing in this State but also for each and every other type of amusement that is defined under the Anzac Day Act.

From the information that I possess at the moment I do not believe that the Anzac Day Trust, which consists of four people, had the power or that it carried out any discussions with the principal people involved in the RSL or the commemoration committee, either prior to the debate on the 1980 Bill or on this occasion. If the Minister has information that shows that to be wrong, then I find it very difficult to understand why Mr Merv Clark, a man whom I have known for quite a period and who is the president of the Anzac Day Combined Parade Committee and South Eastern District RSL president, would not know about it. It is probably unfortunate from the Minister's point of view, but many Opposition members have received phone calls from RSL clubs in their constituencies complaining about this matter.

I think it is important that I inform honourable members of the essence of clause 80, as this Parliament is not being asked to ratify clause 128 of the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill, which confines itself to race meeting times. If clause 80 did that then probably all of us here tonight who were present when the 1980 Bill was debated would certainly be somewhat hypocritical if we did not go along with that sort of proposal because in fact we let it go through without debate and without dissent when it was before the Parliament. However, we are being asked to agree to amend section 4 of the Anzac Day Act, which deals with the time of commencement of all and every form of amusement and entertainment in Queensland on Anzac Day. That is the basic difference. Certainly clause 128 of the 1980 Racing and Betting Bill and section 4 of the Anzac Day Act are in conflict as they stand.

However, under the Anzac Day Act the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations is given the power to authorise the early opening of a race meeting if he so desires. He has that power at the moment. It is certainly no secret that punters attending Anzac Day race meetings have been somewhat exasperated by the restrictions that have prevented them from entering courses and betting on southern events. That is well known in the racing industry. No doubt this is one of the determining factors that have prompted the Minister to bring the time forward to 12.30 p.m.

That is all very well for the Minister involved with racing, and I do not suggest for one moment that that is not his responsibility. However, an alteration to section 4 of the Anzac Day Act affects not only the racing industry but every other type of entertainment and every other type of establishment of the kind I have described right throughout the State. I do not think that is the Minister's responsibility; it is the responsibility of the Minister for Labour Relations. I suggest that this Parliament insist that that particular matter be debated on

its merits or alternatively that section 4 of the Anzac Day Act be divorced completely from this present exercise.

On this occasion the Minister for Labour Relations needs to stand up and be counted. He is responsible for the Anzac Day Act and I want to hear from him what he thinks about an amendment to that section of that Act. He has the responsibility to administer the Act, and he is the one who should bring in a Bill to amend section 4 of the Act, if the Government so desires. This is the firm opinion of the Opposition and we will have more to say on that aspect of the Bill when the clauses are being debated.

The Opposition is happy with a number of provisions in the Bill. We are happy that racing is divorced from Treasury. That was one of the proposals that I personally put forward on behalf of the Opposition during the 1980 debate, and I am pleased to see that that has in fact occurred. It is reasonable to suggest that that will show the sincerity of the present racing establishment in this State in that it will not be thought by the betting public to be completely tied to the strings of Treasury. Because there was that connection, some people were saying that the Treasury took as much as it could out of racing. I am not saying that that will not be so in the future, but certainly that connotation is no longer there.

It will be recalled that in the last debate on this legislation I and other members of the Opposition were very critical that the then Minister (Dr Edwards) had not seen fit to place in the Act itself the actual percentages that were to be taken in book-makers' turnover tax and club levy. It is pleasing to see the percentages stated in the Bill. If it receives a smooth passage, those figures will in fact become part of the legislation.

It is interesting to note that club levies are being shown as a separate entity. Obviously that is because clubs will now be able to get earlier returns. I compliment the Minister on ensuring that that provision was inserted in the Bill. It is a good one and the sort of thing we were arguing for in 1980.

I shall just touch on the closure of TAB agencies. There is no question that this is seen by many honourable members as of some import. I know that the Minister has suggested that from time to time some honourable members have seen fit to push for the opening of TAB agencies simply for electoral purposes. That is not so in my electorate. The TAB agencies were there before I arrived. Mr Harold Dean was the member for the area for many years before my election, which consolidates argument that those TAB agencies were opened by the powers that be without any agitation from the elected representative.

However, let me say this to the Minister: I accept that there should be an upgrading of TAB agencies in this State. I suggest to him that some of the agencies are absolutely disgraceful. Although the Minister may not agree openly in Parliament, I know that he holds similar views. Walking into an open, barren room, facing a wall that is half-caged, is not really conducive to a pleasant afternoon's betting, and his idea of trying to upgrade the facilities of TAB agencies is a good one.

However, let me say to him that if there is any thought in the minds of the TAB of closing agencies in small townships or small business areas, I suggest that it thinks twice about doing so. The Government has an obligation not only to punters but also to small businesses in areas adjacent to TAB agencies. I am thinking in a parochial way about the suburb of Shorncliffe. It is a rather isolated area, but a small business community survives in one street. Possibly there were three reasons for that; now there are only two. It had a hotel, a post office, and a TAB agency. The post office has gone because Australia Post does not take into consideration arguments of the type that I am now putting forward, but I suggest that they are arguments that must be considered. If the TAB agency is closed, the small businesses will suffer drastically and there will be closures.

I do not know whether officers of the TAB really consider what is going to happen in future in situations such as that. It is sufficient to inform them that Housing Commission units are being developed in the Shorncliffe area and that, at long last, the suburb is coming to life because new people are moving into it. The TAB must take into account forward planning when making up its mind whether or not to close agencies. It must not look only at the turnover of a particular agency in any one week; it must look at projections for the future and take the small business people into account.

Shorncliffe is a very good example, because if the TAB agency there were to close, dozens and dozens of punters who now place their bets at that agency would not be able to bet anywhere else. There are a number of reasons for that. I shall not go into them fully, but one is transport and another is the age of the people and their lack of mobility, if I might put it that way. They like to place small bets, and they will not be able to bet on credit by telephone if the TAB agency is closed.

Having said that, I certainly hope that the Minister will take those comments on board. I expect that he will.

Mr Hinze: I guarantee to take them on board.

Mr WARBURTON: I thank the Minister. That is very reassuring.

I wish to make only a couple more comments, one of which relates to the Mt Isa episode. I do not wish to go into it to any great extent, but I think it is incumbent upon the Minister to bring down, as he said he would, a full report. It is a very serious matter, and a number of members of the Opposition could easily have pursued it in this Chamber. Some of the allegations that have been made to us and some of the statutory declarations that we have in our possession are such that they would be of considerable concern to the racing industry in this State. We have refrained from pursuing this matter because the Minister for racing has given a clear indication that he intends to bring down some sort of report. I hope that he will do so as early as possible. If I could finish on this note—

Mr Moore: You have finished more times than Madam Melba.

Mr WARBURTON: One consolation is that at least I start, which is more than I can say for the honourable member for Windsor.

Two matters concerning the Mt Isa incident interest me greatly. One is the fact that for quite a lengthy period the association in the town had had no contact from either the Minister or his officers. I could not understand that. I hope that the Minister will be able to answer that query.

The other matter is that I personally have grave doubts about the powers of the police to take the action that they took in Mt Isa. What the police did was to bring along to the racecourse at Mt Isa a person who they claimed was a vet or had veterinary qualifications and they then took numerous blood samples from horses before the races commenced. The police overrode the authority of the stewards, which is important in itself, and whether or not the police have the power under the Act to do that sort of thing is something that I want to know.

As I say, Opposition members have refrained from pursuing this matter. Could I say to the Minister that that was done in the hope that it was in the interests of racing? Maybe we were foolish not to pursue the matter further. However, I certainly want to know whether I am correct in assuming that the Act as it now stands—not the Bill that was brought forward in 1980—does not give police the power to take the action that they took in Mt Isa.

In relation to the definition of the general powers, functions and duties of members of the Police Force, the Act provides that every member of the Police Force shall at all times cause the provisions of this Act to be duly observed and any such member may make any inquiry, investigations, inspection or examination which in the opinion of such member is necessary to establish whether or not a breach of this Act has been or is being or is intended to be committed.

That is the only provision in the Act that has, or could have, any relevance to what occurred in Mt Isa. My interpretation of that provision is that the police certainly did not have the power to do what they did. In the light of what I have said about the Opposition's attitude, I sincerely ask the Minister to advise us when we can expect to see a report on the Mt Isa episode. I am sure that the Minister will co-operate in that matter.

For the sake of the honourable member for Windsor, I shall conclude by saying that I could not be more pleased that the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club has, through the good graces of the Minister, agreed to develop what is commonly known as the Deagon Racecourse as a top horse-training complex. Honourable members will appreciate that I have been pursuing this matter for a lengthy period. I sincerely believe that if that land at Deagon, which is presently used for training but is certainly not upgraded to the extent required for proper training, had been sold or disposed of by the BATC, it would have been a sad blow to racing in Queensland. That would not have been showing the sort of forethought that this industry needs.

We have a splendid opportunity to develop that area as a top-rating training complex. The land is there. I have been over this ground many times. It is about 100 acres in area. It is bigger than the BATC's Doomben complex. With the sort of foresight that I believe the people in control of the project have, and provided they are prepared to take the advice of others who have already carried out this sort of work in other States and countries, we could have a show-place.

That is very important not only to the racing industry but also to what members from time to time talk about—the tourist industry. If we want to project tourism into an area we must encourage people to go there. A show-place which would allow the viewing of horses in a proper area such as I envisage, would be conducive to tourism. It is the sort of thing that we need. I know that the Minister appreciates that, on a number of occasions, I have expounded the virtues of the Epsom training track. I have said also that Deagon would be a much better project than Epsom. Epsom certainly lacks a lot, and I will not go into that again.

I should like to quote from a booklet given to me by one of my constituents. It refers to a training complex in South Africa. Honourable members will appreciate the similarity between this story and what we are finding in the racing industry in the main cities of this State. It reads—

“For many years of Durban's racing history, trainers had stables on their own properties—on the ridge, near the racecourse or near the beach.

"Horses were trained on the beach or at the racecourse.

"At the time dirt roads made it easy for the animals to be walked between their stables and their training grounds.

"As Durban grew, however, these private stables were gradually squeezed out.

"In 1930, the Durban Turf Club bought 10 acres of land near the Stamford Hill railway station, an area which was convenient both to the beach and to the racecourse at Greyville. This was named, Newmarket. Initially a stabling block was built for 200 horses and their grooms. This grew until eventually it could stable more than 400 local and visiting horses during the winter racing season. Newmarket worked splendidly for many years but in time it became more and more hazardous to walk horses through the traffic to and from the beach and the racecourse.

"Not surprisingly, the City Council objected. Besides, the area of beach available for training and exercise was rapidly shrinking. Clearly Newmarket was no longer suitable and a permanent training centre would have to be found."

After a careful survey of sites, that occurred. If honourable members look at the booklet they will see photographs depicting an outstanding example of a training complex. If that was duplicated at Deagon, we would certainly have something to be proud of.

I must pass a few comments about Albion Park. I was interested to read an article by the turf writer, Jim Anderson, in which he said—

"Any doubts about Albion Park's future as a galloping venue have been dispelled—for the present anyway.

"This follows a dramatic 12.75 per cent increase in attendances at the Creek in the 1979-80 financial year.

"Surprising because, almost without exception, race clubs throughout the country are reporting smaller crowds."

Let me simply say to honourable members and those people who had any doubts about the Minister's will to proceed with his controversial actions at Albion Park that if they had recalled what he said during the debate on the Racing and Betting Bill in 1980 it would have been clear that when the Minister got his hands on the racing portfolio he would do certain things. He said—

"I hope that the time is not too far distant when the Albion Park Racecourse will be solely a trotting complex. There are great trotting complexes in other States of Australia. I think particularly of Moonee Valley and Harold Park. Brisbane certainly needs its own trotting track, and I believe it should be at Albion Park. The complex should be owned by the trotting club. I think that in the weeks and months ahead an endeavour will be made to see

whether it is possible to make this area available to the trotting industry so that it can provide a track of about 5½ furlongs. If that could be done, it would be the best track in Australia. I have had a good look at the track from all angles, and I would say that the sand track, which is nearly 6 furlongs in diameter, could be turned into the best trotting track in Australia. At present the trotters race clockwise. At all other tracks they race anti-clockwise. It would be possible for the trotters to race anti-clockwise at Albion Park. A good grandstand could be built. With a kick in the right direction, the trotting industry will go ahead in leaps and bounds."

If anybody had any doubts about what would occur when the Minister obtained the reins of racing in this State, that quotation would certainly dispel those doubts.

Let me conclude by saying to the Minister that only time will tell whether he has made the right decision in throwing galloping out of Albion Park and reserving it for the sole purpose of trotting.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police): Mr Speaker, I seek the indulgence of the House to make a statement concerning the Anzac Day section of the Bill that might, I believe, shorten proceedings and eliminate a lot of repetition.

(Leave granted.)

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police) (11.17 p.m.): Since the introduction of this Bill in this Chamber last Thursday, a serious and disturbing misunderstanding seems to have arisen in relation to amendments to the Anzac Day Act.

Press reports of last Friday suggested that the Government was legislating to allow race clubs to open their gates on Anzac Day at 11.30 a.m. and to conduct their first race at some time after 12 noon. This is completely contrary to the Government's proposal. Some honourable members have, unfortunately, chosen to use this Press report as the basis for their public comment on the Government's amendments.

Under the provisions of the present Anzac Day Act, a sporting or charitable club cannot open its gates before 1 p.m. or conduct an event before 1.30 p.m. on Anzac Day. The Racing and Betting Act 1980 provides that race clubs may open their gates at 12.30 p.m. and conduct their first race at any time after 1 p.m. The amendments proposed for the Anzac Day Act merely bring the provisions of that Act into line with those of the Racing and Betting Act 1980 as they relate to the time provisions for race meetings on Anzac Day.

The amendments which we are debating this evening enjoy the approval of two important bodies involved with the commemoration of Anzac Day, and I refer Mr Speaker, of course, to the Returned Services League and the Anzac Day Trust. I understand that the RSL issued a statement this afternoon denying that it had not been consulted by the Government in relation to the amendments.

In his statement, Mr Freeman said the RSL was completely satisfied that the Government was not acting in any way to impinge upon the sanctity of Anzac Day. He added that the Government had acted responsibly by allowing organisations such as the RSL and the Anzac Day Trust to examine and comment on the proposed amendments.

Mr Burns: Who said that?

Mr HINZE: The secretary, Mr Freeman.

I say that in order to try to eliminate the controversy that has developed, which is not of my making. I can say quite categorically that it is not the intention of the Government to upset the sanctity of Anzac Day in any way. The member for Sandgate suggested that the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations should be here. I have a letter from the Department of Labour Relations and a letter from the Department of Local Government. I will read them if honourable members desire me to do so. They cover the attitude of the Department of Labour Relations in this matter.

Mr Burns: Incorporate them in "Hansard."

Mr HINZE: All right, I table the letters and seek leave to have them incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letters—

March 2, 1981

Dear Sir,

I enclose a copy of a memorandum which has been prepared for the advice of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, the Honourable R. J. Hinze.

As you may be aware the Racing and Betting Act 1980, which is yet to be proclaimed, contains certain provisions which will require complementary amendments to be made to the Anzac Day Act 1921-1976. These amendments will be necessary mainly to protect the present level of income of the Anzac Day Trust Fund.

In formulating the recommendations contained in the memorandum officers of this Department and the Stamp Duties Office have attempted to remedy certain administrative problems and to generally place the interests of the Anzac Day Trust and of the racing industry in more realistic yet respectful perspective.

As it would be most advantageous to have any changes to the Anzac Day Act effective from the date of proclamation of the Racing and Betting Act, I am suggesting that you may see advantage in having these amendments incorporated in the same Bill as will contain amendments to the Racing and Betting Act. This Bill is presently being prepared and shall be introduced during the forthcoming Session of Parliament.

Officers of the Department are available at any time to consult with you or your officers upon any facets of the suggested changes. Perhaps, in view of the proposed legislative timetable, consultations should commence at the earliest possible opportunity.

I commend the suggested amendments to you.

Yours faithfully,

H. N. Jacobs

Director of Local Government

The Under Secretary,

Department of Labour Relations,
BRISBANE.

12 March 1981

Mr. H. N. Jacobs,

Director of Local Government,

Department of Labour Relations,

BRISBANE.

4000

Dear Mr. Jacobs,

I refer again to your letter of 2 March 1981 with respect to proposed amendments to the Racing and Betting Act 1980 and suggested amendments to the Anzac Day Act 1921-1976.

As indicated in my letter of 3 March this matter was referred to the Anzac Day Trust which met on 10 March to consider the suggested amendments to the Anzac Day Act and make recommendations thereon to the Honourable the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations.

The following summarises the agreements reached by the Trust with regard to the question of the proposed exemption of racing venues and offices and agencies of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland from the provisions of Section 4 of the Anzac Day Act.

(a) The Trust raises no objection to amendment of the Anzac Day Act in accordance with the times provided in Section 128 of the Racing and Betting Act 1980, namely, 12.30 p.m. However, the Trust is of the opinion that these times should apply to all activities covered by Section 4 of the Anzac Day Act 1921-1976.

(b) In the circumstances the Trust considers there is no justification for the exclusion of the Racing Industry and the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland from the provisions of Section 4 of the Anzac Day Act.

(c) Having regard to the history of the observance of Anzac Day in this State, the Trust considers that the discretionary powers of the Honourable the Minister under Section 4(2) of the Anzac Day Act should not be exercised to apply before the hour of 12 midday.

(d) The Trust realizes that consequential amendments will be required to other Sections of the Anzac Day Act e.g. Section 3(4)(c) and (d).

Accordingly, in essence, the Trust has recommended that Section 4 of the Anzac Day Act be amended to permit places of public amusement to open on Anzac Day at 12.30 p.m. instead of 1.30 p.m. as at present. In addition the Trust is opposed to the specific exemption of any place of public amusement from the provisions of Section 4.

On the question of the proposed alterations to the formula for calculating the revenue payable to the Trust from racing activities on Anzac Day, the Trustees indicated that on this particular issue they are sympathetic with any attempt to simplify the procedure for determining the amount to be received by the Trust. It was agreed that provided the income to the Trust is not reduced from that derived under the existing formula, then there would be no objection to the introduction of a formula similar to that submitted in Annexure 1 to the memorandum of the Senior Administration Officer (Racing) attached to your correspondence of 2 March. The percentages proposed by the Trust are as follows—

5% of the Total On-Course and T.A.B. Totalisator Turnover on Anzac Day (Government contribution)

1.3% of the Total Bookmakers' Betting Turnover on Anzac Day (Government contribution)

.7% of the Total Bookmakers' Turnover on Anzac Day (Racing Industry contribution)

The Trust considered that such a formula would simplify the calculations and round off the percentages in comparison to those proposed by the Senior Administration Officer (Racing) while at the same time returning approximately the same income to the Trust.

Under the circumstances I would be grateful to receive your comments on the recommendations of the Trust. In addition may I suggest that should officers of your Department wish to further discuss this overall matter they liaise with Mr. I. A. Staib, Executive Officer of my Department, Telephone 224 8197.

Yours sincerely,
J. E. McDonnell
Under Secretary.

Mr AKERS (Pine Rivers) (11.21 p.m.): I support the Bill generally. I express my concern even at the thought of minimum penalties being included in any legislation that is approved by this House. The provision in the legislation allows a judge to impose a lesser penalty under certain circumstances, and I believe that this is a sufficient compromise to allow the Bill to pass.

One matter under the Minister's jurisdiction that I would call on him to finalise as soon as possible is the problem confronting Mrs Margaret Quarrell and the trouble she is having with the stewards of the Greyhound Racing Control Board. I indicated in this place some time ago the very bad deal that Mrs Quarrell has had in her dealings with the—

Mr Davis: This is old hat; you have been through it.

Mr AKERS: It is old hat, and that is the point; it is still going on. I do not want to spend much time on it now, but I wish to raise it and ask the Minister to note it. I have shown in this place the unsuitability of the analyst the board is using to handle the matters that come before it, and also the unsuitability of the wording of the rules of racing. They do not clearly define what a drug is, and they create tremendous problems when someone like Mr Brittain wants to abuse them. The analyst and Mr Brittain have been shown by experts in court to be incompetent to handle this case. I ask the Minister to note Mrs Quarrell's case and take some positive action, even if it means for once bypassing the actions of the stewards' inquiry. I think that the matter is of sufficient importance for the Minister to take a personal look at it and take some positive action to overcome this continuing problem that Mrs Quarrell faces.

The honourable member for Sandgate mentioned the closure of TAB agencies, and I wish to comment briefly on that matter. I have learnt, with a bit of sadness recently, that the TAB is considering closing the Albany Creek agency. The Minister answered a question of mine on this matter this morning. He said that the turnover of the office is currently \$5,400 per week and that on this turnover it is not viable for automation. Later on he said that on current levels the office is hardly viable even as a manual operation. I assume from that answer that the advice to him was that the agency is at least holding its own at present; it is not losing money. I have had offers from the owner of the shopping centre to extend the rent-free lease of the shop that is being used by the agency at Albany Creek for another year to encourage the TAB to remain there. I support the comments made by the member for Sandgate on the effect that a TAB agency can have on the whole business community. Albany Creek is a considerable distance from all the surrounding shopping

centres. People who want to have a bet—and I have made only about three bets with the TAB in my life—

Mr Davis: How did you go?

Mr AKERS: Not very well. Many people want to bet on the TAB. If we want to make the TAB available everywhere in Queensland, we have to make it available at places like Albany Creek. I urge the Minister to reconsider the matter and consider the offer that has been made by the owner of the shopping centre to see whether there is some way that that agency can remain at least for another trial period.

Mr Hinze interjected

Mr AKERS: I thank the Minister for saying, "That's OK." That will make a tremendous difference to Albany Creek.

This morning in answer to a question from me about St Patrick's College in Shorncliffe, in the Sandgate electorate, the Minister said that he will look after the interests of the college and allow it to continue to use the football ovals inside the Deagon racecourse. Young people from all over north Brisbane attend that college, and I am very pleased to have that reply from the Minister. Over the years the college has spent a very large amount of money on the football ovals there, and has not the money to build new ovals elsewhere.

One of the chief purposes of this Bill is to increase the penalties for illegal or SP bookmaking. Speeches and discussion on the Bill have made much of that aspect. I wish to support the elimination of SP bookmaking in Queensland entirely.

Mr Davis: Why?

Mr AKERS: Because the criminals involved with SP bookmaking with their associated prostitution and illegal drug activities are a real scar on Queensland society.

I am speaking of big bookmakers, the ones who are the big problem in Queensland. They should be entirely removed from the community. Let there be no mistake that certain big SP bookmakers are involved in big crime with all of its attendant standover tactics extending, I believe, to torture and even murder. Heavy fines are useless unless there is a real attempt to catch and prosecute illegal bookmakers and those involved in other forms of big crime in Queensland. I believe there is no real attempt being made to catch the big fish in Queensland. They live in their very well-guarded houses and run their SP bookmaking operations, drug distributions and brothels with complete immunity. They are able to torture and even murder with complete immunity.

How else can the case of Mr Francis Percival O'Neill be explained. Mr O'Neill operated a small shop in Brisbane but he bet and lost heavily with SP bookmakers. He was a loner in Queensland, although he had relatives in New South Wales. He

was found shot dead after a rifle had discharged in his mouth and blown his head off. After his death it was found that he had left a note stating he was heavily in debt to SP bookmakers and that he had been threatened that he must pay up by 5 p.m. on 16 September last year or else. It is on record that O'Neill made a telephone call to the Woolloongabba Police Station at 1 a.m. on 17 September, a few hours after his deadline—and that is a very good word for it. At that time he told police that he was going to commit suicide. In the background a voice said, "Take your time. Take your time." It is known that on the afternoon and night of 16 September he had been drinking with a crony, and it is also known that in the week prior to his reported suicide he had withdrawn two cheques to the value of \$5,000.

With all of that, the CIB report, I understand, said that there were no suspicious circumstances. I ask: How could anyone say, with those surrounding facts, that there were no suspicious circumstances? If I were investigating, I would have asked whose was the voice in the background. Who was it who pulled the trigger leading to the demise of poor Mr O'Neill? Why did the matter go to the Justice Department before that verdict "no suspicious circumstances" was given?

I believe that this is an example of what is happening in Queensland. The only reason I bring that forward and mention his name is that the poor unfortunate is dead and no further attempts can be made to make his life a misery. He has no relatives close to here for the standover men and heavies to harass.

We will not get anywhere in cleaning up this sort of crime in Queensland with our present half-hearted attempts at enforcement. I am not saying that the penalties are not severe enough. I am not saying that the courts are not severe enough. I am saying that the attempts to catch the big criminals—not their runners—are insufficient. Those attempts at enforcement are so weak that I suspect there must be some good reason for it. Surely the case of O'Neill would signify some sort of cover-up somewhere in the system. I suspect that people in fairly high places are protecting these vicious criminals in Queensland.

I urge the Minister to use the other arm of his portfolio to make sure that enforcement is carried out in Queensland. I urge him to adopt suggestions that have been made to establish a special police squad. If this Parliament believes that the penalties should be increased as proposed and has taken the real step of imposing a minimum penalty—even with its modification, the idea of a minimum penalty means that this Parliament believes that it is important—the Minister should appoint a special squad that is answerable to Cabinet only and which would really take some positive action to eliminate these big criminals in Queensland.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (11.32 p.m.): This Bill reminds me of the story of a chap who visited a big racecourse in the United States. He said that it was absolutely amazing that this beautiful track, with grandstands 10 storeys high and immaculate appointments, with 850 windows to sell tote tickets—it was luxury personified—was provided just for him to lose his rent.

Over a number of years I have kept many newspaper files on important facets of this State's activities. The file I have on racing and the TAB would take up just about a whole filing cabinet.

Mr Powell: Could we have it taken as read?

Mr DAVIS: We do not have to worry about it being taken as read, because we are talking about something that does not include the boy scouts. It might be a bit big for you, son. You had better get outside the Chamber.

The people involved in this industry must have been saying to themselves—

Mr Scassola: Are they still refusing you admission to the QTC?

Mr DAVIS: I have a black ban on the member for Mount Gravatt, because he won't take interjections.

Over the years we have listened to various Ministers in charge of racing. I can recall Minister after Minister in charge of the racing portfolio telling us what they were going to do about racing.

Mr Wharton: They were all winners.

Mr DAVIS: It was only in the last 12 months that the Treasurer, now deposed as the Minister in charge of racing, gave us a highly publicised account in this Chamber of what was going to be done for racing in this State. That was after two years of procrastination, white papers, yellow papers and all the proposals that would cure the ills of racing.

An Opposition Member: A red paper?

Mr DAVIS: We have not had a red paper. We have had a white paper and a yellow paper.

Let me review some of the promises that were supposed to be implemented last year. Time and time again we have been told what a curse SP betting is. The Minister in charge of racing has said that it is a \$200m industry, and that fines would be raised to \$10,000 for the first offence and would range up to \$50,000 or three years imprisonment or both. He said—

"The Government intends to take a firm stand on the issue of unlawful betting and deal severely with persons found to be engaged in illegal betting activities."

They were pious words. They were good for headlines, but nothing came of them.

The new Minister in charge of racing has decided to increase fines to between \$15,000 and \$20,000 for a first offence, \$20,000 to \$30,000 for a second offence, and up to \$50,000 for a third or subsequent offence. In June 1980, the report of the Queensland Police Department showed that 51 book-makers had been fined when prosecuted by the police for illegal betting.

Mr Frawley: Call it off; it doesn't matter.

Mr DAVIS: I have not even started.

Mr Moore: We can't hear you.

Mr DAVIS: The honourable member is supposed to be the union representative on the job. Get the microphones fixed if you cannot hear me.

Mr Moore: Point taken!

Mr DAVIS: We constantly go through the whole system and ask, "What is wrong with Queensland racing?" We see headlines reading "Queensland racing at the crossroads." What can be done to improve racing in this State? As a person who goes to the races quite often, I can tell racing administrators of one of the biggest problems that the TAB faces. I suggest that a person would have to be half insane to bet on a race when he cannot hear it broadcast. What is the reason for that? Radio station 4BC says that it gives a wonderful broadcasting service, and it broadcasts races on Wednesdays and Saturdays. What about the other days? What about Tuesdays and Fridays? There are race meetings today on the main tracks in Sydney and Melbourne, but there is no radio broadcast of races on Tuesdays.

Mr Austin: What about 4KQ?

Mr DAVIS: I am glad that "Ralph Nader" has asked me about 4KQ.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Powell): Order!

Mr DAVIS: The Minister for Health.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr DAVIS: Two years ago, 4KQ came into race broadcasting. It broadcast every race meeting covered by the TAB.

Mr Austin: It did not broadcast throughout the State.

Mr DAVIS: It broadcast through the main areas around Brisbane. Because it saw competition, 4BC immediately came in. That was after it said it could not afford to broadcast on Tuesdays because of the cost of land lines. As soon as 4KQ left the field, 4BC immediately dropped the other broadcasts.

The Minister for racing said that, if need be, he will improve broadcasting of races. In fact, he gave the impression that he

would virtually have his own radio station broadcasting them. That certainly is one of the improvements that is needed. If the commercial broadcasting stations will not broadcast races, I think that 4QG should broadcast them. All it does is play a couple of classical records and provide a few farming reports. Radio broadcasts would be one means of improving the revenue of the TAB.

In my opinion, some punters are sick and tired of the lousy dividends paid by the TAB. The TAB emphasises the difference between the dividends it pays and those paid by SP bookmakers. But has anybody had a look at the lousy place pool that the TAB has? It would be one of the most pathetic returns from any TAB throughout Australia. One of the reasons for that is the big take taken out of each of the pools.

On numerous occasions I have said that big spending should be allowed on any track. If someone went to the Lawnton greyhound meeting today and wanted to place a bet on an event at Harold Park today, he should have been able to do so. A licensed bookmaker on any registered track should be able to take bets for any race-meeting, greyhound-meeting or trotting-meeting that that bookmaker wants to be associated with, as long as there is an agreement between him and the appropriate club. In New South Wales a bookmaker can mix his betting as much as he likes. If somebody is attending a race-meeting in Brisbane and wants to place a bet on a Toowoomba event, he should be able to do so. The better the service provided by the bookmakers, the greater the number of people at the track.

As I have said on numerous occasions, I hope that the Minister will improve the amenities provided at Brisbane race-tracks. For years members of the Opposition have referred to the poor amenities that are available. Albion Park, for example, has shocking amenities, as does Doomben. No amenities are provided for wet-weather betting; punters get soaked when it is raining. Even the facilities for the provision of food at Doomben are pathetic.

Reference has been made to Albion Park. I am not against the closure of Albion Park, but obviously the Minister has taken over the role played by the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club and has decided that Albion Park will close. It has been claimed that Albion Park is a battlers' track; that it should be retained as a track for night racing and so forth. However, any sporting arena should be capable of being used by at least a couple of sports. I do not see any merit in retaining a track for the use of only one sport that is conducted only one night a week. Surely Albion Park could be used more than that.

Mr Hinze: Wednesday night?

Mr DAVIS: I do not think sufficient people are involved in trotting. The Minister has mentioned Mooney Valley. It has a racing circuit as well as a trotting circuit. Perhaps the Minister has a certain dislike for Albion Park's trotting track. Perhaps he does not like the way in which the trotters run clockwise. I do not think he has ever forgotten the way in which "Rector" ran the first race at Albion Park. It ran off at every turn. So perhaps the Minister has a personal dislike for that track.

Albion Park should be used for racing other than trotting. It is not worth spending a lot of money on the track just for trotting.

The Bill deals with drugs. Obviously the Government is going to come down heavily on anyone who uses drugs or jiggers. The Bill provides for a penalty of \$20,000 to be imposed on anyone who uses drugs. At the Committee stage I might ask the Minister what happens to a person who is caught using a jigger. Will he be suspended and then have to pay the fine of \$20,000?

Surely we are getting our priorities slightly wrong when every emphasis is being placed on the administration of drugs to animals and law enforcement officers will be put on red alert to grab these wrong-doers while we treat dope pedlars who sell drugs to humans rather lightly in comparison. If I have a punt and the horse I have backed is beaten while running on its merits and I hear that a jigger has been used on the winner, I naturally expect heavy fines to be imposed.

A matter that was mentioned last year when the paper was introduced by Dr Edwards, and which seems to be quiet at present, was the all-tote system throughout Queensland. An all-tote system and having one common pool throughout Queensland is a splendid idea. Toowoomba, which is a reasonably sized provincial centre, has a tote. I was there about 18 months ago. I took \$10 worth of quinella tickets. The girl behind the counter had to use one of the old trammie's clippers, and by the time she finished clicking all of the tickets there was a queue of about 15 people behind me. They missed the race and gave me a blast. It is a good idea to have all tote and a common pool. Not many political parties or politicians would advocate it because we have been reared under the bookie and tote system. But one day we will be all tote in Australia whether we like it or not because that is where the big money is.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It will be the end of the bookmaker.

Mr DAVIS: That will happen in years to come. Many overseas countries are all tote. In France the Prix De Le Arc De Triomphe has prize-money equivalent to \$500,000. The United States has big prize-money. This has happened because of the all-tote system. That system would cut out a lot of the corruption because if the prize-money is big there is no crookedness in the racing game. I am

not advocating an all-tote system because I like to have a bet with the bookies, particularly as I can bet each way.

I make those few points because they are relevant to the Bill. The mechanical all-tote system and one purse system would be of great benefit to racing in this State.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (11.49 p.m.): Let me say at the outset that I do not know a lot about the racing industry. In so far as the racing industry pure and simple is concerned I defer to the Minister and his advisers as having clearly superior knowledge and expertise. I know a little about some of the legal principles involved and it is on them that I should like to comment shortly.

I preface my remarks, which will be addressed to section 218 as modified, by saying that I had occasion to go through aspects of the Bill with the Minister, who has been most co-operative and understanding, about several matters of concern. I have had a great deal of satisfaction in dealing with the Minister concerning certain aspects of the Bill.

The only matter that we did not talk about at our leisure is the one that I shall speak about tonight. It is probably appropriate in racing and betting legislation that a new creature has been launched upon the law of this State. It is something that might be described as an indicative sentence. I cannot recall any other Act which has such provisions relating to the imposition of fines as provided for by the new section 218. The new section 218 is essentially prescribing penalties for revenue protection. It is not about matters of great moral significance; it is about something which the Minister would say, and say forcefully, is depriving the State of the revenue on some \$200m worth of betting activity.

I might keep my remarks to an expression of reservation, but I think something should be said when something new is being proposed. If this were the Income Tax Assessment Act and we were dealing with, say, slight understatements of income or overstatements of overheads, one can imagine the hue and cry if the imposition of penalties involving many thousands of dollars was suggested. Any such proposal would be laughed out of this place, which has a well-known attitude towards matters of taxation.

Dr Lockwood: There are pretty big penalties under the Tax Act.

Mr INNES: They can be big penalties.

Dr Lockwood interjected.

Mr INNES: They can be punitive taxes in the sense of double taxation, and that is fair enough. But the tax involved might be only \$10, and the penalty even with

penalty tax would be \$20, and perhaps a \$50 or \$100 fine, but here we are going straight into a situation where the standard penalty for a first offence is proposed to be at least \$15,000.

Let us briefly turn to what offences can be embraced by those penalties. They are the offences disclosed by sections 214, 215 and 217. Section 214 deals with unlawful bookmaking. Frankly, it does not offend me that one looks to a significant penalty for a person who is in the business of making money out of unlawful activities, and a penalty of many thousands of dollars would obviously be very appropriate for any standard SP case where one is dealing with the unlawful bookmaker. Might I just point out that under the definition of "unlawful bookmaking", it would also be unlawful for a licensed bookmaker to accept any bet on the telephone. Any bet on the nod or credit bet would fall foul of section 214, because that is limited to licensed bookmakers acting at a racing venue when a meeting is being lawfully held, or at an athletic ground where he is permitted to bet. So would telephone transactions of a type which is well known. After establishing some credit with a licensed bookmaker most punters would fall foul of the Act by making telephone transactions, and if a transaction of that nature was in question a person would find himself facing a minimum fine of \$15,000.

The next provision is the keeping of a common betting house, and again it does not particularly offend me that a person who is keeping a common betting house, and making money out of ignoring the law, falls foul of heavy penalties.

But perhaps the section that shows why indicative or mandatory sentences, if one uses a slightly more extreme example, are generally undesirable, is section 217, because it makes it an offence for a person to have in his possession an instrument of betting not authorised by the Act in respect of any horse race, trotting race or greyhound race. What is an instrument of betting? An instrument of betting includes any book, card, coin, document, list, money, paper, record, sheet, table, ticket or other writing which is used, apparently used, or capable of being used in carrying on or in connection with betting.

The definition also includes much more sophisticated equipment, such as microfilms, telephone gadgetry, etc.; equipment of the type that one would normally find only in the operating situation of an SP bookmaker. But the definition is wide enough, and it is probably the appropriate offence, for the punter as well as for the SP bookmaker. If a punter is found with his marked newspaper or his ticket, which is a receipt for an SP operation, he could be charged, and probably appropriately should be charged, under that section with having in his possession an instrument of gaming. Whilst, as I say, I do not cavil at heavy fines for

the man in the business of SP bookmaking, the imposition on the punter, in this case clearly a mug punter who might well be one of those persons, as the member for Flinders has on occasions pointed out—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Why is he a mug punter?

Mr INNES: He is a mug if he runs the risk of this legislation. As the member for Flinders has pointed out, there are places under-provided with facilities in this State. There are the mining towns and the small country towns where it is not unusual for some people to attempt to place a bet or get their money on a race somehow, and it would be unrealistic if we did not believe it. This same provision, which applies to the commercial operator who is making a lot of money out of the operation, can catch the mug punter with his ticket in such a situation.

If he is convicted of a first offence, the consequences are that the penalty shall be not less than \$15,000 and not more than \$20,000. There is a let-out of a sort. The Bill provides—

“Where a Judge constituting a District Court is satisfied in a particular case that there are special circumstances which he considers make it just for him so to do, he may impose a less penalty than that prescribed . . .”

I cannot predict precisely how the first judge who has to interpret that phrase “special circumstances” will act, or how different judges will act, but the word “special” would indicate that the circumstances have to be out of the ordinary. If, for instance, the person involved is a farmer or a truck driver in a remote country town on an average sort of a wage, who has lodged his bet and has a ticket in his possession, there is nothing that would justify his case being termed “special”. It would be a straightforward, routine type of charge in a routine type of situation. The risk there is that he is saddled with a fine of \$15,000.

I do not like mandatory penalties, and I am not suggesting that this part of the Bill imposes such penalties. But it is a new sort of a creature in our legislation. It is trying to get at a mandatory penalty situation with a sort of a cop-out, but we do not know precisely how the cop-out will be interpreted, or under what circumstances. I can see every reason why that situation in the amended section 217 might fall foul of the Act. In the same way that certain alterations to the Traffic Act have led to this Parliament's back-tracking on legislation, I would predict that the first time a person in that situation is prosecuted, convicted and fined \$15,000 and cannot pay it and has his truck or house sold, somebody will come back to this Legislature and say, “This is terribly unfair. We'd better change it and let out the person in that predicament.”

I do not like mandatory sentences. I am not quite as disturbed by this amendment. This is a compromise, but I do not particularly like it, either. I have certainly never indicated that I approve that sort of a compromise. I also have reservations about the District Court's being used as, in effect, a super Magistrates Court. Proceedings for criminal charges in the District Court are invariably before a jury.

[*Wednesday, 1 April 1981*]

This Bill contains severe penalties of up to \$50,000, which is a far greater fine than can be imposed for most criminal charges, and which will not be imposed as a result of the type of procedure that over the centuries we have set up as consistent with guarding the liberty of the subject against savage or severe fines. I do not like it. I have reservations about it, but I do not propose to take the ultimate objection. The Minister has been more than reasonable about many aspects of this Bill. There is no provision for mandatory sentences. I will be interested to see the provisions of the Bill in action, but somebody should make these comments because it is a style of approach that I believe should not be emulated with any frequency at all and one which must be very carefully watched in action. I do not think that the Minister has necessarily avoided all the injustices which it could perpetrate.

I do not want my remarks to be construed as indicating any support for SP operators, but it goes wider than that—the net can catch the little man, the punter who uses SP facilities. In so far as it does that, I think we have to look at this legislation very carefully and rectify any wrongs that we see starting to develop.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (12.1 a.m.): I say at the outset how very disappointed I am at the speech just made by the honourable member for Sherwood. He obviously attempted to have a 50 cent each-way bet and it is not appropriate that he should do so with this Bill. He has outlined, I believe, grievances or worries that he has in relation to what I believe could be termed an attack upon the civil liberties of people by provisions of this Bill. But, regrettably, he has failed to stand up as one of the young bloods of the Liberal Party to be counted on this issue.

At a later stage I will expand upon the allegations that he has made. However, in the early stages of my speech I propose to refer to the conduct of certain police in a recent fiasco—I describe it as that—which has taken place at Mt Isa over the last couple of months. On 17 March 1981 I asked the Minister a number of questions in relation to a recent police raid that took place at the Mt Isa racecourse in which police took swabs or blood samples from racehorses prior to the running of a race.

That, of course, is not the normal procedure for taking swabs; they are normally taken at the completion of a race.

I know that the Minister has a report in his possession; I hope it is the police report submitted by the investigatory team that was sent to Mt Isa to look into this issue. However, I want to cite to honourable members certain incidents that took place at the Mt Isa racecourse on the date in question. I wish to read a statutory declaration by Frederick James Maguire, the trainer of a number of horses that were swabbed—I claim illegally—at the Mt Isa racecourse prior to the running of an event there. I read this so it will be recorded in “Hansard”.

Mr Bertoni: Do you believe Mr Maguire?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I totally believe Mr Maguire. I notice the honourable member who is interjecting is the member for Mt Isa. He knows full well that the people of Mt Isa totally support Mr Maguire. They consider the honourable member has failed to stand up and be counted on this issue. He sold Mr Maguire out.

I spent two days in Mt Isa investigating this matter. The morning I arrived in Mt Isa the police who were appointed by the Commissioner of Police to conduct the investigation arrived on the same plane. They left two days later on the same flight on which I left.

When I asked a question in this Parliament on 17 March 1981 the Minister replied that the matter was still under investigation. The member for Mt Isa is considered to be a laughing-stock in Mt Isa. They believe that he collaborated with the police and was part of the shonky deal that took place at the Mt Isa racecourse.

I will now read to the House so that it can be incorporated in “Hansard” the statement by Frederick James Maguire, the trainer who was particularly affected at that time—

“I, Frederick James Maguire of 127 Simpson Street, Mount Isa in the State of Queensland, Horse Trainer, do solemnly and sincerely declare that I am the trainer of the stallion known as Beau Jo Chaudiere which is jointly owned by Mr. B. J. and Mrs. M. J. Burns. On Saturday, 31 January 1981, the said stallion was intended to be raced in the second race of the day which was due to commence at 2.25 p.m. Prior to the second race at approximately 1.55 p.m. to 2.00 p.m. I was approached by two Police Officers and a Veterinary Surgeon, the latter whom I believe to be employed by the Department of Primary Industries. These three people were accompanied by a steward from the Mount Isa Race Club and the Veterinary Surgeon proceeded to take a blood sample from the neck of the said stallion.”

I point out for the information of the Minister, who is obviously building up very good blood stock on his own property, that the stallion referred to was by the stallion Grand Chaudiere, which we all know is at present throwing excellent progeny all over Australia. I believe that that is a very important and pertinent point to be remembered. The statutory declaration continues—

“I believe that on the day in question the three parties involved approached the Chief Steward, Mr. J. Nugent, with a letter of authority which enabled them to be allowed to take blood samples from the horses running in the first and second races. I believe that the Chief Steward, Mr. J. Nugent, did not request the presence of these three gentlemen at the race track and in fact had to be shown the letter of authority before he would grant them permission to conduct their examination of the various horses in the first and second races during which they would take blood samples.

“The area where the swabbing took place was not in the swabbing room—”

an important point—

“which is the most hygienic area on the race track but in the stalls where the horses are prepared prior to the race. This particular area is less than hygienic with both dust and dirt flying around and the area itself is in no way sterile.

“The Veterinary Surgeon in question did not take the blood sample from the said stallion in as efficient a manner as possible. In fact, the taking of the blood sample took place over a period of twelve to fifteen minutes—”

He was supposedly a qualified veterinary surgeon from the Department of Primary Industries who came on to the racecourse to take a blood sample from a suspect racehorse. It took him 12 to 15 minutes to take that sample.

Mr Bertoni: Are you criticising the veterinary surgeon?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Of course I am criticising him. He was obviously a person who was not efficient in the job he was doing. The declaration continues—

“during which time a needle was inserted in the horse’s neck in an attempt to extract the blood. Towards the end of this time period the said stallion was becoming rather agitated and distressed at having the needle inserted in its neck and as well as this the bell which notifies trainers that all horses are to go to the parade paddock prior to the race had rung. The examination by the said Veterinary Surgeon took such a long time that towards the end of the examination, but during the progress of it, the horse was being saddled in preparation for the race.”

For the benefit of the very unintelligent member for Mt Isa, I point out that during the taking of the blood sample, the horse, which was supposed to participate in the race, was actually being saddled for the race. That was done whilst this supposed expert from the Department of Primary Industries—this veterinary surgeon—was trying to extract blood from its neck by plunging the needle into the horse's neck on at least 12 different occasions to try to find the vein to extract the blood from.

The declaration continues—

“As a result of the treatment which the said stallion was being given by the said Veterinary Surgeon I did in fact voice disapproval of the manner in which the examination was being conducted together with the time when the examination was being conducted. As a result of voicing such disapproval I was in fact given a reprimand by one of the Police Officers in question for non-co-operation. However, I would stress that this was not an incident of non-co-operation with the Police in the exercise of their purported duty but was merely concern which I was showing regarding a horse for which I was responsible.

“I then after the examination had been completed proceeded with the said stallion to the parade area prior to the race. It was in fact here where I discovered a sizeable lump on the neck of the said stallion in the area where the said Veterinary Surgeon had inserted his needle. As a result of locating this lump I drew it to the attention of the Chief Steward and once again I was rather distressed and in fact my manner was once again reprimanded, this time by the Chief Steward. The Chief Steward looked at the lump in question and called over the Veterinary Surgeon in question and asked him whether he would be responsible for the horse being raced to which the said Veterinary Surgeon answered that he would not be. As a result, the Chief Steward informed the brother/brother-in-law of the joint owners of the said horse as well as myself that if we raced the said stallion we would be doing so at our own risk. I therefore decided that the said stallion would not be raced in the second race on the thirty-first day of January, 1981, at the Mount Isa Race Club with the result that the said stallion was scratched.

“The said stallion was the 4-1 odds on favourite. The manner in which the blood sample was taken by the said Veterinary Surgeon was also less than hygienic. The said Veterinary Surgeon at no time washed his hands, however, but merely doused them with metholated spirits.

“At the time when the Veterinary Surgeon was called by the Chief Steward to look at the lump on the neck of the said stallion, the two Police Officers were alone with the particular blood samples which they had taken previously.”

That is another important point. The two police officers were alone with the blood samples that they took. One could say that accusations could be made against the police, and one wonders why the raid took place.

Mr Bertoni: Are you making accusations?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will come to that in a moment. It is significant that after samples were taken and brought to Brisbane, I believe under guard, it was found that they did not give a positive reaction. It is important to keep that in mind because of points that I shall make later.

The declaration continues—

“At no stage during the course of the afternoon was I asked to sign a form attesting to the correctness of the procedure which had been adopted and verifying that the security regarding the particular blood samples was adequate. This particular procedure is usually adopted when a swab is taken off a winning horse after a race.

“I was also the trainer of a horse by the name of Rego Breeze. This particular horse was to be raced in the first race and in fact did start. A blood sample was also extracted from the neck of this horse, however, this particular blood sample was extracted over a period of ten to twelve minutes commencing 1.20 p.m. to 1.25 p.m. Once again, the bell calling the trainers to the parade yard rang during the examination and the horse in question had to be saddled during the examination.”

Mr Kruger: Is that the second horse?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That is correct; the second horse. The declaration continues—

“The said Veterinary Surgeon once again did not conduct himself in as an efficient manner as I would expect a Veterinary Surgeon to do. By this I mean that the time period was far too long than was necessary in the circumstances.

“As a result of my behaviour during the taking of blood samples by the said Veterinary Surgeon, I was fined \$200 by the stewards of the Mount Isa Race Club. I believe that the situation in which I was placed regarding the welfare of my horses which I was very worried about clearly presents extenuating circumstances and therefore I have lodged an Appeal with the North Queensland Racing Association on Tuesday, the 3rd February, 1981, in order to appeal against the said fine and its severity”.

Of course, it is now history that that was completely overridden and the appeal was not upheld. The trainer was found guilty and he was fined \$200.

The declaration continues—

“I was present during the full time period in which the blood samples were

taken from the said horses. I have been informed and I believe that the said Chief Steward did not know nor did request the presence of the Police Officers and the Veterinary Surgeon. As a result of the said stallion Beau Jo Chaudiere being scratched, the owners lost a considerable sum of money due to the training costs which had been incurred in preparation of the said stallion for the second race on the 31st day of January, 1981. I believe that the said stallion would have won the said race due to the form which it had previously exhibited at previous race meetings. On the previous six or seven races which the said stallion was raced in, it won each of its races.

"I would not have opposed and in fact did comment to the Chief Steward and the Police Officers in question that the extraction of a blood sample from the neck of the said stallion after the race would have been more appropriate and in fact I would have had no hesitation in co-operating in those circumstances.

"During the entire incident the horse's welfare was my utmost consideration, due to the fact that it had been prepared for this particular race specifically and because of the value of the said stallion."

That is merely one statutory declaration and it is from the trainer concerned. I also have one from a person named Andreas Smith, who was a stable-hand employed by Mr Maguire, the trainer of this particular horse. As well I have a photocopy of a statutory declaration from a Mr Wayne Stubbings of the Mt Isa race club. He is a horse trainer in the Mt Isa area and has no relationship whatever with the trainer in question. He is a person concerned about what has taken place at Mt Isa in the past.

On 17 March this year I asked the Minister whether he was aware that blood samples had been taken before the races and not after as is the customary practice. In the Minister's answer he gave no indication of why that course was followed on that particular occasion. However, more importantly, other questions that I directed to the Minister on that occasion were not covered in his answer to me.

I asked the Minister—

"Is he aware that neither the North Queensland Racing Association nor the Mt Isa race club asked for police assistance?"

They have never asked for police assistance. I also asked the Minister—

"What has been the outcome of police investigations into illegal interference by Detective Ken Morris?"

The Minister's answer was to the effect that police investigations were still going on. As I said earlier, tonight he waved a sheaf of papers, which might indicate that at long last he has an answer to my questions.

Tonight I want to make it very clear that under the Racing and Betting Act police do not have the right to go onto a racecourse anywhere in Queensland and conduct the illegal activities that were carried out at Mt Isa. Police have no right to take blood samples, swabs or anything else from a racehorse. That was done in Mt Isa. Why was it done? Why did Detective Ken Morris decide to lead this illegal raid on the Mt Isa race club? The obvious conclusion that one must come to is that Detective Ken Morris is an owner of a racehorse in Mt Isa. It is completely illegal for a police officer to own a racehorse. The Police Act makes that illegal. It has been claimed that he does not own a racehorse.

Mr Hinze: Do you think police should be allowed to own them?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Police should not be allowed to own racehorses.

Mr Moore: They should be.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: They should not be. They are likely to be involved in the investigation of incidents occurring in the racing industry, and they should not be allowed to have a self-interest in that industry.

Detective Morris claimed that he did not have any self-interest in the horse. I do not like to refer to someone's personal life, but tonight I have no option. I have a photograph taken of Detective Ken Morris in the winners' circle at the Mt Isa race club. He is shown holding on to the bridle of the winning horse. Beneath the photo appears the name of the lady shown in the photograph. She is said to be Mrs Morris, his wife. The sad fact is that this is the third lady that Detective Ken Morris has been involved with over a number of years. He is not married to the woman shown in the photograph. She is a lady of good repute and I wish them well in the future. However, they are not married. She was registered as the owner of the horse in Detective Morris's name.

I suggest that the proceedings at the Mt Isa race club on that particular day were completely illegal. I expect, and the Parliament and the racing industry in Queensland are entitled to, answers from the Minister as to why Detective Ken Morris led that illegal raid at the Mt Isa race club and why the blood samples were taken from those two horses prior to their starting in races when the normal procedure, if a horse is to be swabbed, is for the samples to be taken after the race has been run.

Rumours have been rife in Mt Isa for quite some time that Detective Morris was extremely disturbed that his horse was unable to win races in Mt Isa. Mr Maguire and the young jockey who took up an apprenticeship in his stable formed a very competent team, and they were winning races every week-end with a number of different mounts

while the horses and the stable with which Detective Morris was associated were unable to come within cooey of them in winning races. It is a well-known fact round Mt Isa that Detective Morris and his stable were losing a hefty amount of money in betting.

In his speech, the Minister said—

“It is sobering to reflect on the range of projects and services which could be financed with an additional \$10m each year. Hospitals, schools, welfare services, road-works and the Police Force are some areas which could be improved for the benefit of all Queenslanders if this additional revenue was available to the Government.”

I have looked carefully through the Bill and the Minister's speech and I am damned if I can find a reference in any detail to revenue from the racing industry going to those projects. I lack facilities in my electorate and other honourable members lack facilities in their electorates. Nowhere in the Bill or in the Minister's speech is it indicated that those benefits will be forthcoming; nor has it been clearly demonstrated or outlined that moneys from the racing industry will be put into revenue in the interests of the general public and used to foster or finance such projects.

I now come to the area to which the honourable member for Sherwood referred. He mentioned the amount of the fines that would be imposed on people convicted of SP offences. The Minister has already summed this matter up in his speech. He said that the millions of dollars that are going through the SP bookmakers are being squandered and wasted each year, and this is costing the racing industry dearly.

I do not think that any honourable member would dispute that for many years New South Wales has been known as the State of the SP kings and, as the Minister knows, it still is. However, the racing industry in New South Wales is still prospering. One of the main reasons that it is prospering in New South Wales is that the Government has paid some attention to the breeding industry. The same can be said of Victoria. While prize-money may be bigger in those States than in Queensland, those State Governments have paid great attention to breeding. Over the years the breeding of prize stallions and mares in those States has far exceeded breeding in Queensland. The breeders in those States produce good progeny—good racehorses—which are in championship class and can command the provision of high prize-money.

This Government stands condemned for the lack of support it has given to the people in the breeding industry over the years. It has been very generous in handing out subsidies to the man on the land. In most cases they are warranted, but in many cases they are not. The problem is that horse breeders in Queensland are not classed

as primary producers, and consequently are not eligible for the Government subsidies available to other primary producers.

Now we come to the area in which I have a particular interest, namely, the fines which can be imposed on people who engage in SP bookmaking. The Bill introduced by the former Minister in charge of racing, Dr Edwards, provided for gaol sentences for such people, but this Bill has deleted those penalties and replaced them with exorbitant fines. I agree completely with the honourable member for Sherwood, who said that this will create a precedent never before seen in this State.

Mr Moore: It is wrong.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Of course it is wrong, totally damned wrong.

For example, this Bill provides for a judge of the District Court to sit alone to hear such offences. The Bill does not explain whether the person charged has the choice of being dealt with by a jury or a District Court judge sitting alone. The decision reached will determine whether such a person is fined between \$15,000 and \$20,000 for a first offence, between \$20,000 and \$30,000 for a second offence and between \$30,000 and \$50,000 for a third or subsequent offence. This Bill removes the section providing for a gaol sentence of up to three years for such offences, but the Minister has said that he intends to bankrupt these people or so embarrass them financially as to stop their illegal SP activities.

I find the Government's action to be completely hypocritical, because for years the Opposition has been calling for amendments to the Companies Act and the Criminal Code which would enable the Government to take the appropriate action to ensure that white-collar criminals such as shady company directors who have been ripping off and fleecing the general public of Queensland would be forced to give access to their private bank accounts and made to repay the people they ripped off. The Government failed to take action against white-collar criminals, but a person accepting a \$2, \$10, \$20 or \$30 bet in a pub on a Saturday afternoon is now to be liable to a fine of between \$15,000 and \$50,000, depending on the number of previous offences he has committed. But those fines are far greater than those being imposed on major drug dealers and others who have appeared before the criminal courts on offences involving large amounts of marihuana. In Ipswich a person who appeared before the Magistrates Court charged with possession of, and trafficking in, heroin was fined the princely sum of \$800 for his third offence, and allowed five months to pay. He was not given a gaol sentence. It is totally hypocritical that the Government should be introducing large fines for bookmaking offences when such comparisons can be

made. Some people in this community who are involved in SP bookmaking have provided an honourable service.

If the Minister is looking for some additional revenue for the State Government, then I believe that he has a responsibility to the people of Queensland to extend the Government's intention of updating the TAB even further. Apart from the pimps who will benefit greatly from this legislation, I do not believe that it will deter many people involved in SP bookmaking in the community. If the TAB service is to be extended, then the TAB agencies under private franchise should have the right to have agents operating in areas at week-ends, particularly on Saturdays, which is the obvious betting day. They could go into the local hotels and other places and legally take bets from people who patronise those establishments. It is obvious that if a person who is over the alcohol limit has to leave a hotel on a Saturday afternoon and drive half a mile or a mile to a shop to place a bet, he will not do so. The obvious solution is to ring an SP bookmaker.

(Time expired.)

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (12.31 a.m.): Earlier tonight the member for Pine Rivers said that SP bookmakers should be wiped out completely because they are thugs, drug pushers and everything else. I do not associate myself with remarks like that. The people I have known in the racing industry, particularly on the bookmaking side of it, have been gentlemen, and they do not come into the category mentioned by the member for Pine Rivers. In fact, I have found the bookmakers at the Eagle Farm, Doomben and Gold Coast racecourses to be thorough gentlemen. They have grown up in the industry. They have worked for SP bookmakers and learnt the trade and, believe me, there is a lot to learn. Those men are a credit to the industry. Although in earlier days those men were engaged in SP bookmaking operations, they could not be classified as criminals.

One amendment that the Minister is introducing imposes a penalty of not less than \$15,000 and not more than \$20,000 for the first offence, not less than \$20,000 and not more than \$30,000 for a second offence and not less than \$30,000 and not more than \$50,000 for a third offence. That is just ridiculous. I do not know of one area, especially in my own electorate, where there is an SP bookmaker operating. However, I believe that the betting service could be improved if there were SP bookmakers.

The other night I heard what Barbara Bowers said on television. I do not always agree with what she says, but she said that this Government skites about free enterprise. Of course, an SP bookmaker or an on-course bookmaker operates a free enterprise business. The Government is trying to create a monopoly by wiping out bookmakers and forcing people to bet with the TAB.

The Racing and Betting Bill was passed by this Parliament early last year, but it has not been proclaimed. Tonight, some 81 amendments to that legislation are being debated. Depending on the way one looks at it, that is either a good or a bad thing. As the former Bill has not been proclaimed it is wrong that so many amendments be introduced. Another way of looking at it is that the Government is trying to make it a perfect Bill. If that is the case, who knows how many more amendments may be brought in? There will be so many amendments to it we will not know where we are.

In what I am about to say I do not intend to cast any aspersions. The previous Minister in charge of racing knew nothing at all about the sport and we were told that that was bad for the industry. The new Minister (Mr Hinze) has been closely associated with racing for some time. He is the owner of one of the biggest race-horse and trotting establishments in Queensland. People will say that by making the substantial loans available to the racing clubs so that prize-money can be increased, it may be that the Minister has a pecuniary interest. That could be so because a man with a great string of race-horses and pacers must win his share of races and therefore receive a share of the increased prize-money. People may say that the Minister is wearing two hats, one of them as an owner who stands to gain financially from increased hand-outs to clubs.

I am concerned about the Racing Development Fund. I believe that the clubs should receive a fair slice of the cake, but if the greater slice of that fund is to go to the principal clubs in Brisbane, Toowoomba, Ipswich, Rockhampton and Townsville, there will be very little left for the clubs in the country. That is very bad. People in country areas patronise the meetings at the country clubs and occasionally, of all the horses that train and race at those clubs, a good horse goes on to compete on the main tracks in the State. Horses from Toowoomba and the districts of Beaudesert and Beenleigh race at courses in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast.

Horses from Gladstone, Banana, Theodore and other places extensively patronise the Rockhampton club, where prize-money is much better than at country centres. Everybody knows that the smaller clubs are being fleeced by the controlling clubs in the district—in my case by the Rockhampton Jockey Club—because the controlling clubs send stewards to meetings in the country centres and the smaller clubs have to pay for the travelling expenses and make a substantial donation to the controlling club. This Bill will hand out millions of dollars to the principal clubs and very little will go to the smaller clubs in country areas.

I am worried about where these millions of dollars will come from. I do not believe that getting rid of SP bookmakers will increase the revenue of the TAB. It is said

that \$200m a year is invested in the SP bookmaking ring. I do not believe that that is so. In any event I am quite sure that some of the places at which SP bookmakers operate have no other betting facilities. We must realise that other forms of gambling are being introduced into the State and that the State has many compulsive gamblers.

Mr Burns: Bill Prest.

Mr PREST: Yes, I am one of those who gamble. Of course, I happen to pay my way.

I am concerned about the ordinary person. The member for Lytton is trying to throw me, because he knows that I like attending the races. I did so on New Year's Day with him. We were going pretty well until the last race, when he tried to put one or two bookmakers out of action for a year or so. They went home with their bags full and we went home with our pockets empty.

I am not against racing in any shape or form. I am not against bookmakers. It is said that racing is the sport of kings. It is not only a sport these days but also a very big business for some people. The Minister says that there must be more money to assist the racing industry to give more prize-money. I do not know that that is necessarily a good thing. It costs a certain amount to feed a horse in Brisbane. It would cost just as much in Gladstone and Rockhampton, and even more in Mt Isa. People in those areas should be racing for substantial amounts also.

What does worry me, if it is a sport and not a business, is how these owners afford to pay such huge prices for untried horses or for yearlings. Where are they getting their money from? Is it just an investment? They should be the ones to be looked at, not the SP bookmakers, for their activities outside the racecourse. We should be looking at these fellows who spend massive amounts of money on untried yearlings and then say they should be given tax concessions also. I do not believe in that.

However, I not here to criticise the Minister for the way he is administering his portfolio. It is the small clubs that I am concerned about, particularly my own Gladstone Turf Club. Recently the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development constructed a road from the industrial estate at Clinton to within a few yards of the stables at the Gladstone course. Its destination is unknown. No-one knows where that road will connect with the main road. If it is the same entrance as that giving access to the race-track, that will be totally unacceptable. The road now comes through a 1.6 ha area of land. I have had deputations from people in the racing industry wanting to know how permission was given for the road to be built where it is and for land to be exchanged. I am concerned also because we find that the land exchanged with the

Gladstone City Council was formerly used for week-end car-parking and on weekdays, morning and afternoon, to exercise horses.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Powell): Order! I ask the honourable member to keep to the provisions of the Bill.

Mr PREST: I will do that.

Whatever happens, it will cost the Gladstone Turf Club quite an amount of money. I would hope that the Minister will grant the Gladstone Turf Club the loans it has requested through the previous Minister. The club has been promised that loans would be made available to upgrade its facilities. We are hoping for an improvement in facilities for the patrons. After all, it is the little fellow who attends race-meetings every week who keeps racing going. Now that the road has been constructed, the stables will have to be removed. The council says that they are dilapidated and have to be pulled down and rebuilt.

I ask the Minister to give very serious consideration to making available to the Gladstone Turf Club, through the Racing Development Fund, sufficient money to enable it to build the facilities that are so urgently needed. Gladstone is an expanding city and recreational facilities must be expanded to meet the needs of the workers who come there.

I also ask the Minister to inquire how 1.6 ha of land right on the highway could have been exchanged for 2.6 ha of land on a rubbish dump. I am certain there is no comparison in the valuations, and I do not see how it could have been done. The land was a reserve for racing. Perhaps approval was given by the Minister.

Mr Burns: The Minister for Main Roads got it.

Mr PREST: I have to keep to the Bill. It is a very serious situation.

Coursing representatives have made many applications to begin greyhound racing at Gladstone. I understand that the Minister is giving favourable consideration to an application from Rockhampton. As that city already has trotting and racing, I suggest that favourable consideration should be given to greyhound racing at Gladstone.

In my opinion, SP bookmakers have made a major contribution to racing in the past. If one goes to racecourses at Eagle Farm, Doomben or the Gold Coast today, one sees many of the fellows who were connected with SP bookmaking standing with their bags.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (12.47 a.m.): Health is of the utmost importance to everyone, and it is something that cannot be bought. Dental health is particularly important, and dental care must be started with children.

In 1973, the then Commonwealth Minister for Health (Dr Everingham), in co-operation with the States, introduced a scheme under which a school dental service was implemented. A number of technologists were trained to carry out the work.

A school dental service had operated in Queensland for many years. During my years at primary school almost 50 years ago, I recall seeing a dentist at least twice. I recall those occasions very well. The Minister for Health remarked to me that technology has improved greatly since then, and that is very true. In those days, a lady travelled round with a machine. There was no power, and the only water came out of tanks. She operated the drill by treading with her foot. It was a terrifying experience for me, and I remember it very well.

It concerns me that, even though the Commonwealth has come to the party and provided funds for the training of people and the provision of school dental clinics, many children still go through primary school without having their teeth looked at by a dentist. It may be said that dental care is the responsibility of parents. However, I believe that dental care can best be provided at school, where children can be treated with a minimum of delay and with a minimum of tears. When they are taken to a dentist's surgery, they look at all the machines and wonder what is ahead of them. They seem to accept treatment more readily when they are with their peers.

Two school dental clinics have been established in the city of Maryborough, and they are doing very good work. The young people who have been trained at those clinics are also doing an excellent job. However, it must be nearly two years ago that plans were first made for caravans to visit the other schools in the district, including some in your electorate, Mr Deputy Speaker. Slabs were poured, power points were installed and water mains were laid but not connected. Everything was ready for connection; but there was no dentist.

It looks as if many children in my area will complete their primary schooling without ever having been examined by a dentist—unless, of course, they are taken to a dentist by their parents.

If children are not taught to care properly for their teeth, tooth decay becomes a problem in their later years. I have spoken to people who have done social work amongst the unemployed. They have told me that young persons, particularly girls, who go looking for jobs and present a gummy look

to the employer on whom they are calling stand very little chance of getting a job. That does not do much for their confidence.

I agree whole-heartedly with the policy adopted by the school dental clinics. Very often they recommend that dental work be carried out privately. In many instances dental problems escape the notice of parents. In fact, school health sisters have discovered problems that both the teachers and parents missed.

I should like to see more money poured into school dental care. The Minister for Health has said that lack of money is the problem. Whereas the clinics have visited some schools and attended to the same children on two occasions, other schools are being totally neglected.

The Minister has said that the caravans are on order but that he does not know when they will be delivered. I have been told that one is operating. I think that is in the electorate represented by the Minister for Works and Housing. As I say, everything is ready in my electorate for the caravans, and I would like to see more done to get them operating.

TOURIST POTENTIAL IN QUEENSLAND

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (12.52 a.m.): I rise to acquaint the House with a most substantial document on the potential of tourism in the State of Queensland. I refer to a report titled "Tourism Potential in Queensland", which is better known as the Boeing report on tourism. It is probably one of the most important documents that have been formulated on Queensland's tourist potential. The Minister has already referred to it. It substantially endorses the progressive tourism policies of the Queensland Government.

The report came into existence because the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation asked the Boeing Company to provide an independent assessment of tourism potential in this State. The report contains the following statement—

"Queensland appears to have the greatest untapped potential of any world tourist market."

Basically the report revolves around two scenarios for the industry in Queensland: a natural level of growth and an accelerated level of growth. The natural growth is progress along historical lines; the accelerated growth would be due to diversion and stimulation from co-ordinated planning between the Government and the private sector, development of major resort attractions, direct air services, tour packages and aggressive promotion.

Under these two levels of growth we have the potential to achieve each year a natural increase in international traffic of

10 per cent and in domestic traffic of 8 per cent and an accelerated potential of 19 per cent increase in international traffic and 12 per cent increase in domestic traffic.

The report goes on to say that the major problems facing tourism in Queensland are the lack of awareness, limited infrastructure, extreme distance for international travel, increasing cost of travel and the circuitous international air service to the State of Queensland. It acknowledges that Australia is now the second fastest growing visitor destination in the world after Portugal.

The Boeing report estimates that in 1985 Queensland will be seeing a natural growth of 448 400 tourists a year up to a potential in accelerated growth of 709 700. The possible influence on the economy of the State is substantial. Assuming that visitor expenditure is in the vicinity of \$50 per day per person, under the natural growth cycle tourism in Queensland in 1985 would be worth US\$697m and, on the accelerated cycle, US\$875m. It is estimated that the multiplier effect of 2.5 would bring the total benefit to the economy of this State.

The QTTC has already estimated that 1 400 jobs can be created for every 25 000 international visitors coming to this State. Boeing estimates that approximately 140 000 jobs can be created as a direct response to 37.5m intrastate and interstate trips. That is a ratio of 1:268.

An important facet of the report is the future employment potential in this State. Under the natural cycle we can expect 29 800 new jobs to come on tap by 1985 up to a potential on the accelerated cycle of 56 700 jobs.

That is a tremendously exciting report and I commend it to members of the House. It clearly demonstrates the great potential available to Queensland to capitalise on the growing international tourist boom and significantly, as I said at the outset, it endorses the policies of the Government towards tourism in this State.

EXPLOITATION OF FILIPINO WOMEN

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (12.57 a.m.): Tonight I should like to take the opportunity to express my concern at the modern trade in human flesh which is now taking place in the form of the purchase of Filipino women. It seems to be the latest growth industry in Australia. I notice that many of the advertisements in the personal columns in newspapers now concern the purchase of Filipino women in one form or another. It is so-called bride-buying. However, I wonder how many of those girls and women make it up the aisle to the altar.

An Honourable Member: A lot of them do.

Mrs KYBURZ: Perhaps a lot of them do.

In many instances it is simply the purchase by lonely and aged or indeed inadequate men of women who will "suit" their needs. I am not saying that these men should not have active sexual lives but I believe that buying girls is just not on.

The prices range from \$2,000 to \$10,000. We cannot legislate for compassion but we can regulate the purchase of people. That is precisely what it is. My main concern is for the future welfare of these women and girls. Does it mean that if some of these relationships do not work out the women will finish up at the end of a welfare queue feeling estranged in Australia if they do not happen to have any family support? It is quite obvious that any relationship is temporary whether or not it is sanctified, so-called, by a certificate which happens to be a marriage certificate.

I hope that in the future they will have the opportunity to form support groups, although this is just what they need now. My main concern for these girls, however, is that they are now being imported for prostitution in the form of modern massage parlours. It is very sad that they are being talked into this in the Philippines where, as we all know, there is widespread poverty and unemployment, particularly among women. But I do not see a massage parlour as a legitimate form of employment. Other people may see it in a different light, and, of course, that is their right, but I think it is very sad that these girls are lured to Australia and then dumped in massage parlours. As I said, although this might be seen as a legitimate form of employment in the East, I am sorry, but I do not see it as being so in the West.

An elderly man came to see me about how he could obtain a Housing Commission house, and quite apart from being a single person, as far as I could see he had absolutely no right to one. He went to the Housing Commission, and I suppose in an attempt to put him off they said nicely that if he got married he might have a chance. He decided to buy a bride from the Philippines. He then went back in to the Housing Commission and they said to him, "Okay, you are married now, but you will have a better chance if you have a child and are really in need of a Housing Commission house." Promptly nine months later he returned with that problem fixed. The people at the Housing Commission then said, "Right, we will put you on the list now, but you only have one child. You need a few more."

Mr Scott interjected.

Mrs KYBURZ: I am sorry to say that I think it is a fraudulent way of obtaining a Housing Commission house. It might sound all right to the honourable member, but it does not to me.

Mr Neal: It is a very exhausting way.

Mrs KYBURZ: That is another point. I think we have to consider that these introduction agencies are springing up all over the place doing nothing but trading in female flesh in the form of Filipino girls who do not know what they are in for when they come to Australia.

MR H. W. FANCHER

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (1.2 a.m.): For a number of years there has been a very messy affair involving certain pastoral holdings going on in Far North Queensland, and I urge two Ministers, in particular, to step in and clear up the mess once and for all. I refer to the Minister for Lands and Forestry and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General.

I am talking about the affairs of that American confidence trickster, Mr Henry Wiley Fancher, who is now living out on the Gilbert River in North Queensland. I do not have time in this debate to do more than give an outline of this man's operations in Queensland, but he achieved prominence when the Premier paid all his expenses for a trip to Europe in a so-called investigation of the "loans affair" late in 1975. We all remember Joh and the "loans affair". I believe that as a result of this favour to the Premier the man now has protected status in Queensland—he is above and beyond the law.

Very briefly, Mr Fancher came to Australia from America in 1965 and formed Yarraden Pastoral Holdings Pty Ltd. At one stage this company apparently held a wide range of properties under a subsidiary company, Mt Mulgrave Pty Ltd. This company later bought out Hayman and Sons, amongst whose assets were two station properties known as Chadshunt and Inorunie. The Yarraden and Mt Mulgrave companies—they no longer owned the properties of the same name as these had been sold off previously—were allowed to go into liquidation. Later, in 1976, Mr Fancher—it should not be forgotten that he is really Hayman and Sons—was declared bankrupt on the petition of International Harvester Credit Corporation of Australia Limited. Mr Fancher had apparently sold Inorunie and Chadshunt to a Mr F. R. Hart in 1975, even though at that time those properties were mortgaged to a member of the Hayman family. I must also add that the rents on these leasehold properties were then in arrears to the State, and I believe that they are still in arrears. In 1977 Mr Hart sold Inorunie and a number of cattle thereon to A. H. Carter and Sons. Mr Hart apparently only thought he had title to this block. In fact, title was still held by Mr Fancher. So A. H. Carter and Sons missed out, even though they spent considerable sums trying to achieve justice through the courts.

5185—22

After his bankruptcy, and after weaving this incredible web of deceit and dishonesty, Mr Fancher went back to the USA where he obtained further funds and then came back to Australia to form a company now known as the Chadshunt Grazing Company. He was a declared bankrupt but apparently was able to buy the Chadshunt property from the liquidators before 1978. I do not believe that the liquidators have ever received any money.

Mr Fancher's bankruptcy was annulled in August 1980, and later in that year he apparently successfully bought Inorunie from the liquidators at a public auction. Once again, I believe that no money has been paid by Mr Fancher to the liquidators. How can this man be allowed to operate? Why has he not been investigated by the Fraud Squad or the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs? Is he beyond the law of Queensland? Why cannot Mr Carter be offered some assistance by the Government of Queensland to allow this fraudulent law-breaker to be brought to book, so allowing Mr Carter to obtain some justice?

I ask these questions because this man Fancher seems to all the people who know what is happening up there to operate outside the law. He has in the past literally littered the countryside with "rubber" cheques. His debts have never been honoured. During all the time of Mr Fancher's nefarious operations, he has constantly dealt in cattle in a questionable way and has never been charged by the police. His neighbours are concerned that he is stealing their cattle. He regularly has earmarks cut into stock bearing other people's brands, and then blames his men. In other instances he has had neighbours' cattle on his vehicles and again blamed his own men.

He can transport unbranded cattle with impunity because he is supposed to have a slaughtering business near Kilcoy and sells beef to the Arabs. He has said, "I love the Arabs". Mr Fancher will not allow neighbours to accompany his stockmen when boundary areas are being mustered. He has told the Stock Squad he will give back only beast for beast. People living in the area say that he has ordered his men to shoot neighbouring bullocks that stray onto his property. Shots have been heard late at night in the area, and this is causing serious concern.

I could go on and on, but time prevents this. I again urge that an investigation of this American national be carried out by the proper authorities. He has not only defrauded smart grazing people who should have known better, outwitted the police and imposed unduly on his neighbours, but also cheated dozens of ordinary working people, small contractors and stockmen. I cite as an example of the type of investigation that can well be mounted against this international crook the Macrossan inquiry set up by Sir

William Knox in 1976 into a range of companies which would have been proud to have Henry Wiley Fancher as their articled clerk. I believe that if this man operated anywhere other than in Far North Queensland he would long ago have been investigated along the lines I have referred to, and would have been exported back to the good old USA.

RACING INDUSTRY IN NORTH QUEENSLAND; CUNNINGHAM FAMILY; CT X-RAY SCANS

Mr KATTER (Flinders) (1.7 a.m.): I briefly comment upon the racing industry and the discussion that took place earlier tonight. I was extremely disappointed in the fact that during the police inquiries in Mt Isa, one of the families that were heavily interviewed by the police was the Kyle family at McKinlay and the people who race horses with that particular family. To my knowledge, I have never heard a rumour about, or a substantial complaint against, those racing people in north-west Queensland. I was extremely disappointed to see such a hard-working family living in one of the isolated outposts in North Queensland treated in that way. It was a terrible worry for the family. I am very pleased to see that those charges have been withdrawn.

I wish to make one other comment about the racing industry. When the loans that were granted to the major racing clubs in Queensland were converted to grants by the State Government, it meant that most of the country clubs that had never been able to borrow money missed out on the sort of assistance that was forthcoming when that principle was introduced. Of course, one of the great drawbacks in country racing is that the clubs simply cannot borrow money.

Whilst I am on the subject of racing, I would like to refer to the Cunningham family of North Queensland. It always strikes me as passing strange that families from all parts of Queensland, except the Far North, receive recognition at some stage. I have met Mr Cunningham only since Collinsville has been in my electorate, but over the years the Cunningham family has put literally \$1m into looking after the poor people of North Queensland, and particularly the children of ex-servicemen in the State. They have contributed a very large part of their money towards preserving the past. One of the relics which a lot of money has been put into is the old slab Bowen River Hotel. I would ask anyone in that area to go and see that hotel because it is a preservation of a true relic of the past.

That family pioneered breeding stock and the use of crops for the beef industry in North Queensland. They stood up fairly courageously against the big companies that have tried to destroy the industry and manipulate it to their own advantage. In all ways they are the sort of people who should be honoured with recognition by royalty.

An Opposition Member: Did they contribute to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation?

Mr KATTER: I take umbrage at that comment. When one speaks highly of anybody Queenslanders and Australians have the not very nice trait of knocking him. There are probably a dozen ways in which I could knock that family or any other family but I am saying something nice about them. The answer to the honourable member's question is that to my knowledge the family has not contributed, and I am quite sure that they would not.

Something that is desperately needed in North Queensland is a CT scanner which is used to make an entire internal X-ray scan of a person's head or body. Unfortunately all the four scanners in Queensland are in Brisbane, and I believe that the mooted provision of a fifth one is also for Brisbane. It is not necessary that this equipment be concentrated in one big city. New Zealand has these scanners at Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin. A new one is to be installed in Invercargill. The machines are scattered throughout the length and breadth of New Zealand.

North Queenslanders have to travel 1000 miles to use one of these machines. I now wish to quote from a leaflet handed out by a Mr Haley, a person of gifted intellect in North Queensland, and one who goes out of his way to do something for the community in which he lives. In his leaflet he refers to a number of cases, but I will cite only one from Charters Towers. The leaflet states—

"Two-year-old Barbara survives a Land Rover running across her neck and is brought to intensive care in Townsville General Hospital. Her removal to Brisbane is inadvisable and diagnosis is inhibited by the lack of a CT scan. The alternative of five drill holes in the skull is more dangerous, slow and expensive than a computerised scan and less effective."

(Time expired.)

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (1.12 a.m.): I rise to draw the attention of the House to anomalies in the Public Service Superannuation Act and the State Service Superannuation Act by way of discrimination between males and females. It is important to look firstly at the contributions. At under 20 years of age, both males and females pay 2 per cent of their gross salary, but over 20 the gap appears. At that stage males pay 5.5 per cent and females pay 4.75 per cent until at age 35 and over when males pay 6.5 per cent and females pay 5.75 per cent. Honourable members may argue that that discriminates in favour of women in the Public Service.

However, when one examines the benefits that are paid under these two Acts it is very clear that the people being discriminated against are full-time employees of the State Public Service who happen to be women.

I wish to draw to the attention of the House two particular areas of benefit. Most superannuation schemes in Australia have provision for a spouse's pension, but that is not so in Queensland, which has provision for a widow's pension which is paid to a wife or a dependent defacto wife—and that is determined by the Superannuation Board in appropriate circumstances—calculated at 66.7 per cent of the annuity. The husband of a female public servant cannot collect a widower's pension if she dies. However, the wife of a male Queensland public servant is paid a pension upon his death.

A particularly disgraceful anomaly occurs in relation to children's pensions. I will speak later about who is deemed to be a bread-winner in this community and this Government's attitude to bread-winners.

Pensions are payable to children of deceased contributors, provided that the contributors are males. If a contributor is a female, the pension is only payable subject to a child's having been wholly dependent upon the deceased female contributor. That is blatant discrimination and completely ignores the fact that the wife of a deceased male contributor may have been receiving a very high salary and the child may not have been wholly dependent on the male contributor. That is not taken into account. A male contributor's wife automatically receives a pension at the rate of 66.7 per cent of his annuity and his unmarried children under a stated age also receive a pension automatically.

To me, it is wrong in principle that men and women in the Queensland Public Service should be treated so differently. It is particularly improper that, although a woman contributor's income may have been vital to her family whilst she was alive, on her death her husband receives no benefit at all. Unless her husband has either left her or died and children have been wholly dependent on her, they receive no benefit at all.

I put it to the Government that it is time to amend the Act. The Queensland State Service Union, the Professional Officers Association and various other unions involved, such as the Queensland Teachers Union, are very anxious to see these anomalies removed so that both men and women are treated equally under the State Service Superannuation Act in the way of benefits paid and contributions made.

I conclude by commenting on the term "bread-winner". Recommendations have come from Cabinet about appointments to be made to the Public Service. We have been told that bread-winners are to have preference

over married women. I think it is fair comment that, in today's economy, one could argue that it takes two incomes to make a bread-winner in any family today—and certainly two-thirds of the nation fit into that category. The time is long overdue to examine the employment roles in our society on the basis of equal merit rather than on the basis of sex, and certainly not on the basis of marital status.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.17 a.m. (Wednesday).
