

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 1983

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 1983

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Warner, Toowoomba South) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER OATH

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

Commission thereupon read by the Clerk.

**APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF REPORTER AND DEPUTY CHIEF REPORTER;
REDESIGNATION OF CLERK-ASSISTANT**

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, following the vacancy which occurred through the retirement of Mr Cedric Smith, formerly Chief Reporter, Parliamentary Reporting staff, the position of Chief Reporter has been filled by the appointment of Mr John Bevan Battersby, formerly Deputy Chief Reporter. The position of Deputy Chief Reporter has been filled by the appointment of Mr Robert Ward Gustavson, formerly Reporter, Parliamentary Reporting Staff.

I also have to inform the House that the position of Clerk-Assistant of the Parliament has been redesignated Deputy Clerk of the Parliament.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS

Treasurer's Annual Statement

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Treasurer's Annual Statement for the year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered to be printed.

Brisbane City Council Accounts

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the books and accounts of the Brisbane City Council for the year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered to be printed.

Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts

MR SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts for the year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations of his ninth report.

Ordered to be printed.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN

Mr SPEAKER: Pursuant to the requirements of Standing Order No. 13, I nominate the following members to form the panel of Temporary Chairmen for the present Parliament—

Desmond James Booth, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Warwick;
James Henry Randell, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Mirani;
Max Richard Menzel, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Mulgrave;
Demetrios Fouras, Esquire, member for the electoral district of South Brisbane;
Brian John Davis, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Brisbane Central.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Appointment of Ministry

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that, on 7 November 1983, His Excellency the Governor—

(a) Accepted the resignations tendered by the Honourable Valmond James Bird, the Honourable Jannion Anthony Elliott, and the Honourable Angelo Pietro Dante Bertoni, PhC, MPS, as Members of the Executive Council of Queensland and as Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs of Queensland, Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts of Queensland, and Minister for Health of Queensland, respectively;

(b) Appointed—

The Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen,
The Honourable William Angus Manson Gunn,
The Honourable Russell James Hinze,
The Honourable Claude Alfred Wharton,
The Honourable Ivan James Gibbs,
The Honourable Michael John Ahern, BAgrSc,
Donald Frederick Lane, Esquire,
The Honourable William Hamline Glasson,
Brian Douglas Austin, DipCE, MIEAust, Esquire,
The Honourable Lionel William Powell,
The Honourable John Philip Goleby,
The Honourable Neil John Turner,
The Honourable Vincent Patrick Lester,
The Honourable Martin James Tenni,
The Honourable Neville John Harper,
The Honourable Geoffrey Hugh Muntz, AAIV,
Peter Richard McKechnie, Esquire, and
Robert Carl Katter, Esquire,

to be Members of the Executive Council of Queensland;

Appointed—

The Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, to be Premier and Treasurer of Queensland;

The Honourable William Angus Manson Gunn, to be Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer of Queensland;

The Honourable Russell James Hinze, to be Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing of Queensland;

The Honourable Claude Alfred Wharton, to be Minister for Works and Housing of Queensland;

The Honourable Ivan James Gibbs, to be Minister for Mines and Energy of Queensland;

The Honourable Michael John Ahern, BAgrSc, to be Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology of Queensland;

The Honourable Donald Federick Lane, to be Minister for Transport of Queensland;

The Honourable William Hamline Glasson, to be Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police of Queensland;

The Honourable Brian Douglas Austin, DipCE, MIEAust, to be Minister for Health of Queensland;

The Honourable Lionel Willian Powell, to be Minister for Education of Queensland;

The Honourable John Philip Goleby, to be Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services of Queensland;

The Honourable Neil John Turner, to be Minister for Primary Industries of Queensland;

The Honourable Vincent Patrick Lester, to be Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs of Queensland;

The Honourable Martin James Tenni, to be Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services of Queensland;

The Honourable Neville John Harper, to be Minister for Justice and Attorney-General of Queensland;

The Honourable Geoffrey Hugh Muntz, AAIV, to be Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs of Queensland;

The Honourable Peter Richard McKechnie, to be Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts of Queensland; and

The Honourable Robert Carl Katter, to be Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs of Queensland.

I lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 7 November 1983 containing the relevant notifications.

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

Appointment of Leader of the House

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: I desire also to inform the House that arrangements have been made, and the Honourable the Speaker informed accordingly, for the Honourable Claude Alfred Wharton, Minister for Works and Housing, to be Leader of the House.

OPPOSITION APPOINTMENTS

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 a.m.): I desire to inform the House of the following Opposition appointments—

Leader of the Opposition—Keith Webb Wright, member for Rockhampton;

Deputy Leader of the Opposition—Neville George Warburton, member for Sandgate;

Opposition Whip—Thomas James Burns, member for Lytton;

Opposition Secretary—Leslie John Yewdale, member for Rockhampton North;

Leader of Business in the House for the Opposition—Brian John Davis, member for Brisbane Central.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBERAL PARTY APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.11 a.m.): I bring to the notice of the House that the Parliamentary Liberal Party has elected the following officers—

Leader—the member for Nundah (myself);

Deputy Leader—the member for Mt Coot-tha (Hon. W. D. Lickiss);

Whip—the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes).

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Protection of Federal System

From Mr Ahern (five signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will protect our traditions, institutions and the Federal system.

Declaration of Moreton Island as National Park

From Mr Burns (2 666 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will prevent sand-mining on Moreton Island and declare the island as a national park, except for existing townships, tourist resort, airstrips and lighthouse reserve.

Petitions received.

DEATH OF MR L. F. DIPLOCK, CMG

Motion of Condolence

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.13 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“(1) That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Leslie Frank Diplock, CMG, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland and Minister of the Crown.

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

Leslie Frank Diplock was well known to many of us. News of his recent death was received with shock by his relatives as well as his many friends in the House who knew him so well when he served here as the member for Condamine from 1953 to 1960 and as the member for Aubigny from 1960 until his retirement in May 1972. I personally held Mr Les Diplock in the highest regard and I very much regret his passing. We lived and worked together very closely in the years he was in the House.

He was born at Brisbane in 1899 and attended school in Rockhampton. He later joined the Department of Public Instruction, where he had a long and very successful teaching career. He became a head teacher in 1922 and was an inspector of schools from 1949 until 1952.

After only three years as a member of the Legislative Assembly, he was selected to fill a vacancy in the Gair Cabinet in June 1956 and, in view of his teaching experience, he served as Minister for Public Instruction from 1956 to 1957. He had been elected to the House as the Australian Labor Party member for Condamine. However, following the split in 1957, he gave his full support to the then Premier, the Honourable Vincent Clair Gair, and assisted Mr Gair in the formation of the Queensland Labour Party. He later became a leading light in the Democratic Labour Party movement in Queensland and, indeed, on a national basis.

Les Diplock was a humble man, a practising Christian and a man who was well remembered in communities such as Dalby long after he had settled in retirement at Scarborough. He is credited by many with saving Dalby through his rescue operation of the then ailing Napier Brothers in 1963. He took over the chairmanship of the company and with skill and hard work assisted in the rescue of the work-force of 250 employees. I remember the time very well and, as Works and Housing Minister, I sought to work in with him and to assist him in that operation.

Les Diplock was also active in many community organisations. He was made a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George in 1972 for his outstanding services to education and to the community generally.

He is survived by his widow and four children.

On behalf of the Queensland Government and, I am sure, all members of this House, I extend our heartfelt condolences to the family of the late Leslie Frank Diplock.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.15 a.m.): I second the motion moved by the Premier to express sympathy to the widow and family of the late Leslie Frank Diplock, CMG.

Leslie Diplock entered State Parliament in 1953 just as the Australian economy was picking up following the end of World War II. His unbroken record as the State member for, firstly, the electorate of Condamine and, later, the electorate of Aubigny, I believe testified to the dedicated service he gave to the people of those areas. Mr Diplock became the Labor member for Condamine after a long and useful career in the Department of Public Instruction, which is now known as the Education Department. He is remembered by his former students as a thorough and dedicated man.

Although rejected for active service in both World Wars, he served with the Volunteer Defence Corp and was second-in-command of the Warwick unit from 1940 to 1943. Mr Diplock's community interests were widespread, and at various times he was president of the Warwick Red Cross Branch, the Warwick Turf Club, the Warwick East Bowling Club and the Dalby Rotary Club.

Following the resignation of Mr T. A. Foley as Secretary for Mines in 1956, Mr Diplock was selected to fill the vacancy in the Gair Cabinet and was allocated the portfolio of Secretary for Public Instruction. In the election following the political crisis of 1957, Mr Diplock was re-elected for the Condamine seat as a member of the Queensland Labor Party. He was again successful in the 1960 election, when he transferred to the Aubigny electorate and defeated the sitting Country Party member in an election that saw the decimation of the Queensland Labor Party. Mr Diplock was appointed deputy leader of the party, which was reduced from 11 to 4 seats.

From 1963 until his parliamentary career ended with the abolition of the seat of Aubigny in the redistribution in 1971, Mr Diplock was the only Queensland Labor Party member in the House. His ability to retain the electorate's confidence was a tribute both to his great personal character and to the esteem he commanded because of his community involvement.

Mr Diplock represented his electorate strongly in local government matters. He led numerous deputations that resulted in funds being allocated to the councils involved. He also regularly toured the electorate, carefully advertising his visits in the press beforehand.

My knowledge and understanding of Les Diplock is that he was one of the great characters of this Assembly, and that he made a significant contribution to the House during his 19-year term. He was a great debater in the Parliament and a most consistent attender to his responsibilities in the electorate, especially where these affected the livelihood of farmers and the welfare of people living in rural towns and hamlets.

As the Premier has said, Mr Diplock's service to education and the community was recognised when he was made a Companion of the Order of St Michael and St George in 1972. I join with the Premier in extending condolences to his family.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.19 a.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I join with the Premier and the Deputy Premier in this motion of condolence to the family of Les Diplock.

Members would appreciate that Les Diplock was unique. He was the only independent member to survive right through until 1972. For three years I had the privilege of working in this House with Les Diplock. Although we were of different political persuasions, I had an association with him in that he had a long link with Rockhampton. He was educated in that city and taught there. In fact, for a long time one of his nephews worked for me in a business in which I was engaged in the newspaper industry. I also knew very well his brother, who was closely linked with the trade union movement.

Les Diplock was a man of strong beliefs. In the split in 1957 he opposed the Australian Labor Party, but he held to his beliefs with some dignity. As I said, he was the only man to survive, not only in 1957 but also right through to 1972. It needed a special type of character to do that.

He served well not only in the political arena but also within the community. He was deeply involved in community activities and was well respected. He was also unique in that, as an independent, he was able to capture the seat of Aubigny from the then Country Party.

He will be remembered not only for his political involvement but also for the contribution he made as a teacher and an inspector of schools. The Opposition and I join in this motion and express our deepest sympathy to Mrs Diplock and her children.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.20 a.m.): On behalf of the Liberal Party I join with other speakers in expressing condolence to the relatives of the late Les Diplock.

He was a member of this House for 19 years, and I knew him for 15 of those years. He was a very fine and highly respected gentleman. As a schoolteacher and inspector he was well known throughout the education world, and was held in high regard by many of his students. He was one of those who, in 1957, stood on a principle against interference in the affairs of the State Executive by outside influences. He paid a political price for his stand but, nevertheless, survived in this Parliament for 15 years.

But it was his work at Napier Brothers with which I was most impressed. At the time he took on the chairmanship of that company it was in a desperate situation and with the aid of his friends and other local people at Dalby he restored the confidence of the employees and the customers of that company. Because of his confidence in the future of the company and the people who worked for it he made very strong representations to financial institutions and to the Government for assistance and, as a result of his efforts, the financial position of that company was restored. I got to know him very closely indeed during those negotiations and came to appreciate his forthright and resolute manner. Also, I realised why he had been so successful in the political arena for so long.

He was a very strong believer in Christian principles and was most active in his church. He was, of course, heavily involved in many church activities. He was very much a practising Christian, not just a token one. So, on behalf of my colleagues in the Liberal Party, I associate myself with this motion and I express the deepest sympathy to the relatives and close friends of Les Diplock on his recent passing.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (11.23 a.m.): As the member for Condamine I would like to support this motion of condolence. As has been said this morning, Les Diplock was the member for Condamine until, following a redistribution, he became the member for Aubigny. I fully endorse the remarks of other members that Mr Diplock was held in very high regard as a parliamentarian and as a citizen in the Condamine area. I express to his family the condolences of the electorate of Condamine.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (11.24 a.m.): I very briefly join with other members who have expressed their condolences to the family of Les Diplock. Part of the Cunningham electorate was once represented by him as the member for Aubigny. Together with many other people, for many years I helped to run election campaigns in the area, and I found that it was his genuine approach to the people of the area that enabled Les Diplock to retain the seat for many years. He had a very real understanding of the problems of the area. It would be fair comment that it was he who saved the Napier Brothers foundry and prevented its going to the wall. The people of the Darling Downs area owed him a tremendous debt of gratitude for his efforts.

I was interested to hear the Deputy Premier refer to Mr Diplock's practice of advertising in advance the time at which he would be at a certain place in the electorate. Both the Honourable Tom McVeigh and I adopted that practice because we realised that it was a very important facet of his representation. I know that, during his term as member, many people who followed my political persuasion voted for him because of the personal representation that he gave. I join with other members in expressing condolences to his family.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.25 a.m.): It gives me pleasure to support the motion of condolence before the House and to briefly record, on behalf of the people of all political persuasions in Taroom shire, and, in fact, throughout his electorate, who were represented by the late Les Diplock for a fairly short period, the esteem in which he was held. I am sure I echo the feelings of those who were represented by Les Diplock within the Taroom shire, which was in his electorate at that time, when I express my personal sympathy to those whom he has left behind.

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

PAPERS

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

Reports—

- James Cook University of North Queensland for the year 1981
- Government Gas Engineer and Chief Gas Examiner for the year ended 30 June 1983
- State Electricity Commission of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1983
- Local Government Grants Commission, Queensland, for 1983
- Public Accountants Registration Board of Queensland for the year ended 31 December 1982
- Department of Works for the year ended 30 June 1983.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council—

- Public Service Act 1922-1978
- Wivenhoe Dam and Hydro-electric Works Act 1979
- State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- Stamp Act 1894-1982
- Electricity Act 1976-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- State Housing Act 1945-1983
- State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act 1957-1983
- Explosives Act 1952-1981
- Petroleum Act 1923-1983
- Electricity Act 1976-1982
- Electricity Act 1976-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- Industrial Development Act 1963-1981
- Industrial Development Act 1963-1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- Rural Training Schools Act of 1965 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- Grammar Schools Act 1975 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982
- Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Regulations under—

- Stamp Act 1894-1982
- Public Service Act 1922-1978
- Housing Act 1945-1983
- Builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act 1979-1982
- Education Act 1964-1974
- Explosives Act 1952-1981
- Gas Act 1965-1981
- Miners' Homestead Leases Act 1913-1982
- Mining Act 1968-1983
- Mining Titles Freeholding Act 1980-1982
- Petroleum Act 1923-1983
- Mines Regulation Act 1964-1983

By-law under the Education Act 1964-1974

Statute under the University of Queensland Act 1965-1983

Rules under the Coal Mining Act 1925-1981

Notification under the Electricity Act 1976-1982

Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drug Trafficking

Statements of Accounts of the State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) for the year ended 30 June 1983
Statement of Income and Expenditure Account of the Coal Mine Workers Pensions Fund for the year ended 30 June 1983
Record of Debate of the Australian Constitutional Convention, Parliament House Adelaide, 26-29 April 1983
Resolutions of the Australian Constitutional Convention, Parliament House, Adelaide, 26-29 April 1983.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Alleged Misuse of Government Funds During State Election Campaign

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (11.37 a.m.), by leave: Honourable members will recall that the Leader of the Opposition singled me out for criticism on election night over my so-called “misuse of Government funds” during the State election campaign.

Although I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition was under considerable mental stress that night because of his promise to resign if he did not lead the ALP to victory, I cannot let his smear of me or my Department go unanswered.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: He hasn't resigned yet.

Mr TENNI: I noticed.

Had the honourable member not been so upset on election night, he might have bothered to check the facts concerning the source of this criticism, which was a tour of schools and shopping centres in my own electorate and the ALP electorate of Cairns by a display caravan of the Department of Mapping and Surveying. The best judges of the tour's worth were the hundreds of children, teachers and parents who inspected the display material on mapping, environmental pollution and rural and urban fire safety in Cairns, the northern beaches and the Tableland. At no stage was any criticism received from any of these quarters that the display was considered a waste of money or somehow sought to promote my own electoral campaign in Barron River.

However, these facts did not stop my ALP opponent in Barron River, who obviously enjoys the same sense of fair play and honesty as the Leader of the Opposition, from alleging that the caravan tour was a blatant attempt to brainwash the children of the far north. She also falsely alleged that brochures and posters had been shredded or thrown away because they did not carry a credit to me. I can only hope that my schoolteacher opponent has learnt at least one lesson from this campaign—that is, a new respect for telling the truth.

The facts are that the tour was organised to promote the opening of the State Government's new map shop in Cairns and the launching of a campaign to encourage greater awareness of fire safety.

It is clear that the Opposition's personal attack on me is indicative of their shabby record towards the far north. Not content with making empty promises about removing the sales tax on freight and reducing fuel prices, the Opposition has now gone one better and wants to keep the far north in the dark about the services available from the State Government. I have always held the view that the people of the far north have as much right as any other area of the State to be fully informed about the activities of the State Government. This was the sole reason for this caravan display.

Now that the Opposition Leader has had time to absorb the fact that he did not win the State election, he may in future prefer to check his facts before making such false allegations.

I invite him to inspect any of the Department's Sunmap caravans, which are based at Townsville, Rockhampton, Brisbane and Toowoomba for the specific task of promoting the services available from the State Government's mapping authority. He will see that the caravans perform a very useful task in improving public awareness of this important Government activity.

The Department of Mapping and Surveying certainly has nothing to hide about its very active role promoting the State Government's mapping services, either in Cairns or any other area of the State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr HARTWIG: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. This is not an appropriate time under Standing Orders for a personal explanation to be made.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Callide.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (11.43 a.m.), by leave: According to the established rules of interpretation, Tuesday's ballot for the election of Speaker was in clear breach of Standing Orders Nos. 6 and 7 in that the ballot-papers were so prepared that no member of the House could cast a secret vote. Even from the press gallery and the public gallery, as well as from the floor of the House, the way members voted was obvious. It was clear, of course, that votes were cast on party lines and that every party member was publicly intimidated by the type of ballot-paper used. He could not vote in secret, as is the clear intention of Standing Orders Nos. 6 and 7. Therefore he was under duress in his voting, which is contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

The ballot-papers, as such, contained the names of all members—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders, the honourable member has to show that he was personally involved. I cannot allow him to continue.

Mr HARTWIG: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HARTWIG: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I acknowledge your ruling against the member for Callide. However, I ask you to reflect on the ministerial statement that you allowed to be made and I refer you to Standing Order No. 108A, which reads—

“A Minister of the Crown, by leave of the House, and so as not to interrupt any other business, may make a Statement relating to matters of Government policy or public affairs.”

All members heard what the Minister said. His statement did not relate to Government policy or public affairs, but you allowed it. I ask for an explanation.

Mr HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. I move a motion dissenting from your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Appointment of Mr E. C. Row

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.59 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That Edward Charles Row be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.”

The position of Chairman of Committees of the Legislative Assembly ranks next in importance to that of Speaker of the House. As honourable members are no doubt aware, the member who is appointed to this position is required to take over as Deputy Speaker on those occasions when Mr Speaker is absent.

In moving that the member for Hinchinbrook fill this very important position, I am proposing the appointment of a member who has served in the Legislative Assembly since 1972. He has been a member of the panel of Temporary Chairmen since March 1975. I am sure I speak on behalf of all members when I say that over the years he has earned our respect for the manner in which he has carried out his often difficult duties.

I am confident that the member for Hinchinbrook will discharge admirably the responsibilities of the office of Chairman of Committees.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (12.1 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to second the Premier's nomination of the member for Hinchinbrook as Chairman of Committees. In the operation of this Parliament, the role of Chairman of Committees is second only to that of Mr Speaker. Edward Charles Row, in his term of over 11 years in this House, has shown that he has the experience and knowledge to fulfil this position with distinction. As the Premier said, he has been a Temporary Chairman of Committees since 1975 and, before entering Parliament, he had a decade of local government experience in the Hinchinbrook Shire Council.

Mr Row has had extensive parliamentary experience. He was a delegate to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association seminar in London in March last year. He has participated in a wide range of parliamentary committees and was a member of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation from 1975 to 1977.

Ted Row's long experience as a Temporary Chairman of Committees will enable him to carry out the duties of Chairman of Committees in a way that can only bring credit to this Parliament. I trust that honourable members will give him their whole-hearted support and co-operation.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (12.3 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“Omit the words—

‘Edward Charles Row’

and substitute the words—

‘Colin John Miller’.”

I move this amendment as a follow-on of the proposal that was put before the House that the honourable member for Ithaca be considered for the position of Speaker. The Parliament has made a decision on that matter and we support that decision.

On this occasion I am reluctant, of course, to have to use the expressions that I am forced to use by virtue of the Standing Orders because the honourable member for Hinchinbrook is a very worthy member of this House for whom I have the highest respect and regard.

It is my belief that the honourable member for Ithaca who, until recently, held the position of Chairman of Committees of this Parliament is the most experienced man, with the breadth of knowledge and understanding required to hold, and continue to hold, the office of Chairman of Committees.

The other day, during the previous debate, I mentioned the qualifications of the honourable member for Ithaca. I am sure that no-one in this House will dispute the high qualifications that he possesses. I said then, and I repeat, that it is a pity party politics play a major role in the appointment of these officers of the House. I understand the problems relative to party politics, but I think that we should try, occasionally, to be objective about the qualifications of the people who hold these offices.

I mention, in passing, the number of rulings that the honourable member for Ithaca has made as Chairman of Committees, that have gone into the history books of this Parliament and have become precedents. Without cataloguing them or showing members the computer list of the rulings that the honourable member for Ithaca has made, I point out that many of them are memorable, were made in times of crisis, and were made for the benefit of all honourable members of this House. Nobody can dispute his qualifications or ability.

As I probably will not have a further opportunity to speak in this debate, I wish to say that if, as a result of the voting in the division that will be held in this Chamber, the honourable member for Ithaca is not successful, the honourable member for Hinchinbrook will have the complete support of the members of the Liberal Party. Personally, he will always have mine.

I take the opportunity of registering a protest about a matter that has already been decided by the House. It is relevant to this debate. Mr Speaker, I refer to your announcement of the names of the panel of Temporary Chairmen. Under Standing Order No. 13, we are obliged to accept your ruling on this matter, and, indeed, we do so. Standing Order No. 13 states—

“Mr Speaker shall nominate, at the commencement of every Parliament, a panel of not more than five Members to act as temporary Chairmen of Committees when requested by, or in the absence of, the Chairman of Committees, and any temporary Chairman while acting under this Standing Order shall have all the powers of the Chairman of Committees of the whole House: Provided that he shall immediately give place to the Chairman of Committees on his return and at his request. If a vacancy occurs in the panel, Mr Speaker shall nominate another Member to fill such vacancy.”

Of course, that decision by you, Mr Speaker, is made without debate; it does not involve the moving of a motion. Unfortunately, in that panel of Temporary Chairmen—I have always regarded it as being an all-party panel—there is not a representative of the Liberal Party.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You don't exist as a party.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Yes, we do. The honourable member was wrong when he referred to the Standing Orders before, and he is wrong again on this occasion. The Liberal Party is here in this Parliament. It is represented by six very capable members. They are a great deal more capable than the honourable member will ever be. The combined wisdom and experience of those six members leaves for dead the combined wisdom and experience of the honourable member and his colleagues. I know that the members of the Australian Labor Party would like to see various other people in this House not be given a voice, not to be heard and not be recognised. That is the way in which the members of the Labor Party look on Parliament. Their philosophy is that Parliament should work only as a one-party Parliament. That is the way in which they act in the Commonwealth Parliament, and that is how they want to act here. The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues will have to respect the fact that the Liberal Party is represented in this Parliament.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: We won't respect anything.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member will learn about it in due course.

Mr Speaker, I again bring to your attention and the attention of other members the fact that a member of the Liberal Party was not included in the panel of Temporary Chairmen, which I have always regarded as being an all-party panel. I brought to your attention, and also to the attention of the Leader of the House, that any one of the six members of the Liberal Party would have been happy and competent to serve on the panel of Temporary Chairmen.

I support the nomination of the honourable member for Ithaca without any rancour or any protest about the honourable member for Hinchinbrook. I hope that the House will consider the qualifications of the honourable member for Ithaca.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mt Coot-tha) (12.9 p.m.): I have pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the leader of the Liberal Party, and I support the remarks made by him. The honourable member for Ithaca has been a member of this Parliament for 17 years. One really does not have to describe the way in which he would officiate in the capacity of Chairman of Committees in this Chamber. In fact, he is the Chairman of Committees in this Chamber until the members of this Assembly otherwise decide.

I believe that there would be no disagreement if I said that the honourable member for Ithaca performed his duties as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees with great dignity, competence and efficiency and that he commanded the respect of all members. Mr Miller has all the qualifications necessary for this position. It is logical that, having been Chairman of Committees in this Assembly and having performed those duties in such a capable manner, and being eligible for re-election, he should be so re-elected. I support the amendment.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.11 p.m.): The Opposition is opposed to the amendment moved by Sir William Knox. I move the following amendment—

“Omit the words—

‘Colin John Miller’

and substitute the words—

‘Leslie John Yewdale’.”

When canvassing the question of a member’s ability to serve as Chairman of Committees, it must be considered that, because many of us have served on the panel of Temporary Chairmen, a number of us could fill that position.

Les Yewdale was elected to this Assembly in 1972. Currently he is party secretary, and he has served in most of the other positions in the Australian Labor Party. He has had wide experience in the procedures of this House and he knows the system of Parliament. I believe that if anyone other than a Government member is to be elected to serve the Parliament, it ought to be a member of the Opposition. I make that point forcibly because it would seem that, from the information given to the Opposition, there is a determined attempt by the Government to ensure that this is not a Parliament of the people but a Parliament of the National Party.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I rise to a point of order. Do I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is moving an amendment to my amendment? If he is, I bring that to your attention, Mr Speaker. I believe that the House must first deal with my amendment.

Mr WRIGHT: Prior to attacking the problem this way I was advised by the table staff that this is the proper way of handling it.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (12.14 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Rockhampton North is competent to carry out the position for which he has been nominated. His history and background in this Parliament show conclusively that he is able to accept the responsibilities of the position of Chairman of Committees. I have no qualms in suggesting to the honourable members of this Assembly that Mr Yewdale would do the job properly. He is the sort of person that members want to deputise for you, Mr Speaker, in your absence. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is: That the amendment be agreed to. Those in favour say, “Aye”; to the contrary, “No”. I think the “Ayes” have it.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Correction; I think the “Noes” have it.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I am sure that I heard you say, “The ‘Ayes’ have it.” You ruled in favour of the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: I tender my apology to the Leader of the Opposition. I made a mistake.

Mr Burns: Divide!

Question—That the amendment (Mr Wright) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 30

Campbell	Kruger	Vaughan
Casey	Mackenroth	Veivers
Comben	McElligott	Warburton
D’Arcy	McLean	Warner, A. M.
Davis	Milliner	Wright
De Lacy	Prest	Yewdale
Eaton	Price	
Fouras	Scott	
Gibbs, R. J.	Shaw	<i>Tellers:</i>
Goss	Smith	Burns
Hamill	Underwood	Hooper

Noes, 49

Ahern
Alison
Austin
Bailey
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Cahill
Chapman
Cooper
Elliott
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Gunn
Harper
Hartwig

Harvey
Henderson
Hinze
Innes
Jennings
Katter
Kaus
Knox
Lane
Lee
Lester
Lickiss
Lingard
Littleproud
McKechnie
McPhie
Menzel

Miller
Muntz
Newton
Powell
Randell
Row
Simpson
Stephan
Stoneman
Tenni
Turner
Wharton
White

Tellers:
FitzGerald
Neal

Resolved in the negative.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (Sir William Knox's amendment) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 72

Ahern
Alison
Austin
Bailey
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Cahill
Campbell
Casey
Chapman
Comben
Cooper
D'Arcy
Davis
De Lacy
Eaton
Elliott
FitzGerald
Fouras
Gibbs, I. J.
Gibbs, R. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Goss

Gunn
Hamill
Harper
Harvey
Henderson
Hinze
Hooper
Jennings
Katter
Kaus
Kruger
Lane
Lester
Lingard
Littleproud
Mackenroth
McElligott
McKechnie
McLean
McPhie
Menzel
Milliner
Muntz
Newton
Powell

Prest
Price
Randell
Row
Scott
Shaw
Simpson
Smith
Stephan
Stoneman
Tenni
Turner
Underwood
Vaughan
Veivers
Warburton
Warner, A. M.
Wharton
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:
Burns
Neal

Noes, 7

Hartwig
Innes
Knox

Lickiss
White

Tellers:
Miller
Lee

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

SITTING DAYS

Sessional Order

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

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o’clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and on Friday 25 November 1983, and Friday 16 December 1983, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and the aforementioned Fridays, and after 1 o’clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.”

Motion agreed to.

DAYS ALLOTTED TO ADDRESS IN REPLY

Sessional Order

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

“That the House may, on the Tuesdays and Thursdays allotted to the debate on the Address in Reply, continue to sit until 10 o’clock p.m. Each of the periods between 11 o’clock a.m. and 4 o’clock p.m. and between 4 o’clock p.m. and 10 o’clock p.m. shall be accounted an allotted day. All provisions of Standing Order No. 17 shall, mutatis mutandis, continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Appropriation Bill (No. 2)

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

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

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Appointment of Members

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

“That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 22, the Standing Orders Committee for the present Parliament consist of the following members—
Mr Speaker, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, Mr Gunn, Mr Wharton, Mr Neal, Mr Wright, Mr Warburton and Sir William Knox.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is—

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Those in favour say “Aye”—

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, in line with the Standing Orders, I have sought the call to debate the issue before the question is put.

Mr SPEAKER: Those in favour say, “Aye”; to the contrary, “No”—

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, if you put the question—

Mr Lane interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.41 p.m.): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is a pity that some Ministers do not understand a bit more about the Standing Orders. If they did, we might have more decorum in this House.

The proposal put forward by the Leader of the House is a total breakdown of the Westminster system. In today's "Telegraph" I noticed an article entitled, "Hayseeds stack the odds." The article is attributed to Mr Quentin Dempster. He certainly has depicted the members of the National Party correctly when he refers to them as "hayseeds". The important part of the article reads—

"Mr John Warner, the newly-elected Speaker, has a massive job on his hands if he wants to carve out a place in the State's history as a reformer of this most abused democratic institution."

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is reading directly from a newspaper.

Mr WRIGHT: I am allowed to do so.

Mr Hinze: You are not allowed.

Mr WRIGHT: Surely the Minister understands that every member has the right to quote from material of substance, and, when one considers the article by Mr Quentin Dempster, one sees that it certainly is material of substance. He stated in the article—

"... if he wants to carve out a place in the State's history as a reformer of this most abused democratic institution."

I stress the words "most abused democratic institution". It has been traditional in the Westminster system for Parliaments to ensure that parliamentary committees are truly representative of Government and of Opposition. We see in this motion a plan to totally distort, and in fact rig, the representation on one of our most important committees, the Standing Orders Committee.

One begins to wonder why. What is the Government up to? Why does it have to deliberately and blatantly misuse its numbers to give it this total control of a parliamentary committee that has the task of ensuring that the Standing Orders of this Parliament are such that the Parliament operates effectively; not in the interests of the National Party or of the Premier or any other Minister, but in the interests of the people whom we are supposed to represent? Instead of that, we see a plan here to totally rort the system.

I believe that the same will be true when we come to consider every other committee including the Printing Committee, the Library Committee and the Refreshment Rooms Committee. I am told that the same will be true when we come to consider the Committee of Privileges and the Committee of Subordinate Legislation. I see the Premier nodding in agreement. We have the affirmation that that is true. Why does he want to rort the system? Why does he want to control it in such a way that no alternative view can be brought forward?

Although those committees may not seem important to people outside, they are important because they are part of a system that is supposed to work responsibly. Parliament is supposed to have a responsible decision-making process. That comes about only when there is a sense of impartiality.

Virtually since the beginning of Parliament in Queensland, Parliament has ensured that its committees are Parliamentary committees—I stress that—not National Party committees. They have represented the various groups within the Parliament. But not now.

A Government Member: They do.

Mr WRIGHT: They do not. The Government is proposing control that will totally destroy the very system of Parliament.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I am not talking about the capacity of members to put a point of view. I am talking about the final determinations of those committees.

I refer particularly to the Committee of Privileges. What is its role? It is to consider matters that are brought to the House concerning the misuse and abuse of privilege. If the Government wishes to misuse the Committee of Privileges, no doubt it can do so by using numbers such as are proposed here. Through that committee it will be able to attack anyone.

As to the Standing Orders Committee, Mr Speaker, you have said that, although you do not intend to make major changes to the Standing Orders, you are prepared to consider the desires of the House. As is reported on page 8 of today's "Telegraph", you have said very clearly, to use your exact words, that your first loyalty is to the Parliament and not to executive Government. How can members have the considerations and deliberations of Parliament clearly outlined and defined if Parliament has a Standing Orders Committee that is so structured as to ensure that only the final views of the National Party members shall be heard? How can members achieve changes in the Standing Orders when the decisions of that committee are so organised, biased and gerrymandered that the final outcome must reflect what Joh Bjelke-Petersen or the National Party wants? That is totally unfair and is not in keeping with the Westminster system. It is not in keeping with the traditions of this Parliament or Parliaments of our ilk.

Anyone who looks at the break-up of this Parliament will see that the National Party has 43 members and the ALP Opposition 32 members, and there are 6 Liberal members and 1 Independent member. All members appreciate that there is never representation from the Ministry on these committees. The Speaker is always represented in that he is chairman of the committees. What must be done immediately is to subtract from the 43 members of the National Party the 18 Ministers and you, Mr Speaker.

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I hear the hyenas on the Government Benches laughing. Let them try to show me one nomination that comes from the Ministry. There is not one.

A Government Member: Surely you are not going to try to justify that argument.

Mr WRIGHT: I am. I have the complete list of the membership of the committees that the Government is proposing and there is not one nomination from the Ministry. All the nominations are from the Government back-benches. The composition of the committees generally will be 5 members from the National Party, 2 from the Labor Party and 1 from the independents. I stress the word "independents" because the Premier said that the Liberal Party will not be given any recognition here. I have no argument against the independents having a representative; I consider the independents should be represented. However, the representation given to Her Majesty's Opposition in the persons of the members of the Australian Labor Party is totally unfair.

I remind honourable members of the political parties' percentages of the votes cast in the last election. The ALP received 44.01 per cent of the vote. The National Party received 38.879 per cent of the vote. The Liberal Party received 14.9 per cent of the vote. The Labor Party has three times the electoral support of the Liberal Party in terms of votes, yet, on some committees the Government proposes that the Labor Party has representation equal to that of the Liberal Party and on others its representation is in the ratio of 2 to 1. In terms of seats won, the Labor Party has five times the numbers of the Liberal Party. Whereas the Labor Party won 32 seats, the Liberal Party won only six, yet the Government suggests that the Labor Party and the Liberal Party should have equal representation on some committees. On others it proposes that the representation be on the basis of 2 to 1. Even though the Labor Party's support is 5 per cent higher than that for the National Party, the Government proposes that the National Party have five members on the committee and that the Labor Party have only two.

If one breaks it down even further, one begins to realise that it is simply not fair. We come back to lack of fairness and integrity in the Parliament and to the knowledge that the members of this committee are being effectively drawn from 24 back-benchers, not from 43 members as is proposed here.

What will happen? The Liberals will have one committee position for their six seats; the Nationals will have one committee position for each eight seats that they hold; but the Labor Party will have only one committee position for each 15 seats that it holds. There is a manipulation, and it should not exist.

If one goes back into history, before the split in the Labor Party in 1957, there were 49 Government members and 24 Country Party and Liberal Party members in the Opposition. At that time the Library Committee was constituted on a 4:3 basis, including Mr Speaker. There were four ALP members, two Liberal members, and one Country Party member. The break-down of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee was Mr Speaker, three ALP members and three Country Party members representing the Opposition; in other words, 4:3. The Printing Committee was constituted on a 4:3 basis. It comprised the Labor Party Speaker, three Opposition members—two Country Party members and one Liberal Party member—and three Government members. Leaving aside the Speaker, there was equal representation. The Refreshment Rooms Committee was also constituted on a 4:3 basis, including Mr Speaker. There were three ALP members and three Opposition members made up of a Liberal and two Country Party members. The Standing Orders Committee comprised a Labor Party Speaker, three Opposition members and three Government members.

In 1960, during the first term of the National-Liberal Government, there was a similar type of break-up. On the Printing Committee there were two Government members from the Country Party, one being the Speaker, two Government members from the Liberal Party and three Opposition members. There was a 4:3 ratio. There was a Country Party Speaker and three Government members as against three Opposition members. The same was true with the Parliamentary Buildings Committee. There were three Country Party members, one Liberal Party member and three Opposition members, with one Country Party member being the Speaker. Other than the Speaker, that was again a 3:3 breakdown. That situation existed with the Printing, Refreshment Rooms and Standing Orders Committees. The Standing Orders Committee had three Opposition members, two Liberal Party members, a Country Party Speaker and another Country Party representative. History shows that there should be equal representation.

In 1972 the figures were much the same as we have today. At that time the Labor Party had 33 members. The Library Committee had three ALP members, three Government members and a National Party Speaker. "Hansard" records show that that was the break-up of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee, the Printing Committee, the Refreshment Rooms Committee and the Standing Orders Committee. Why do we now have this abortion of parliamentary representation? It is a distortion of the Westminster system, a system that is supposed to be truly representative of the parties of the Parliament. I wonder whether the Government wants to have control so that there will never be a change in the Standing Orders. If Opposition members put forward a recommendation, the final decision will be made by the total committee. Any recommendation to this Parliament will be brought to it, in effect, by the National Party. The same will be true of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation.

What we see here is a control of the only instrument that this House has over the bureaucracy. We talk about ministerial reports and reports from the quangos. Those reports do not exist. They never come to the House.

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: If they do, they are not debated. The Committee of Subordinate Legislation under a power that is delegated to it by the Parliament is the only effective instrument that members of Parliament have over the decisions made by the bureaucracy. Regulations are introduced. The various changes that are made to the law are binding on the people. It should not be forgotten that when regulations are introduced, even though in some instances they are not tabled in this House for six months or more, they become legally effective from the moment that they are gazetted.

Members from both sides of the House—in 1972 on the basis of equal representation—have always considered those departmental enactments. We could then say to the departments, "We won't cop that." I myself served on that committee. If its members did not agree with the department, they would go to the Minister. If the Minister would not change the subordinate legislation that offended, the committee members would bring a report to the Parliament and a motion seeking its disallowance would be moved. It is on the record that, in the past, members of the Liberal Party joined with Labor Party and National Party members to support motions in the House seeking the disallowance of departmental decisions. How will it happen now? How can we possibly get a decision through a Standing Orders Committee or a Committee of Subordinate Legislation to challenge anybody? The controls will be totally in the hands of the National Party.

I repeat that it is totally wrong, unfair and undemocratic. The system needs to be changed. There has to be proper representation. That will only be done when there is equal representation from the Government and the Opposition. Therefore, I move the following amendment—

“After the words ‘Sir William Knox’ add the words—
‘Mr Brian Davis’.”

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (12.57 p.m.): I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. If there were to be one clear and definite indication of what life will be like under the new National Party Government in the State of Queensland, this is it. Some of us in this House—and some of the public in our State—might have been naive enough to have believed otherwise. Only the other day we had an indication of what will occur when the Premier announced, despite the promise given only seven or eight months ago on behalf of this Government by Sir William Knox as Minister for Employment and Labour Relations, that he would indulge in tactics that would affect our State service unions.

We understand what will happen. Believe me, we in the Opposition will cop it. But it is our clear responsibility to point out to the public of Queensland what the Government is all about and to remind them that what we said the Government would be about if it won Government in Queensland this year was absolutely true.

I will not prolong the debate. The Leader of the Opposition has clearly outlined what seems to us to be the most important feature, that is, the precedent that was set back in 1972. Surely precedent is important. I suggest to all honourable members, particularly the new National Party back-benchers, that pressure should be put on this clique of Cabinet Ministers—on the executive Government we are about to see in Queensland—to ensure some fairness, not only for us but also for themselves.

Only yesterday, in the Chamber adjacent to this one, we, as honourable members of the Parliament of Queensland, sat silently, with our guests round us. The dignitaries of Queensland, including the judiciary, were present. We stood as the Governor and his entourage entered. The Governor took his seat and, not long after, he said—

“At the opening of this, the First Session of the Forty-Fourth Parliament, my Government reaffirms its allegiance to Her Majesty The Queen and gives an assurance that it will continue to uphold the finest traditions of the Westminster system.”

It concerns me, just as it concerns every other member of the Opposition, that today the Governor is made to look an absolute fool in the eyes of the public of Queensland, because his Government is to abrogate its position and fly in the face of comments made by him only yesterday.

The other point I wish to make is that, during the election campaign, the Liberal Party campaigned vigorously on parliamentary reform.

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

Mr WARBURTON: Before the luncheon recess I indicated to the House that the Government's decision to proceed as it intended was in complete conflict with what was said by the representative of the monarch yesterday in the Legislative Council Chamber.

In conclusion, the most critical component of the Westminster system is that Parliament consist of two equal participants in the parliamentary process. My opinion is that, by its actions, the Government has in fact prostituted the parliamentary processes and maligned the very gentleman who yesterday opened this Parliament. I suggest it would be in the best interests of the Westminster system and this Parliament if the Government of the day was big enough to reconsider its position.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (2.16 p.m.): I find myself in a very difficult position—

An Opposition Member interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: If Opposition members want to be rude about it, I will be rude to them.

As I understood the matter, the proposed membership was to be 4:3:1. Only 15 minutes ago I was advised that a different arrangement had been proposed. The House should know that although the Liberal Party is very happy to have, as of right, a

representative on the Standing Orders Committee and other committees, it also believes that as the committees are all-party committees, their membership should reflect the constitution of the Parliament.

An Opposition Member: Hear! Hear!

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is all very well for the honourable member to say that now, but he gave us a good deal of rubbish in regard to the panel of Temporary Chairmen.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That hurt, didn't it?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Yes, but the honourable member's philosophy is all for the Labor Party and none for anybody else. That should be made absolutely clear. I also point out that the Opposition voted against our nominee for Chairman of Committees.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is all very well to say that we are irrelevant; as far as the Opposition is concerned, Parliament is irrelevant. It is no use Opposition members making excuses for their inconsistency.

The Liberal Party supports the all-party committees of Parliament and believes that they should reflect the constitution of the Parliament as closely as possible. Because there has been a change in the constitution of the Parliament, we have to support the ratio 4:3:1.

I point out that these committees, which are normally formal committees of this House, are agreed to usually without debate. It should be able to be sorted out behind Mr Speaker's chair without any difficulty at all. That is what the running of the Parliament and all its associated functions is all about.

An Opposition Member: No compromise!

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The room for compromise is there and always has been there in the past.

It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to grandstand, as he did this morning, on his attitude towards different things. It has been the Liberal Party's policy for a long time to be consistent in these matters. So we support the addition of another person to these committees, commencing with the Standing Orders Committee. We do that on the understanding that it is a principle that we support, not because we support the Labor Party, which is entitled to recognition in the same way as the Liberal Party. I hope that the sort of remarks that were made by Opposition members earlier today will not be repeated in this Chamber.

Mr MILLER (Ithaca) (2.20 p.m.): I support the remarks of the leader of the Liberal Party. The matter we are discussing should be of great concern to this Parliament. Having had the opportunity of serving on the Standing Orders Committee for the past three years, I appreciate what it can do for Parliament. I am very disappointed that, although we were given a list yesterday afternoon showing that the Standing Orders Committee would comprise four Government members, three Labor Party members and one Liberal Party member, there will now be only two Labor Party members on that committee.

There should be a balanced representation on the Standing Orders Committee. I see no danger to the Government in having a 4:4 ratio. You, Mr Speaker, as chairman of that committee, would have a casting vote if ever an impasse occurred. But I found that, in the three years that I was a member of that committee, members were prepared to discuss a problem and agree to a compromise. Although the Premier was known by many as a man who would not give way, I was very impressed in that three-year period by his giving way to something put forward by either a Liberal Party member or a Labor Party member. I have seen the Leader of the Opposition do exactly the same thing. That is what the Standing Orders Committee is all about.

I want to read briefly from the "Encyclopaedia of Parliament" by Wilding and Laundry published in 1966. The passage refers to what occurred when the House of Lords considered whether it should have standing committees, including a standing orders committee. The authors state—

"The committee recommended against the proposal, however, mainly because it felt that it would be impossible to obtain a realistic political balance in a body which would, by its very nature, require to be a smaller replica of the House itself."

I believe that the words "realistic political balance" are the most relevant. I hope that this Parliament today will consider a realistic political balance on the Standing Orders Committee.

If there is a reason why the Leader of the House has decided to change the constitution of the committee from that circulated yesterday, I hope that he will inform the House of it, because I was very happy with the original proposal. I should like to know why the change has occurred.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (2.24 p.m.): The passing of this motion will end any chance of parliamentary reform of our Standing Orders. It is a very clear indication from the members of the National Party that they will not again allow what occurred in this Assembly last year when the Standing Orders Committee made recommendations to the Parliament and they were forced into the position of having to debate Standing Orders for the first time in 20 years. It is fairly clear now that members of the National Party said, "Some of our fellows made a mistake."

At that time, the Premier and other National Party members of the Standing Orders Committee agreed to a report recommending certain changes. But the members of the National Party then found that some of the changes the Premier and others had agreed to were not in their interests and they did not want them. That occurred because the changes would have given other members a fair go on the floor of the House. They would have put Ministers under pressure and made question-time sensible and reasonable and at least responsive to the way Parliament should operate.

What happened then? The Leader of the House and the Government Whip moved to defeat the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee, recommendations that had been supported by the Premier, the then Deputy Premier (Dr Edwards) and others on the Government side.

It has been said that we should be arranging these things behind the chair. Through you, Mr Speaker, the Leader of the House told us that the Standing Orders Committee would be in the ratio of 4:3:1. The secretary of the Labor Party, who is the honourable member for Rockhampton North, told us that the ratio was 5:2:1 on some other committees, but 4:3:1 on the Standing Orders Committee. I cannot understand why the Government now needs extra numbers on the Standing Orders Committee. That committee has always comprised three Government members, three Opposition members and Mr Speaker.

Which one of its number doesn't the Government trust to turn up or to vote as it would wish? Why does the Government have to load the committee with Government members? Is it scared that, in a debate, some Government members might be prepared to support reform, that they might be prepared to accept the recommendations of their fellow-members to reform this Parliament which is steeped in the 1880s?

Why do the numbers have to be loaded in this way? Why does the Government have so little regard for the ability of the Government members it is placing on it? What is wrong with Mr Speaker, the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the House and the member for Balonne, that there needs to be five of them to defeat two Opposition members when this committee meets? Why cannot this committee be more representative?

The Standing Orders Committee is part of our Parliament. This is not the Government's Parliament. Someone has suggested, however, that "because we won the election it is our Parliament." That is not right. It is the Parliament of the people. Those people whom the member for Callide represents as an Independent are entitled to have their views put here. Their views should not be stifled because he is the only Independent. The six Liberal members should not be stifled because they number only six. When I was in this Parliament leading a team of 11, I was screwed to the wall by the Government. I was cut short on staff and facilities. Every opportunity was taken to stop us from asking questions and speaking in the Debate on Matters of Public Interest. We were stopped from asking questions that the Queenslanders whom we are so proud of wanted us to ask.

What is wrong with this Parliament that we cannot reform it? What is so wrong with this Parliament that Government members are not even prepared to allow reasonable representation on a committee that could make good recommendations? The Government clearly has the numbers. What is wrong with having a committee that could bring forward some ideas which the Government could, if it so desired, prevent coming into vogue by using its steamroller tactics? Why should this committee be loaded?

It seems to be part of the inbuilt feeling in the National Party that it cannot allow anyone to have a fair go, that nobody should have a reasonable chance to put forward a proposal. The National Party has to steam-roller everything so that there can be no chance, no right. National Party members are saying, 'All for us; we are the winners; spoils to the victors and the rest of you can scratch round as much as you like in Parliament, and if it gets a bit hard Parliament will not sit, or it will sit for only a very short time.'

Mr Lane: You are a bit like Roy Harvey.

Mr BURNS: Maybe he learnt from some of the Government members. The Minister is the last one who should shout at me about parliamentary decorum or the operations of Parliament.

The Standing Orders Committee is an avenue through which we should be approaching you, Mr Speaker, about matters that were clouded because of the way debates were conducted last year relating to amendments to the Standing Orders. With some security we should be able to say, "Can we not refer to that committee the matter of how question-time operates?" Under the New National Party Government, it would probably be recommended that we go back to the 1880's. It would be recommended that we never again have a reform that would allow an extra question or a supplementary question to be asked by members.

You will recall, Mr Speaker, when those reforms were before Parliament. You will remember the strenuous opposition from the National Party towards any change whatever. Members of the National Party said, "Everything is OK. Parliament is going along very well. We are happy." Many people in the community look to us to see whether we can bring this Parliament up to date. The first step would be to have a committee to look at it—to do no more than that. There should be no great fear. The Government has the numbers and it is entitled to the numbers on the committee. It is entitled to have a ratio of 4:3:1. It is wrong that 43 members should have five voices, 32 members should have two and six members should have one, without giving the member for Callide any consideration at all because he stood against the Government. That is not the way Parliament should operate. It is in no way a fair go. It is to the shame of the National Party and this Parliament that we will be forced, through the use of numbers, to accept such a situation.

It is not fair to the people of Queensland, particularly those who fully believe in parliamentary democracy. It is not fair to those people who believe in the Westminster system and do not just pay lip-service to it.

I intend to vote against every proposal to set up these loaded committees. Even if it takes all night, I will debate every proposal and divide the House on each and every one of them.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (2.30 p.m.): During my period in this Chamber, I have never heard such hypocrisy or poppycock. We have moved a motion to set up a committee. It is the right of the elected Government to be represented on committees. On this committee, Mr Speaker is an ex officio member. The Government has four representatives and the non-Government parties have three representatives.

In the last session of the Parliament the Australian Labor Party asked that the membership of the Standing Orders Committee be increased to eight, and the Government agreed to that request. The member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest) was appointed to the committee, and the committee worked all right.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr WHARTON: I ask the member for Mackay to wait a minute.

Mr Casey: You are the biggest welsher who ever stood on his feet in this Parliament.

Mr WHARTON: The honourable member is the welsher. He will remember what happened with the Standing Orders Committee last year. I was not going to tar him with it—

Mr Casey: Three for Labor.

Mr WHARTON: The honourable member used to come along with a bloc vote. He would put his point of view. Although he did not get everything that he wanted, he got a lot of it. On behalf of Mr Speaker, I presented a report to this Parliament, and I did not welsh. The member for Mackay did not like the report being presented to the Parliament. Parliament decided the matter. The member for Mackay and the member for Lytton (Mr Burns) ran to the dissenters up the back—

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr WHARTON: I ask the honourable member not to keep interjecting; it will not get him anywhere. He went and made a shirt-tail arrangement that was quite contrary to the report that was presented to the House, but he fell on his face. The honourable member accused me of being a welsher. He was the welsher. Not only does he welsh within this House; he welshes outside the House, too. He welshed on the payment—

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr WHARTON: Mr Speaker, I appeal to you. The member for Mackay had a water resources contract at Gayndah, but he has not paid the people to whom he owed money. He welshed on the payment to them, and he has welshed in this House. He is a professional welsher.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The comments of the Minister are completely untrue and incorrect. I find them personally offensive to me, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr WHARTON: The honourable member's firm went into liquidation, and he can not get out of that one.

Mr CASEY: Mr Speaker, I raised a point of order. The Minister is completely incorrect.

Mr WHARTON: In all deference, I will do what the honourable member asks and withdraw and apologise. However, Mr Speaker, you might deal with the honourable member in the correct way, too.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister withdraw those words?

Mr WHARTON: I have withdrawn them unequivocally.

Previously we had a Leader of the Opposition who stood over certain people and did those sorts of things. Today we have a new Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether he is any better than the previous one. I must say that he is pretty hopeless.

We do not know how members on the Opposition side will vote on matters, but we do know that in August this year the ALP voted with the dissenters who wanted to change Government procedures. Those Liberal members who supported the ALP are not here today. The future for the ALP is not bright. It will certainly lose by its disregard for the people, and it will lose again at the next election. The ALP is on the wrong tram, and it was on the wrong tram when it went into the election. It used the media to try to gain government; but both the ALP and the media were on the wrong tram. A chap by the name of Quentin someone-or-other is reported as saying something or other. The ALP fell flat on its face, and the National Party became the Government.

This is not the ALP caucus, in which the leader stands over the members; this is Parliament, in which the Government, which enjoys a majority, sets up various committees whose members have been nominated by the various political parties.

I say to the leader of the Liberal Party, as he terms himself, that yesterday he was given a piece of paper that contained a typing error. It was the only piece of paper circulated in the House. I informed him of that earlier today.

Mr Burns: Who?

Mr WHARTON: I informed him of that earlier today.

Mr Burns: You did not give me one.

Mr WHARTON: I did not give it to the honourable member for Lytton. I am not talking about him; he should sit down and be quiet.

Mr Burns: I am sitting down. You did not give me one. I will stand up and say that you did not give me one.

Mr WHARTON: I said I gave it to the leader of the Liberal Party. I did not know that the honourable member for Lytton regarded himself as its leader. The piece of paper that I circulated this morning to the secretary of the ALP and to the Leader of the Opposition had the correct numbers on it. So the Labor Party should not come up with all this cock and bull about not having the right names. The Labor Party was given an up-to-date list.

A Government Member: They should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr WHARTON: Yes, members of the Labor Party should be ashamed of themselves.

What the ALP is trying to do is take away power from the elected Government. If a Government member happened not to attend a committee meeting—and that does happen—the ALP would want to enforce its will on the people, people who did not elect it to office. These committees are Parliament House committees.

Mr Wright: They are not your committees.

Mr WHARTON: I said they are Parliament House committees. The Leader of the Opposition should be quiet and he should listen. He has a very loud voice. I said that the committees are Parliament House committees. It does not matter what the total number of members on a committee is, so long as the elected Government of the day retains its rightful representation on that committee. The Government has nominated four members from the Government side and three from the non-Government side.

Honourable members have heard a lot from the Leader of the Opposition about how unfair the Government's proposals are supposed to be concerning the membership of the Standing Orders Committee. In the Parliament of New South Wales—

A Government Member interjected.

Mr WHARTON: I reckon it is a Labor Government.

As I was saying, in the Parliament of New South Wales, the Standing Orders Committee in the Legislative Council is made up of six Labor members and four non-Labor members, and the same ratio applies in the Standing Orders and Procedures Committees of the Legislative Assembly. So much for equal representation under Labor! I am sure everyone will accept it as being fair and just that four members from the Government side and three from the non-Government members constitute the committee.

Mr Fouras: Five.

Mr WHARTON: No, four; I am not counting Mr Speaker. Sometimes Labor Party members claim Mr Speaker is independent; sometimes they do not. They should make up their minds.

I commend the motion.

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

Ayes, 37

Campbell	Knox	Smith
Casey	Kruger	Underwood
Comben	Lee	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Lickiss	Veivers
Davis	Mackenroth	Warburton
De Lacy	McElligott	Warner, A. M.
Eaton	McLean	White
Fouras	Miller	Wright
Gibbs, R. J.	Milliner	Yewdale
Goss	Prest	
Hamill	Price	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hartwig	Scott	Burns
Innes	Shaw	Hooper

Noes, 42

Ahern	Harper	Newton
Alison	Harvey	Powell
Austin	Henderson	Randell
Bailey	Hinze	Row
Bjelke-Petersen	Jennings	Simpson
Booth	Katter	Stephan
Borbidge	Kaus	Stoneman
Cahill	Lane	Tenni
Chapman	Lester	Turner
Cooper	Lingard	Wharton
Elliott	Littleproud	
Gibbs, I. J.	McKechnie	
Glasson	McPhie	<i>Tellers:</i>
Goleby	Menzel	Neal
Gunn	Muntz	FitzGerald

Resolved in the negative.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Appointment of Members

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

“That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 300, a committee be appointed for the present Parliament to assist Mr Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members.

That such committee consist of the following members—Mr Speaker, Mr Newton, Mrs Chapman, Mr Littleproud, Mr McPhie, Mr Milliner, Mr Campbell and Mr Innes.”

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (2.49 p.m.): As was indicated previously in the debate on the compilation of and representation on the Standing Orders Committee, the Opposition is not prepared to accept the proposal put forward by the Minister. For that reason I move—

“That all words after the word ‘members’ second occurring be omitted and that the following names be inserted in lieu thereof—

‘Mr Speaker, Mrs Chapman, Mr Littleproud, Mr McPhie, Mr Milliner, Mr Campbell, Mr Veivers and Mr Innes’.”

In the previous debate, the Minister endeavoured to make out that the representation he proposed was in fact on a 4:3 basis. When one considers, Mr Speaker, that you, as the member for Toowoomba South, are a member of the National Party, there is no way that the figures can be rorted to substantiate such a claim. Instead, the fact is that the Government’s proposal is for a 5:2:1 representation—five from the National Party, two from the Australian Labor Party, and one from the Liberal Party. That is not satisfactory. The composition of the Printing Committee is similar; the Government’s proposal is 5:2:1. Honourable members will note that the Opposition is not trying to take control of the committee system and is not trying to usurp the power of Government in this way. It is trying desperately to stick to the Westminster system, the very system that the Governor of Queensland said yesterday, as was mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton), that the Government would stick to rigidly. However, 24 hours later the Government is doing exactly the opposite.

The Printing Committee does not sit, anyway, so I suppose I am saying that I want more members of the Opposition on a committee that has not met for four years. I could say, "What is the use?" But it is the principle of the matter, the principle of having Opposition members and non-Government members involved in the committee system.

The break-down that is proposed by the Government strikes at the very core of the Westminster model, yet the Government claims that it adheres to that model. I suggest that the Government has cast it aside.

I will go back to what has happened in the past, not just when a Labor Government was in power before 1957, but to 1972 when the Labor Opposition had 33 members. Even then the committees consisted of Mr Speaker—in that instance a member of the National Party—three members from the Government parties and three from the ALP. It was a seven-member committee with Mr Speaker as its chairman. So what the National Party, through this Parliament, is trying to do is stack the committee system to its own advantage. The Opposition is not prepared to accept that. The people need to know that this is symptomatic of the Government's attitude.

I have spoken before about the excesses of the National Party in Government and today, on the very first full sitting day, the Government is endeavouring to rot the system, to stack the committee system so that the National Party has total control. The question has to be asked: Why does the Government want to do it? As the committee system does not work, it would not be overworking its members. It must come back to the fact that the Government wants total control to protect itself against the possibility of a committee putting forward a recommendation to which the Government is opposed. The Government wants to prevent not just the Opposition but also private members of Parliament from having a proper say in this House. The Opposition opposes the motion and that is why I have moved the amendment.

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (2.52 p.m.): I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Although it was previously Labor Party policy to abolish the Senate, I have been amazed at how well its committee system, which makes a valuable contribution to the Commonwealth Parliament, works. It is interesting to note that the convention accepted by all parties in Canberra is that its committees have equal representation from both the Government and the Opposition and that the chairmen are members of the Government. That has been accepted by both the National Country Party and the Liberal Party in Canberra. Why can it not be the accepted practice in the Queensland Parliament?

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Printing Committee has been a farce; it has met twice in six years. As the Leader of the House said, it has a valuable role to play in the Parliament. However, it cannot play any role if it does not meet. Recently the new Government Printing Office was constructed at South Brisbane.

Mr Davis: It was opened without having any machines installed.

Mr MILLINER: I know it was opened as a political stunt before the election.

Following the construction of the new Government Printing Office, a number of matters will have to be brought to the attention of the Printing Committee. No party in this Parliament has a mortgage on ideas; it is only common sense that the committee should have equal representation so that matters that need resolution can be fully discussed to ensure that the decisions benefit all members of Parliament. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (2.54 p.m.): I do not think there is much need for me to comment further.

Mr Davis: No, because you want to rot the system as you have done so many times.

Mr WHARTON: If I answer the honourable member, it will be recorded in "Hansard" However, it makes lovely reading because the honourable member's point is untrue.

What the ALP has said is also untrue. I remind honourable members that the composition of the Printing Committee in New South Wales, which has a Labor Government, is two Liberals, two Nationals and six Labor. I need say no more.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (Mr Wright's amendment) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 42

Ahern	Harper	Newton
Alison	Harvey	Powell
Austin	Henderson	Randell
Bailey	Hinze	Row
Bjelke-Petersen	Jennings	Simpson
Booth	Katter	Stephan
Borbidge	Kaus	Stoneman
Cahill	Lane	Tenni
Chapman	Lester	Turner
Cooper	Lingard	Wharton
Elliott	Littleproud	
Gibbs, I. J.	McKechnie	
Glasson	McPhie	<i>Tellers:</i>
Goleby	Menzel	Neal
Gunr.	Muntz	FitzGerald

Noes, 37

Campbell	Knox	Smith
Casey	Kruger	Underwood
Comben	Lee	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Lickiss	Veivers
Davis	Mackenroth	Warburton
De Lacy	McElligott	Warner, A. M.
Eaton	McLean	White
Fouras	Miller	Wright
Gibbs, R. J.	Milliner	Yewdale
Goss	Prest	
Hamill	Price	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hartwig	Scott	Burns
Innes	Shaw	Hooper

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

LIBRARY, PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS, AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS COMMITTEES

Appointment of Members

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

“That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 330, the Library, Parliamentary Buildings, and Refreshment Rooms Committees for the present Parliament be constituted as follows—

Library—Mr Speaker, Mr Lingard, Mr Littleproud, Mrs Harvey, Mr Booth, Mr Hamill, Mr Smith and Mr White.

Parliamentary Buildings—Mr Speaker, Mr Borbidge, Mr FitzGerald, Mr Elliott, Mr Bailey, Mr De Lacy, Mr Veivers and Mr Lee.

Refreshment Rooms—Mr Speaker, Mr Randell, Mr Alison, Mr Cahill, Mrs Chapman, Mr Veivers, Mr Campbell and Mr Lee.”

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (3.3 p.m.): As I have stated on two previous occasions, a principle is at stake here. The arguments against what the Government is doing have been well advanced. I therefore move the following amendments—

“That all words after the word ‘Library’ second occurring be omitted and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof—

‘Mr Speaker, Mr Lingard, Mrs Harvey, Mr Booth, Mr Hamill, Mr Smith, Mr De Lacy and Mr White.’”;

“That all words after the words ‘Parliamentary Buildings’ be omitted and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof—

‘Mr Speaker, Mr Borbidge, Mr FitzGerald, Mr Elliott, Mr De Lacy, Mr Veivers, Mr Campbell and Mr Lee.’”;

“That all words after the words ‘Refreshment Rooms’ be omitted and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof—

‘Mr Speaker, Mr Randell, Mr Alison, Mrs Chapman, Mr Veivers, Mrs Warner, Mr Campbell and Mr Lee.’”

Mr YEWDALÉ (Rockhampton North) (3.5 p.m.): I second the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not think there is any point in canvassing the matters that have already been raised. When I was elected to this Parliament in 1972, I was appointed a member of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee, and I served on it for about 11 years. At that time the committee had three Government members and three Opposition members. It worked fairly well during the construction of the Parliamentary Annexe and the renovation of Parliament House. At the same time, I think that some influence was exercised over some members of the committee by the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton), as well as by some public servants. Nevertheless, those six people on the committee reached a fair measure of agreement. The chairman of the committee was always Mr Speaker, and during the period there were several different Speakers.

I do not think that the comments of the Leader of the House about what happens in New South Wales are relevant. Today we are arguing about this Parliament, this Government and these committees. This Parliament has to make decisions on those matters. Irrespective of what Government members say, I do not think that the community will accept the Government’s argument that it needs a ratio of 5:2:1 on these committees.

The six members of the Liberal Party, those independent people sitting up the back of the Chamber—I do not know how they are described—have one representative on these committees. The ratio for the Opposition is one to 15 or 16 members. Of course, the Government has five members, including Mr Speaker, on these committees.

The Leader of the Opposition said that Mr Speaker should act in an impartial and democratic manner in conducting proceedings in this Parliament. However, during the time that I have sat on these committees I have found that Mr Speaker has voted with the Government members. Such occasions probably were fairly rare.

I do not know whether there are many arguments in the Refreshment Rooms Committee or the Printing Committee. The greatest problem with them is that they do not function properly. They do not allow the back-benchers to have a say in their functioning. The Government does not want the committees to work very often, and it wants to dominate them when they do work. That is the present situation.

I believe that the Privileges Committee and the Standing Orders Committee are probably more important than the other committees in that they have a direct bearing on the functioning of this House and on its members. If we cannot win this argument today, in the eyes of the public of Queensland there is something wrong somewhere.

The Government is dominated by the Premier. He dominates not only the Leader of the House but most of the other Ministers. It would seem that the back-bench members on the Government side will be dominated to a greater extent by the Premier. Decisions which will be in full accord with the wishes of the Premier will be made on the appointment of these committees. We are justified in ventilating these matters today. We have to let the public know of the complete and blatant dictatorship of the Premier since the National Party achieved a majority in this Parliament at the last State election.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (3.9 p.m.): I intend to answer some of the matters raised by the Leader of the House. He referred to the New South Wales Parliament and to its standing committees. He likes to refer to other Parliaments and to the way in which the democratic system works. I will go a little further and refer to the Senate where the Estimates Committee C is made up of three Labor senators, two Liberal senators and one National Party senator, and the Estimates Committee B has Senator Bjelke-Petersen among its members. So it can be seen that the Labor Party does not

differentiate between political parties when it is in office in other places. This motion is typical of the stand-over tactics adopted by the National Party and by the Premier himself.

I am sick and tired of seeing almost every Speaker, Chairman of Committees, and Temporary Chairman of Committees from the National Party or the Liberal Party go to London. It costs the people of Queensland a fortune to send them overseas. When they return they say how marvellous the Westminster system is but not one of them has put into practice what he learned over there.

The actions of the National Party, the Country Party or whatever it is are typical of the dictatorial attitude adopted by the Premier. I remind the House that during the election campaign the Premier stated that the reason why he does not want standing committees, such as a public accounts committee, is that they are perks for members, who, he claims, could get as much as \$100 a day in expenses. That is the greatest joke I have ever heard in my life. Like the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I was a member of a standing committee that sat five days a week for six weeks. The members of that committee did not receive one cent by way of expenses.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: That is typical of the straight-out rotten untruths told by the Premier.

Similarly, the members of the Select Committee on Education did not receive one cent by way of expenses. The Premier is only trying to denigrate politicians. The real reason why the Premier does not want to see the establishment of a public accounts committee and other parliamentary committees is that their establishment would allow the people to see the rorts that this Government perpetrates on them.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (3.13 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. When you gave the call to the member for Brisbane Central, Mr Speaker, the member for South Brisbane, too, was on his feet. You acknowledged that, although you gave the call to the member for Brisbane Central. Surely the rules of this House should prevail and every member should be given a chance to debate these issues. I ask you to allow the member for South Brisbane to speak.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane): I move—

“That the member for South Brisbane be heard.”

Motion agreed to.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (3.14 p.m.): Today honourable members have witnessed a shemozzle with regard to the constitution of the standing committees of this Parliament. In the two terms that I have been a member of Parliament, I have served on the Library Committee and the Committee of Subordinate Legislation. I have been impressed with the impartiality of the committee members. After a while I came to the belief that there was no political bias on the part of the members of those committees when they examined the issues pertaining to those committees. In fact, on the Library Committee, the only concern expressed was with regard to the Premier's Department trying to dictate to the committee what it should be doing.

In fact, the then Speaker (Mr Houghton) and every member of the committee stood solidly behind that committee and made sure that people outside the Parliament did not dictate the way in which the Parliament functioned. I am concerned that the only reason why the committees are being stacked is that during the last session the Labor and Liberal members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee decided to support the appointment of Mr Scassola, the defeated Liberal member for Mt Gravatt, as chairman of that committee. Mr Scassola was the only person who had the ability to do the job in the interests of the Parliament.

I would be remiss if I did not join with other members of this Parliament and say that the electorate of South Brisbane and the people whom I represent would be absolutely appalled at the abrogation of the democratic processes of the Westminster style of Government that we so loudly proclaim. I suggest that this is a sad day for this Parliament.

If the media are concerned about where we are going in these early days of the Bjelke-Petersen regime, it is time that they pointed out that it is not good enough for the Government to be run by numbers, that the democratic processes should be adhered to. The Parliament should be allowed to reign supreme. It should not be subjected to the executive or to the whim of one man. It is time that we stood up and were counted. It is pleasing to know that the true Liberals will vote with us on this issue. Several Government members were members of the Liberal Party before they joined the National Party. If they were true Liberals, they would be on this side of the House voting on this matter of principle.

I support what the Opposition is doing. I will do that, as Government members would understand, until the cows come home. I am supporting a principle that is fundamental to the Westminster style of Government. It is about time that Government members understood what that means.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (3.17 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the House.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the House was not even on his feet.

Mr SPEAKER: I called the Leader of the House.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis): I move—

“That the member for Port Curtis be heard.”

Question put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 30

Campbell	Kruger	Vaughan
Casey	Mackenroth	Veivers
Comben	McElligott	Warburton
D'Arcy	McLean	Warner, A. M.
Davis	Milliner	Wright
De Lacy	Prest	Yewdale
Eaton	Price	
Fouras	Scott	
Gibbs, R. J.	Shaw	<i>Tellers:</i>
Goss	Smith	Hooper
Hamill	Underwood	Burns

Noes, 48

Ahern	Henderson	Muntz
Alison	Hinze	Newton
Austin	Innes	Powell
Bailey	Jennings	Randell
Bjelke-Petersen	Katter	Row
Booth	Kaus	Simpson
Borbidge	Knox	Stephan
Cahill	Lane	Stoneman
Chapman	Lee	Tenni
Cooper	Lester	Turner
Elliott	Lickiss	Wharton
Gibbs, I. J.	Lingard	White
Glasson	Littleproud	
Goleby	McKechnie	
Gunn	McPhie	<i>Tellers:</i>
Harper	Menzel	Neal
Harvey	Miller	FitzGerald

Resolved in the negative.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (3.26 p.m.): There is little need for me to do more than remind the House that at the last election the ALP did not win Government. From the way in which Opposition members have acted, one would think they were the Government. I remind honourable members that the National Party won the election and is the Government of the day.

One can only guess at how many committee positions would have gone to the National and Liberal parties if the ALP had won the election. The Labor Party has fooled itself all the way along the line, but it cannot fool the people of Queensland who elected the National Party to form a Government to represent them. The Government will respect that mandate given to it by the people. I commend the motion to the House.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (Mr Wright's amendment) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 42

Ahern	Harper	Newton
Alison	Harvey	Powell
Austin	Henderson	Randell
Bailey	Hinze	Row
Bjelke-Petersen	Jennings	Simpson
Booth	Katter	Stephan
Borbridge	Kaus	Stoneman
Cahill	Lane	Tenni
Chapman	Lester	Turner
Cooper	Lingard	Wharton
Elliott	Littleproud	
Gibbs, I. J.	McKechnie	
Glasson	McPhie	<i>Tellers:</i>
Goleby	Menzel	Neal
Gunn	Muntz	FitzGerald

Noes, 37

Campbell	Knox	Smith
Casey	Kruger	Underwood
Comben	Lee	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Lickiss	Veivers
Davis	Mackenroth	Warburton
De Lacy	McElligott	Warner, A. M.
Eaton	McLean	White
Fouras	Miller	Wright
Gibbs, R. J.	Milliner	Yewdale
Goss	Prest	
Hamill	Price	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hartwig	Scott	Hooper
Innes	Shaw	Burns

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Rail Freight Review

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Transport: Did he notice in the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor that the Government will be reviewing rail freights to ensure that the competitiveness of the mining industry is maintained and that its contribution in terms of responsibility to the Queensland community is balanced? Because of the obvious concern in this area and the press reports to the effect that New South Wales has reduced rail freights recently, will he outline the current position in Queensland?

Mr LANE: I noted the reference in His Excellency's Opening Speech to an examination of rail freights in Queensland. The Government has made that commitment. The matter is under examination. Because of the enormous economic impact that rail freights and charges have on export coal and minerals and on the financial situation of

Queensland the setting of rail freights is determined by the Government mainly on the advice of the Treasury. My concern in this matter is to provide a very efficient and reliable transport system to deliver coal for export. Honourable members will note the benefits that flow to Queensland from that system. The substantial rail freights collected by the department are designed to benefit the whole of Queensland's population and should not be lavished on rail employees by way of unrealistic feather-bedding of industrial agreements. The rail freights will inject into the revenue of the State funds that will help to finance hospitals and the social welfare schemes provided by the Government, and will allow the Government to undertake initiatives to attract further business to the State.

The Government has no intention of killing the goose that has been laying golden eggs for many years. The matter is under review by the Mines Department and the Premier and Treasurer and my department is having some input.

Group Apprenticeship Scheme for Master Painters, Decorators and Sign-writers

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Is he aware of press reports to the effect that there has been a delay in approval of a group apprenticeship scheme for master painters, decorators and sign-writers, which is to eventually employ 50 apprentices? Will he inform the House whether that report is correct and what steps are being taken to rectify the situation?

Mr LESTER: The question deals with apprentice painters. On 13 October we talked about a group apprenticeship scheme. All the guide-lines have been fulfilled. The scheme awaits the Federal Minister's signature. So far he has not complied.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LESTER: Opposition members cannot cop it.

The Minister has not acted. It is about time that the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations woke up and answered these queries and tried to help our young apprentices. As I said, all of the guide-lines have been fulfilled. Ministers under the previous Government were able to carry out requirements within two weeks but although the Federal Labor Government talks about trying to provide employment opportunities, when it is given a chance by us to do so, it is not able to carry out its responsibilities. I ask that the Federal Labor Party forget politics and get on with helping our young apprentices so that they may take part in the group scheme, be trained and be helped to a better future, and so provide more tradesmen for this great State of Queensland.

Appointments to Hospitals Boards

Mr DAVIS: In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I point out that in 1982 he appointed these Liberal aldermen to the boards of the following hospitals: Alderman Goss to the Chermside hospital; Alderman Coneybeer to the Queen Elizabeth II Hospital; Alderman Turnbull to the Royal Children's Hospital; Alderman McDonald—he was then a Liberal, but I do not know what he is now—to the Royal Women's Hospital; Alderman Rose to the South Brisbane hospital; and Alderman Atkinson to the North Brisbane hospital. I ask: As these aldermen are members of the political party to which the Minister belonged, and as he has now defected to the National Party, will those Liberal appointments still stand?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to put his question.

Mr DAVIS: He's got it; he knows what I am talking about.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to put a direct question.

Mr DAVIS: That is the build-up to the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to put a direct question; otherwise, he will sit down.

Mr DAVIS: The question is: Will these Liberal appointments now be changed to National Party appointments?

Mr AUSTIN: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked me that question. When those appointments were made, I came under some considerable pressure from the honourable member. The Government of which I am a member now, as did the Government of which I was a member then, selects people for boards throughout this State on the basis of their individual merit and ability. The Government recommends to the Governor in Council that people be appointed on their ability. I say to the honourable member here and now that in the future the Government will always recommend to the Governor in Council that the best possible person be appointed to Health Department boards and other boards. No matter whether the person be a member of the National Party, the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, we intend to select and recommend to the Governor in Council the best possible person for the job. I believe that that is the fair and correct policy.

Rail Transport for Expo '88

Mr DAVIS: In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I point out that on 30 May the Brisbane "Telegraph" carried the headline "Rails Grand Plan" for Expo '88. The announcement went on to say that the South Brisbane interstate railway station would be shifted to Roma Street.

Mr LANE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, would you ask the honourable member to stop waving paper around, speak into the microphone and stop mumbling? I cannot hear his question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to get on with his question.

Mr DAVIS: All right, Mr Speaker. I will talk slowly so that the block-headed Minister can understand what I am saying.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to get on with the question, or I will sit him down.

Mr DAVIS: I ask: Is it a fact that the plans that he announced have been shelved because of the cost? What was the estimated cost? Can he hear that?

Mr LANE: I did not hear the first part of the question because the honourable member indulged in personal abuse. If he repeats that part of the question, I will be happy to answer it.

Mr DAVIS: Mr Speaker, with all due respect, I do not think that the Minister can answer it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to repeat the question for the Minister for Transport.

Mr DAVIS: Well, I will ask him this—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member prepared to repeat the question for the Minister?

Mr DAVIS: I am certainly prepared to repeat it; but will he answer it? In May, he made the statement in the press that the South Brisbane interstate railway station would be shifted to Roma Street. I have asked him whether those plans have been shelved, and what was the cost of the plans.

Mr LANE: No, and we do not know the price yet.

St Helena Island

Mr SHAW: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his statement in "The Courier-Mail" of 27 July 1983 that there would be no damage to the environment in the vicinity of St Helena Island or any threat to fishing as a result of coral dredging, and to another statement by him this week that the Queensland Cement and Lime Company will now be permitted to continue dredging. I ask: Is he aware that a coral reef off St Helena Island, which was popular with amateur fishermen as an area that provided good catches, has been completely removed and only a barren hole remains? Does he still assure those concerned about the dredging that they should not worry? Will he release details of the

independent impact assessment that recommended resumption of dredging at Catalina Island, together with details of the monitoring program that he believes will minimise the environmental effects of dredging?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Government spent \$20,000 for a recommendation on that subject to be given by an independent body. The report said that there was mainly dead coral, or all dead coral, near the island and that no harm in any shape or form would be done to the environment. It said further that no aspect of the island would be affected. With that report in hand, Cabinet made a decision that dredging could be continued. It had been stopped for some considerable time.

Two other points that were considered were the greatly increased cost to home building if the company had to obtain its coral from other distant areas, and the effect that the closure of the operation would have on the jobs of 900 people. Cabinet made a decision on the committee's recommendation.

Rail Strike in Central Queensland

Mr ELLIOTT: I ask the Minister for Transport: Will he indicate the current position regarding the industrial dispute within the Central Division of the Railway Department, which has caused the cancellation of or delays to the Sunlander services to and from North Queensland and great inconvenience to thousands of tourists from Queensland, interstate and overseas?

Mr LANE: The Sunlander service to the north and the service from Cairns to Brisbane have been resumed despite the efforts of Mr Garth Head, the secretary of the Station Officers Union, who had attempted to call a strike over a staffing matter at the Miriam Vale station.

The award provides for a spread of 10 hours and a two-hour break to facilitate the working of trains on the north coast line. There was a dispute over the rostering and the spread of hours that was resolved quite adequately within the division, until Mr Head intervened. Incidentally, Mr Head is a prominent member of the Australian Labor Party and a colleague and comrade of honourable members on the Opposition benches.

Mr Head called a strike that caused delay and inconvenience to many thousands of Queenslanders, pensioners going on holidays and tourists who are putting money into the State. This very prominent member of the Labor Party overrode the wishes of the local people, including the station-master, who was not interested in going on strike on this issue.

There may be some industrial trouble in the Railway Department in the very near future because there has been a tendency in recent days for some deliberate stirring of railway personnel by some Brisbane-based union officials.

I could not help noticing that prior to the Federal election, when the Labor Party was so anxious to get the Hawke Government elected, and more recently, when it was anxious to try to win the Treasury benches in this State, very little industrial trouble occurred in the railway service. That was purely for political purposes. However, since the election, several minor instances of deliberate stirring by Australian Labor Party members, who also are prominent union officials in railway unions, have occurred. I sincerely hope that this does not augur badly for future industrial harmony in the railway system.

State Government Assistance to Primary Industries

Mr ELLIOTT: In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer him to the commitment made by His Excellency the Governor in his Opening Speech that the Queensland Government would remedy the imbalance in Government assistance to primary industries. I now ask: Will he assure the House that, on behalf of the Government, he will give that commitment his unqualified support?

Mr TURNER: I am aware of the statement made by the Governor in his Opening Speech. He referred to the fact that the level of Government assistance to primary industry is only 4 per cent, compared with 24 per cent to manufacturing industry. As is well known by producers and producer organisations in Queensland, those figures

bear out the tremendous amount of national export income earnings that are derived from primary production in this State and nation. They also indicate the amount of employment that is created directly and indirectly in rural industries.

The present upturn in Australia's economic climate can be more directly attributed to the upturn in rural industries as a result of improved seasonal conditions. It is unfortunate that not enough people in Australia are aware of the role played by primary industries. I also direct that remark to the Federal Labor Government because of its cut-back in assistance to primary industries in this country, particularly in Queensland.

I give the honourable member a commitment to do everything in my power to ensure that rural industries are protected during my term as Minister for Primary Industries.

Public Accounts Committees

Mr WARBURTON: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Bearing in mind his consistent denial of the usefulness of public accounts committees, why is it that officers of his department have recently held discussions with Government officials in the Labor States of New South Wales and Victoria on matters relative to the operation of public accounts committees?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Obviously the honourable member knows something that I do not know. I am unaware that they have been doing that.

Mr WARBURTON: I direct a supplementary question to the Premier. Because of his statement, because I am correct, and because the representations have come from not only his own department but also the Public Service Board, will he make available to this Parliament a full report on the findings or recommendations of the gentlemen who have had those discussions?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: There is absolutely no obligation on me to make a full public report available to the honourable member or to this House. Ministers are responsible for their departmental officers. It is not necessary for their recommendations to be tabled in this House. The answer to the honourable member in that regard is obviously, "No."

Reforms to Queensland Legal System

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I refer the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to his statements prior to the October State election in which he promised sweeping reforms to Queensland's legal system. I ask—

- (1) What reforms has he initiated to date?
- (2) What other reforms are being considered at the present time and when does he expect to see such reforms implemented?
- (3) Will he appoint a courts review commission to undertake a detailed investigation into the entire workings of Queensland's courts system?

Mr HARPER: Consideration is presently being given to reforms and to restructuring the Department of Justice. When the submission is finalised, Cabinet will make a decision and in due course the honourable member will be informed of the results.

Electoral Enrolment

Mr R. J. GIBBS: In directing a further question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to his public statements of intent to introduce a joint electoral enrolment card and ask—

- (1) Has his submission gone before Cabinet and, if so, has his initiative been favourably received?
- (2) What is the approximate cost to Queensland taxpayers of maintaining an enrolment card and enrolment system separate from those of the Commonwealth?
- (3) Will it be taken as normal procedure that any initiative he attempts to introduce will earn a public rebuke from the Premier?

Mr HARPER: My recommendations have been considered by Cabinet and it has agreed that discussions continue in an effort to obtain agreement with the Commonwealth for the introduction of a joint enrolment card. At no time has there been any suggestion

by the Government or me of consideration being given to a single electoral roll. Consideration has been and is being given to the introduction of a joint enrolment form, subject to agreement being reached with the Commonwealth Department.

Taxation and Employment

Mr STEPHAN: I refer the Premier and Treasurer to the broken promises made by the Prime Minister on behalf of the ALP prior to the Federal election, including the creation of 500 000 more jobs, the introduction of tax cuts and the reduction of fuel price, and ask: In view of the continuing increase in the Federal deficit, can Queensland continue its present policy of having the lowest taxes in Australia and creating more jobs, as evidenced by the latest figures which showed that we were the only State to register a drop in the number of unemployed in the last quarter?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is quite true that in every State sphere and also in the Federal sphere the Labor Party made a great number of promises at election-time that it obviously could not fulfil. Of course, among those promises was the creation of 500 000 new jobs, the reduction of taxes and the lowering of fuel prices. They are typical of the many promises made. A big burden has been placed on the community at large because those promises have not been honoured.

This State is very fortunate to have a balanced Budget. We are doing the things we promised to do. We do not have taxes that are levied in other States. As the honourable member for Gympie indicated, this is the lowest-taxed State. We believe that we can maintain that position. We are opening six new coal mines. On the other hand, mines are being closed in New South Wales.

I have with me figures that show we are the lowest-taxed State in Australia. The relevant figures per head of population are—

	\$
Victoria	577
New South Wales	509
South Australia	414
Tasmania	374
Western Australia	360
Queensland	346

Those figures show that Queensland is a good place to live. We can understand why people flock out of the electorates of Mr Wran and Mr Cain, particularly, to come up here.

We intend to do all we can to maintain our position. We want not only to reduce taxes but also to create more employment. Mr Hawke created conditions that led to the closure of the motor vehicle assembly plant at Acacia Ridge. We are well on the way to getting somebody to step in there and make use of those facilities. Our objective is to do something for the 900 men who were put out of employment, just as we are using our best endeavours to achieve our objectives in every other area of this State.

Committees of Inquiry

Mr BOOTH: I refer the Premier and Treasurer to a number of moves to set up numerous committees to inquire into just about everything and ask: Is this an attempt to take most of the business of the House away from public scrutiny and deny the House its true role of governing this State?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: This is one of the ills that have beset the Labor Party and thrown it off course. At the moment one of its pet hobbies is to set up committees of inquiry, judicial inquiries and so on. During the election campaign the Opposition committed itself to 17 of them, the last being a three-year judicial inquiry into the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

We know that the Labor Party does not know how to govern and that it needs committees to assist and advise it. It is interesting to note that every Minister in the Western Australian Government has an outside adviser to assist with the recommendations of his departments. Those Ministers are not capable of running their own departments.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: How many have you got? You have four constitutional lawyers to help you.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member would not have a clue about what he is saying. Every Minister of this Government makes his own decisions.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Wolston.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Can anybody imagine a Minister appointed to run a department who does not know how to form judgments of his own and needs an outside personal adviser to reach the correct decisions? The reason for all of these committees of inquiry and investigations is to camouflage the fact that the Labor Party is getting away with murder; but, of course, in this State the Labor Party is not the Government.

Financial Status of Queensland

Mr BOOTH: Is the Premier and Treasurer aware of an article that appeared in the "Telegraph" of 10 October in which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Wright) said that the State could run out of money by the end of October 1983? Has the State run out of money, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will be in the House later this evening when I would like to relate a story to him. At that time I will point out to him how absolutely foolish and ignorant he is and how unreliable his statements are. From that statement alone, one can understand why the people did not elect the Labor Party into Government.

38-hour Week for Sugar Industry

Mr MENZEL: Is the Premier and Treasurer aware that the Australian Sugar Producers Association has offered the combined sugar industry unions a 38-hour week in spite of the disastrously low sugar prices of the last few years? Will he intervene to stop the introduction of the shorter working hours? When will he tell the sugar industry that if it can afford the introduction of a 38-hour week it cannot justify requests to the Government for financial assistance?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I was surprised when I read in the press that the sugar industry was foolish enough to suggest that it should introduce a 38-hour week when the industry is in its current position. I cannot understand it. I cannot believe it. I just cannot accept that it would be stupid enough to do this when it is on its knees. As the honourable member pointed out, it will do the industry no good to ask the Government for assistance if it intends to unnecessarily give away large sums of money. The people in the sugar industry should rethink their decision at this time when everybody ought to be putting his shoulder to the wheel to try to stabilise things. The workers' attitude of working less for more pay is just not on as far as this Government and the rest of the community are concerned. All of us have to do what we can to lower costs because, in the economic situation in which we find ourselves today, additional costs cannot be accepted.

Brisbane Prison Complex

Mr FOURAS: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: Does he agree with the concept that in the past prisoners were incarcerated for punishment rather than being incarcerated as punishment? Will the Minister change his hard-line stance, which appeals to the worst and basest instincts of the electorate, when he suggests that there is no need to look at the problems that exist at the Brisbane Prison Complex? Will the Minister inquire into whether prisoners did get sick from eating food that was not very good, whether a prisoner loses the privilege of a visit every time he writes a letter, whether parole conditions are worse than in any other State and whether this Government spends less money on rehabilitating prisoners than any other State Government? Will the Minister order a full inquiry into the problems that exist at the Brisbane Prison Complex?

Mr MUNTZ: The first part of the member's question was absolute rot. I refuse to change the stance I have taken, which was, admittedly, a hard-line stance. It is obvious that the Labor Party is more interested in the welfare of prisoners than in the safety and

security of the community. The honourable member has to realise that prisoners have committed a crime, an offence against society. My first priority is the security of the prison and the safety of the community outside. There will be no inquiry as requested by the honourable member. The situation is completely under control.

At present the prison has returned to near normal. Those who require accommodation will receive it as soon as it is available. Those prisoners who created the havoc and caused the damage have only themselves to blame. They have made their bed and now have to lie in it. As soon as the prison returns completely to normal and arrangements have been made, certain prisoners will be accommodated elsewhere. I repeat that there will be no inquiry. I have called for a report, and I will be taking that report to Cabinet early next week.

Permits for Carriage of Goods by Road

Mr CASEY: I refer the Minister for Transport to the requirement of the State Transport Act regarding the need to obtain permits for the carriage of goods by road in Queensland, and I ask: Why has his department recently decided to remove, from 1 January 1984, the requirement to obtain a permit to carry navy beans, peanuts, prefabricated roof trusses, sugar-cane, sawn timber and tobacco leaf, which will mean a substantial loss to the State's railway system and more congestion on our roads?

Mr LANE: The goods and commodities mentioned by the honourable member are among those referred to by the management consultants, P A Australia, in a report commissioned by the Government and tabled in this Parliament earlier this year for the information of all members. If the honourable member reads that report, he will see that those commodities, which were protected under the State Transport Act in that a permit was required to be issued by the Commissioner for Transport before they could be carried by road, were not returning a profit to the Railway Department. In fact, in some cases the carriage of those goods was not even covering the cost, let alone making any contribution to consolidated revenue. So there was no point in continuing with a system of protection with respect to those commodities. Therefore they have been deregulated.

The second matter that was considered at the time was the need to provide the best possible form of transport system to those who wished to move commodities and goods from place to place. In some instances that can be done better by road. If there is no effect on the profit of the railways, and the goods can better be carried by road for the customer, obviously they should be deregulated, and they will be deregulated on the lines suggested by the honourable member.

Penalty Rates

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: What is the Government's present policy on the review of penalty rates? Is he aware of comments made by at least one Federal Government Minister that such a review is necessary, and does information presently available suggest that a substantial number of job opportunities is being lost because of the existing penalty-rate structure?

Mr LESTER: It is a fact of life that jobs are being lost because of increased penalty rates. It is another fact of life that the wages bill is increasing rapidly as a result of penalty rates. To take the matter a little further, I suggest that it is very clear that the tourist industry, for example, which is trying to attract people from all over Australia and from overseas, is being affected on Saturdays and Sundays, when many services are unavailable because of penalty rates. In addition, the State's trading position is made less competitive by penalty rates. In turn, that means fewer job opportunities. If goods are not being sold overseas, interstate or locally because costs are too high, people lose jobs.

In 1982, the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission conducted a limited inquiry, which found that in some sections of the tourist industry wages were being increased by 15 to 18 per cent. In the licensing area, the inquiry revealed that a 25 per cent decrease in penalty rates would mean an increase of 7 per cent in employment. It was also found that employment would improve by 25 per cent if no penalty rates were paid.

This Government is responsible. It is updating the inquiry. I point out clearly that any employer, if he so desires, has the right to put a case to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for lower penalty rates. If the Government sees a trade-off in the form of more jobs, it will support such an application. Lower penalty rates give a bonus in jobs. In the light of recent comments, I must reprimand members of the Labor Party who in the run-up to the last election, tried to make short political gain on the matter of jobs. They fell flat on their faces and could not continue their campaign when they found that the situation in Queensland was better than anywhere else in Australia. The Government will be responsible. At the end of three years, it will be working to ensure that there are more jobs.

Mr YEWDAL: I rise to a point of order. The Minister has been making a speech for the last quarter of an hour. He has finished answering the question and he is only grandstanding.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no valid point of order.

Mr LESTER: It is very clear that the members of the Labor Party cannot take the medicine handed out to them. It is also clear that the people of Queensland have a choice between increased penalty rates with fewer jobs and lower penalty rates with more jobs. The choice is clear. The Government, as a responsible Government, will take the necessary action, and not throw the unemployed on the rubbish heap. When the chips are down, it becomes obvious that that is what the Labor Party is trying to do.

Government Policy on Aborigines

Mr JENNINGS: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs: In regard to Aboriginal communities in Queensland, will he confirm that it is the Government's policy to consider not only the position of Aboriginal adults today but the future of their children and their children's children? Will he also confirm that the Government will not be stampeded into making any ad hoc, off-the-cuff decisions today without considering the ramifications for Aborigines in the future?

Mr KATTER: The issues raised by the honourable member emphasise what the World Health Organisation has said. Although I do not usually agree with what that body says, I do agree with the claim that it made very strongly—and it produced a lot of evidence to support the claim—that unless the health of these people is looked after properly when they are young, in later life they will suffer detrimental brain damage and a restriction in the growth of their mental capacity.

If we do not provide proper health and educational facilities the Aborigines will be handicapped for the rest of their lives. Unfortunately, at this stage, in order to provide them we must provide police protection. Enormous problems have arisen in providing that protection for those people. That is the reason why at present we are not being stampeded into rushing through legislation. It is also the reason why we have closed the canteens on at least one of the settlements and are considering the drinking laws in all of the Aboriginal communities throughout Queensland.

We will be bringing into this House legislation dealing with the deed-of-grant situation on reserves to guarantee Aboriginal children not only educational and health facilities but also access to the land that surrounds the communities now and will surround them in the future.

Transfer of Specialist Teachers

Mr D'ARCY: I ask the Minister for Education: Is it a fact that teachers in my electorate who have special status, that is, resource or back-up staff status, are being asked or told to transfer to class teaching? Is this being done throughout Queensland? If so, is it a charade for the Government to claim that it is reducing class sizes?

Mr POWELL: I have no knowledge of any specialist teachers being asked or told to transfer from their specialty into general teaching areas. If the honourable member has a case in point, I ask him to put it to me and I will answer it in the proper manner.

Bicentennial Horse-race

Mr HARTWIG: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I point out that Queensland racing clubs have made tremendous progress under his administration, and that he will be visiting Japan for the running of the Japan Cup. I ask: Will he consider the staging of a bicentennial cup in Brisbane that would attract racehorses from all over the world and would carry more prize-money than the Melbourne Cup?

Mr HINZE: Consideration has been given to the running of a major race, such as the one referred to by the member for Callide, carrying substantial prize-money, but there is a real problem with getting horses into and out of Australia. Although last year the principal clubs were looking favourably at such a proposal, they seem to have gone off the idea now, and I do not know whether I should resurrect it. As the honourable member suggested, perhaps the bicentenary might be a good reason for me to talk further with the principal clubs about the proposal.

Riots at Brisbane Prison

Ms WARNER: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: As he stated that the provisions at Brisbane Prison relate only to convicted prisoners, I ask: Is he aware that some of the same harsh provisions with respect to food, visiting, letters, also relate to prisoners on remand who have not yet been convicted of any crime, and that our justice system assumes that they are innocent until proven guilty? Will he investigate the allegations that prisoners on remand were bashed for communicating with the media during the recent disturbances, which could have been avoided if decent conditions prevailed at the gaol?

Mr MUNTZ: The situation at Brisbane Prison has been satisfactorily controlled and there is no need for alarm. I have received no reports of bashings, as the honourable member has alleged. I have nothing but commendation for the prison officers concerned. They acted magnificently and very professionally in a situation that required every skill to be exercised. I have good reason to be very proud of their actions.

The honourable member mentioned the food supplied to the inmates. In that regard, and as I have stated on a number of occasions, all inmates at the prison receive equal treatment. There is nothing wrong with the food that has been served up to them and the prisoners have no reason for complaint.

I am aware of the situation as regards prisoners on remand and those in minimum and maximum security sections. I am continually reviewing the situation, but I have no concern there. I have every confidence in the superintendent and the officers at Brisbane Prison.

Plight of Service Station Operators

Mr LEE: I refer to the plight of the many service station operators throughout Queensland and ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Is it his intention to assist them? If so, when will he begin an investigation into their plight, who will he ask to undertake such an investigation, what information will he be seeking, and when will the findings come before the House so that they may be fully debated in this Chamber?

Mr LESTER: The present situation in relation to the fuel industry as a whole, not only in Queensland but also over the length and breadth of Australia, is extremely complex. No Government is entirely happy with the situation as it affects either the service station owners or anyone else involved in the petrol industry.

However, I can tell honourable members that the price of fuel in Brisbane is lower than that in any capital city in Australia. For example, the price of fuel in Melbourne at present is 48c per litre, but in Brisbane it is approximately 44c per litre. That higher price is caused by taxes imposed by the Labor Governments in New South Wales and Victoria. Queensland is one of the States that does not tax fuel.

The Queensland Government will be conducting an inquiry into the petrol industry to see what can be done to improve the situation for service station retailers and for consumers, although Queensland's record in this area is better than that of any other State in Australia. The Government has an audit under way, with the co-operation of

the service station owners, and when that audit is completed, the Government will be in a position to work out what type of legislation will be introduced, if it is necessary, to improve the situation.

I will not be responsible for introducing, off the top of my head, legislation that may not work. I seek the co-operation of all people concerned to assist the Government to introduce legislation that will be a model for the rest of Australia.

Proposed Increase in Federal Members of Parliament

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: In view of his statements regarding the dangers of enlarging both the Senate and the House of Representatives, a view which is shared by many people in this House including me, and as the matter has not been determined in the Federal Parliament, is there any way in which he can bring influence to bear to change the view of some of the members of the Federal House to stop that Bill being approved and to stop the ALP sabotaging the Senate with the proposals that it has in mind because of the arrangements with the nexus?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I appreciate the question that the honourable member has asked. I think that most people are not in favour of increased parliamentary representation because of the cost and, perhaps, the public respect or lack of respect for members of Parliament. On the other hand, those persons in Canberra, particularly the National Party and the Labor Party members, maintain that those persons in the outback are entitled to fair representation which they say they will not receive with the present number of members. The majority of members will be representing the closely populated areas. The National Party is concerned about that. I have spoken to Federal members of the National Party at different times. That is the attitude that they have adopted. There is nothing that I can do about it. I can appreciate why they want additional members of Parliament.

Overseas Travel by Premier and Treasurer

Mr HOOPER: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Now that he is Treasurer as well as Premier, will it be necessary for him to travel regularly to Japan and to Korea every few months or, in some cases, weeks, as the previous Treasurer (Dr Edwards) did? If not, are we to assume that there were reasons other than Government financial business that compelled the now departed doctor's continued presence in the Asian flesh-pots?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member obviously does not appreciate the importance and value of the loans that we have raised. One for \$500m was raised by Dr Edwards in various parts of the world at the lowest interest rate and on the best possible terms to build ports and port facilities where interest and redemption can be met from the facilities provided. As I have indicated, \$600m will be borrowed to electrify various section of the State railway system. It will give a tremendous amount of impetus to industry and create a great number of jobs in many sections of industry. The loans are raised on the basis that interest and redemption can be met through the facility that is provided. The result of one loan will be lower rail freight rates. Enormous gains will be made. At the same time a great deal of employment will be created. Money cannot be obtained unless one chases round for it. Whether I go or whether somebody else goes in my place—

Mr Hooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The money must be obtained at the cheapest possible rate.

Mr Hooper: You are not answering the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked a question. He should listen to the reply.

Mr Hooper: I'm not getting an answer from the old rooster.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am giving him the answer. He just cannot follow it.

It is obvious that at some time or other someone has to visit different places to get the best deal to obtain the type of money that is needed to keep pace with Queensland's development. I emphasise that that is done in the areas in which interest and redemption can be met through the particular project.

Aboriginal Land under Deed of Grant in Trust

Mr SCOTT: I direct a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs. Following that rather quaint outburst in answer to the previous question, I am reluctant to do so, but I ask: How much longer will Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders have to wait before at least one example of the deed of grant in trust is produced so we can see how genuine the Government is in the provision of land for Aboriginal people?

Mr KATTER: A number of aspects of this problem will become evident to the House very shortly. If it makes the member for Cook any happier, I can tell him that I have been perusing my speech on this matter. If he and some of his colleagues had kept out of some areas in the north, we would not have experienced the serious trouble recently.

Mr Scott: That's a lot of rubbish.

Mr KATTER: The member for Cook went there on 11 November. The activities occurred at Edward River one week later, and the member for Cook was being quoted. He should maintain a very low profile in the House on these issues.

Aboriginal Health Program; Federal Capital Funds

Mr SCOTT: I direct a question to the Minister for Health. I understand that the Commonwealth Government has provided, under the Aboriginal Health program, funding for capital expenditure as opposed to operating funds. Some new Aboriginal health accommodation units are to be provided. If the Minister is not aware of that, will he be able to obtain information for the House on when we can expect construction of new Aboriginal health program accommodation units at Weipa, Kowanyama and Wujal Wujal, all very important places?

Mr AUSTIN: I am unaware of the allocation of the additional funds to which the honourable member has referred. However, I refer him to discussions I had with the former Liberal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Senator Baume, prior to the Federal Labor Government's taking power.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: No, it is not very long ago, and it is very pertinent to the question, because the member for Cook may be able to raise relevant matters with one of his colleagues in Canberra.

During those negotiations we managed to extract from the Federal Liberal Government extra funding for some of the programs we planned to embark upon within the Health Department. I was advised verbally—not officially—that the new Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Holding, has since cut back that program.

Mr Scott: That's not true.

Mr AUSTIN: I have been advised that it is true and that funds have been taken away from the Queensland Health Department. I have been advised also that the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs intends to expend its health resources in another direction. Its policy is that the Aboriginal people in Queensland are best equipped to direct their own health services. The Queensland Health Department is quite happy to administer those services; yet the Federal department, I understand, intends to direct funds away from the State department to services that can be provided directly by the people. We suggest that that is not the most efficient use of health funds for the Aboriginal people of Queensland. In fact, the system that has been built up throughout Queensland with Aboriginal health workers has proved to be the most effective system in Australia.

In conclusion, I give an undertaking to provide an answer to the honourable member's question.

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

GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that His Excellency the Governor, on Wednesday, 23 November, delivered to Parliament an Opening Speech of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. I presume honourable members will take the Speech as read?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mrs CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers) (4.35 p.m.), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!", said: I move—

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

'May it please Your Excellency—

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

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

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is the honourable member's maiden speech and the House will hear it in silence.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I offer my most sincere and heartfelt thanks to my Pine Rivers constituents for the confidence they have placed in me by electing me as their parliamentary representative. My special thanks go to my supporters, my campaign committee, booth workers, campaign director, and especially to my husband and family. Without their support, I would not be here today. I fully intend to work hard, earnestly, and with humility, to ensure that Queensland continues to advance in exactly the same manner it has done for over 25 years. The National Party's stability has been proven at the ballot box, and it is now able to govern in its own right.

The past years of a National Party-led Government have seen the abolition of death duties, making life easier in this State for those who have lost a loved one. At a time of sorrow, it is a comforting thought that the bereaved will not be burdened with the extra costs of death duties, which still exist in other States today. The abolition of gift duties lifted another great burden from the shoulders of Queenslanders. Yet another burden was lifted by the abolition of road taxes. Heaven knows how necessary this was for all those persons in the western areas in particular. We surely needed this alleviation in taxes to assist with transportation in these areas, or Queensland would never have flourished as it has, and it will continue to flourish.

The National Party-led Government has moved towards reducing pay-roll tax, stamp duties and land taxes. In the three years 1980 to 1983, the total value of building approvals was \$6,125m, an increase of 63.4 per cent in three years. In the same period, 20 new primary schools and nine new high schools have been constructed. As we all know, it is our up-and-coming generations that need our constant consideration, and it is for this reason that the National Party Government is proud of the fact that computers have been introduced into educational programs in all TAFE colleges.

Despite the interstate migration and the overall economic down-turn, Queensland, under the National Party policy of small business/private enterprise and through its resources, has been able to recoup jobs lost. Between 1980 and 1983, over 50 000 extra jobs were created—more than 11 times the number of jobs created Australia-wide. The National Party-led Government has consistently moved to reduce taxes and Government charges as a major part of its private enterprise platform. The record speaks for itself.

It has rejected financial institutions duty, petrol tax, and tobacco tax. We know what a burden these taxes are on the ordinary folk who have to carry the load if moves are not made to relieve the strain of taxes such as these.

Queensland has the lowest driver's licence fees and pay-roll tax, and the highest pay-roll tax exemptions. Through progressive policies this private enterprise Government, of which I am proud to be part, has undoubtedly proven its effectiveness over the past three years by creating an environment in which 59 000 new businesses were established and 38 000 new company names were registered.

The National Party Government is most definitely a Government that believes in the family unit. In assistance for the family, Queensland is known throughout the Commonwealth for its free hospital system, which is a must in raising a family in today's economic circumstances. Queensland's population growth is 3.1 per cent, doubling the national average of 1.7 per cent. Yes, everyone who loves Queensland as I do will agree that good government, sound planning, a good life and contented citizens must be the basis of a great nation. Is it any wonder that so many wish to follow in our footsteps? One can understand why people flock to our State thousands at a time, knowing full well that they will be cared for under a Government whose economic planning has been such that all those who are willing to have a go are given the initiative in this wonderful State, and will surely have their reward.

Through the Government's progressive policies, Queensland now radiates a strength and pioneering spirit which all other States admire. We have seen the establishment of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, and are the first State to appoint a Tourism Minister. No doubt that is the reason why visitors to Queensland increased by 22.9 per cent between 1979 and 1983, an average annual growth of 7.4 per cent. It is of paramount importance to ever increase the popularity of our tourist industry and to make use of those beautiful areas which Nature has provided for Queensland in great abundance. In 1982 tourism attracted over \$485,205,000 into Queensland from outside the State. Queenslanders spent another \$387,680,000, making a total of \$872,885,000. As every tourist dollar spent is worth \$2.60 to the economy, tourism is worth \$2.25 billion to Queensland's economy.

The Government has established hospitality training courses, upgraded tourist facilities and generally created an environment in which tourist enterprises can prosper. Is it any wonder that, between 1981 and 1982, tourism jobs rose by a massive 9.7 per cent? Industrial development has also greatly increased the value of tourism in our sunshine State, and that is why stimulus must be given to aid this industry through the reconsideration of penalty rates and the creation of more jobs.

In the past we have noted the vast support for our private enterprise form of Government. Our future looks even brighter for this, our newly formed Government. Small business plays such an important role in the growth of this State that a portfolio to provide the necessary watch-dog support to aid its development has been created. It is vitally important to continue that growth and give all possible help to small businesses to enable jobs to be created.

I believe I speak for most members of this Legislative Assembly who know only too well the importance of welfare services to any electorate. To relieve the problems in my area of Pine Rivers, the establishment of senior citizens' units and much needed help towards the building of more handihomes is imperative. For those honourable members who do not know what a handihome is, I point out that it is a home close to a normal home for handicapped people. It is for the use of handicapped people when their parents or guardians need a holiday, or in times of sickness or hospitalisation. In the long term, it would cost the Government less to aid Handihome than it would to build more Government institutions. It would also be far better psychologically for the handicapped themselves. I am proud to be associated with the starting of the first handihome in Pine Rivers, and I take this opportunity to congratulate all the persons associated with this project.

That brings to mind the importance of the family unit. I feel very proud to be part of the National Party, which has named 1984 as the Year of the Family. That undertaking means a great deal to me, because my first role after marriage was that of a mother, and I know that a solid family unit is the only way to help our Christian society prosper in the way to which we, as Queenslanders, have become accustomed. A family bond is of

paramount importance, and the family unit is the very foundation-stone of a strong and healthy society. Yes, in the Year of the Family, all people in our society should be making a conscious effort to be involved in, and benefit from, the spirit of the family unit.

The Queensland Government has established numerous child and maternal welfare centres. It is my intention to see that, during 1984, initiatives are introduced to support and encourage the family unit. I intend to see that these initiatives are introduced, and to ensure that deterrents are fought against bitterly.

Under no circumstances will I see legislation to relax drug laws come into effect without a good fight. I am sure it is the view of this Assembly that the illicit use of drugs such as marijuana and heroin are soul-destroying and contrary to the morals of our Christian society. Drug addiction is the consequence of a break-down of good family life and respect for our society. Legislation outlawing the use and peddling of hard drugs in this State has, I believe, been passed. However, without intrinsic encouragement for the family unit, these laws will continue to be broken. I believe that the natural and simple things in life provide quality in society's standard of living, and nothing is more natural than the firm base of a solid family life.

As a wife, mother, and business partner, I am proud to be a woman representing the Pine Rivers electorate. It is indeed encouraging to see more women members returned to this Parliament than to the last one. I believe women in Parliament provide a different point of view. They tend to be more compassionate and to understand more fully the role that the welfare, education and health services of the State play in the community. Through my experience in the electorate, I have found that the establishment of a women's advisory committee to help mothers who wish to stay at home, as well as those in the work-force, would provide a great service to the community. The roles of wife and mother have come under considerable threat in recent times, and I see it as my duty as a member of Parliament, and particularly as a woman, to be supportive and protective of these two roles under all circumstances.

Another component necessary for a healthy society is access to sporting and recreational facilities. Sporting and recreational activities in my area are booming. I know that each and every sporting body in Pine Rivers is for ever grateful for the amount of subsidy received from the State Government. My constituents are grateful for the way in which the State school facilities have been made available for the benefit of the whole community, and no doubt this will continue under the National Party Government, which stands for the betterment of Queensland.

As the patroness of seven sporting clubs and a member of a further five, I not only appreciate the progress that has taken place in my area but also understand full well the existing needs. I believe that sporting and recreational facilities offer to the community creative outlets and healthy mental and physical activities to prevent the destructive use of free time, which too often results in anything from petty theft to alcoholism.

In the Pine Rivers electorate, I would like to see, first and foremost, a police and citizens' youth club. Pine Rivers is a rapidly expanding growth area, with many young people in need of a community centre.

I have been a councillor of the Pine Rivers Shire Council for the past eight years, and I have found my election to the State Parliament to be a natural progression. My service in the council has provided me with a sound knowledge of Government workings and has made me aware of the problems associated with the co-ordination of the various Government departments. It is necessary for the State Government and local governments to act together in support of tax-payers and rate-payers.

It is my ambition to simplify the relationship between local and State departments by moving towards the elimination of red tape, thus enabling faster approvals, quicker subdivisions, more jobs and less interest being paid, particularly by developers.

Being a councillor, and having lived in Pine Rivers all my life, I have learnt a great deal about my electorate. I have constant contact with my constituents at a grassroots level. I have fought for their rights, helped those in need, and come to understand their requirements.

Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I say to the Honourable the Premier and Treasurer and his Cabinet Ministers that the most fundamental needs of my electorate are—

1. The construction of bypass roads, such as a southern and northern link, to assist in the alleviation of the congestion of traffic in the centre of Strathpine;
2. The completion of Old Northern Road as quickly as possible, to enable the traffic to flow more easily between Albany Creek and Brisbane city;
3. An extensive survey into solving transport problems in the Albany Creek and Bracken Ridge areas, with particular consideration being given to buses; and
4. The construction of senior citizens' and pensioners' units throughout the electorate.

In conclusion, I wish all members well in their efforts to improve and assist their electorates. I know each and every one will be working hard to achieve that aim.

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (4.55 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply so ably moved by the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman).

I express my personal loyalty to the Throne in the person of our sovereign, Her Most gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and I include the people of the Greenslopes electorate in this expression of loyalty.

I extend to the Premier and to the Government my deepest appreciation for their having honoured me and my constituents in the electorate of Greenslopes in choosing me to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech of His Excellency.

My congratulations go to the Premier for a resounding electoral win that has made history in Queensland and that will firmly establish this State on the path to progress and development well into the future, and will demonstrate to the rest of Australia the unique, hard-working and determined nature of Queensland.

At this point, I acknowledge the contribution made by the former member for Greenslopes during 17 years service in Parliament.

To the people of the Greenslopes electorate I extend my most sincere thanks for showing such confidence in me by electing me as their representative. I am acutely aware of the great responsibility that this position entails, and I assure them that I will represent the interests of each and every one of them to the best of my ability and the utmost of my energy. The people of Greenslopes have demonstrated an openness and frankness most gratifying to encounter and I look forward to maintaining and expanding a close relationship with them whereby they will feel free to actively participate in the representation that I offer. I am indebted to the Greenslopes branch of the National Party for its loyal and tireless support throughout the campaign and also to the many other helpers whose efforts contributed greatly to a successful endeavour.

Mr Speaker, "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government." These words expressed by Thomas Jefferson are central to the philosophy of the National Party Government. I wish to affirm my total commitment to this philosophy and to restate these words as a reminder to legislators that the central concern, "The care of human life and happiness", must not be clouded by statistics and economic expediency. The central concern in fact is "people". Human life and happiness is dependent on the satisfaction of basic human needs as defined by Abraham Maslow and ranging from physical through to self-actualisation needs. However, the only acceptable justification of Government, which also determines the limits to its legitimate authority, is its task of serving human needs—serving them better than would be done without any government.

With this in mind, I would like to emphasise two of the stated objectives of the National Party Government that I feel are essential to the fulfilment of governmental responsibility in providing such conditions by which these needs can be satisfied. I wish to stress this point: it is the role of Government to provide the wherewithal for people to satisfy their own needs as they perceive them, thereby giving freedom of choice to all as opposed to a big brother system under which a Government dictates the needs and then satisfies them. Let me state two National Party objectives that I feel are relevant to the economic and social realities of today, to which I energetically apply

myself. They are, firstly, the protection of the security of private ownership and the advancement of private enterprise through individual initiative and, secondly, the balancing of economic and social opportunities and community services in city and country.

I wish it to be understood, that although my prime responsibility is to my electorate of Greenslopes, I am not merely an urban representative in this Government but am most definitely concerned with the well-being and progress of the whole of Queensland. It is to this end that I particularly address myself to the most urgent needs of all Queenslanders by promoting private enterprise and the small business sector to provide those desperately needed jobs that give both employer and employee a secure and dignified position in our society.

I can do no better than to quote the words of the present Premier of Queensland, the Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, member of Barambah, and once the member for Nanango. In 1947, in his speech in the Address in Reply, he said—

“While I recognise fully the need for Government planning for specific purposes, still it cannot be too often or too strongly affirmed that the lifeblood of production and trade will still be the initiative, resourcefulness and courage of individuals and groups. And freedom is a fundamental condition wherein these characteristics are given the fullest encouragement—freedom to make decisions, freedom to act, freedom to experiment and to incur the risks involved in the undertaking of projects great or small. In the interests of the community the State must impose but the minimum of conditions, regulations and restraints, and beyond these must encourage, yea, demand the greatest freedom. In such an atmosphere constructive development is more readily attainable.”

This statement is as relevant today as it was in 1947, the year in which I was born. It is encouraging to see that the National Party Government's employment and small business policies are providing a climate favourable to technological development by private industry, specifically by establishing a Queensland Science and Technology Council and establishing a centre for innovation management to assist the small investor or businessman to develop and market his products and ideas. I am encouraged that this Government has had the foresight to create a Ministry of Small Business which, under the very capable direction of the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, the honourable member for Landsborough, would I expect begin to arrest the alarming failure rate of small business. Positive steps are already under way to assist this vital sector of our economy. Assistance is provided to aid formation of a single, independent body to represent the views of small business to the Government. This will at last give a voice and a cohesiveness of purpose to this part of our economic community which, as employer of almost half of the work-force in Australia, that is, of approximately 2.75 million Australians, is entitled to a great deal more representation than it has experienced in the past. Many of these businesses will be heartened to know that no longer are they the forgotten little people, the voiceless plodders in the business world, and now the much-needed legislation on shop leases will lift a financial burden for a number of them.

Small business is most certainly a major employer not only in Queensland and Australia but in fact the world. However, maximum effectiveness in the market-place of this important segment of commerce is sometimes restricted and the impact of its voice lessened.

There are a number of reasons contributing to this situation. Two of these are apathy and fragmentation by some sections resulting in a break-down of a co-ordinated voice in the presentation of their case to those in authority, whether in the public or private sector.

There are many trade organisations and commercial groups structured to present the voice of small business on behalf of the particular segments, and while these organisations form an important part, chambers of commerce or traders associations at suburban level are indeed playing an important part in the planning and presentation at this level of commerce.

In regard to this point, I have already had discussions with members of the small business organisations in my electorate and I have visited the Small Business Development Corporation and discussed with officers of that corporation the extension of involvement of traders associations within my electorate.

Planning for the future plays an important part in business and in commerce in general. Because of the changing scene in the market-place today, it is indeed important that those in small business set about to plan to meet the challenge that confronts them in the market-place if they are to survive in this time of competition and economic and technical changes that are taking place around them.

If we stop for a moment to think of the changes in technology, computerisation and other fields, we realise that those who are planning for the future must have a broad view of the scene. It is truly a time of professionalism by those entering the field of small business. When I refer to professionalism and training of those in small business, I refer to everyone from the owner of the business, particularly if he is involved in the day-to-day operations, to the newest employee.

While the Government supports and sponsors free enterprise, it is not so naive as to believe, as do some, that market forces will control the balance of the market-place. Governments have a part to play and, while keeping at arm's length, they must govern and plan.

For this reason, the National Party has viewed with concern the many irregularities which have occurred over recent years in relation to retail leases. It is my intention to speak further on this matter when the retail lease legislation comes before this House. I will be concerning myself with every segment of that legislation in such areas as the charging of goodwill or key money on the assignment of leases, the formulas adopted in relation to rent calculations or rent charges, charges against outgoings, renewal of leases and options, and the rights of tenants and, of course, landlords in relation to mediation and tribunal.

Small business throughout Australia is now feeling the pangs of pain in the form of controls and hardships being imposed at Federal level. Withholding tax and tax against genuine recipients of superannuation are just two of the schemes that the Federal Government has thought up to make life a little harder for those in small business.

It is reasonable to say that in Australia, and in particular in Queensland, we are starting to see economic recovery resulting from the changes to the world economy. Truly, the world economy does have an effect on small business throughout this State and, may I say, small business, by its attitude and input, if only in a small way, has an effect on the world economy. If we are to share in and benefit from the world's economic recovery, which appears clearly evident in America, we must get our house in order—and not only to benefit but also to compete at the level of the world's economic recovery. For this reason it is my intention to speak briefly on high technology and computerisation and its effects on those in small business.

Computers are playing a greater and an increasing role in the activities of small business. However, small business must realise that this is complex equipment which, if not properly understood and correctly operated, loses a great deal of its effectiveness. People are generally aware that computers are changing rapidly and are beginning to impact more and more on their everyday lives. A great deal of thought is being given by responsible organisations and the Government to providing proper areas of research and knowledge to guide small business more effectively into this age of high technology. I will be involving myself closely with the Ministry of Industry, Small Business and Technology.

Today, more than ever in the past, the small business operator needs training and I have recently familiarised myself with the services being offered by the Small Business Development Corporation and the excellent service being offered by TAFE and other institutes of training to those in small business. The National Party Government offers many services to those in small business and it is my intention to press for these many services to be publicised by the appropriate areas of Government in order that small business operators are more familiar with the services available to them.

The electorate of Greenslopes contains a number of small businesses struggling to survive in the present economic climate. Being an area that is largely residential, it contains a few small, scattered groupings of retail stores and a light industrial section in the western corner. On visiting many of these premises I was concerned at the despondency of many of the proprietors, who often felt they were facing a lone battle against insurmountable odds. I intend to make vigorous representation on their behalf to the Government and to the appropriate Minister because I firmly believe it is essential that those people be made aware, firstly, of the help that is now available for them through

recent Government initiatives and, secondly, that, given whatever stimulus is possible, the thinking and attitude changes to one of determination and resourcefulness that will bring out diversity and a fresh approach to the task at hand. I strongly recommend that an extensive advertising campaign be embarked upon to make these business people aware of the assistance that is available for them because awareness is the first step in problem-solving.

I deal now with our society. Special attention must be directed also to the family as the vital unit upon which our society is founded—a unit which today is at risk. Enormous social pressures are taking their toll on the families of today, as evidenced by the growing divorce rate. The greatest pressure falls on sole parents and sole survivor members of families, who are faced with the financial restrictions of their positions as well as the complex problem of not fitting into our social pattern. Many become the cast-offs, the forgotten ones in our society. About ten per cent of the electorate of Greenslopes is made up of sole-parent families (including those separated, divorced or widowed). We cannot afford such a large number to be ignored, and I intend to ensure that they are included in the plans for the Year of the Family in 1984.

I commend the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs, the Honourable G. H. Muntz, member for Whitsunday, for proclaiming 1984 as the Year of the Family and for his undertaking a State-wide campaign to promote and strengthen the family unit. Although the allocation of a further \$13m to reduce the burden of council rates on pensioners by increasing the maximum rate subsidy from \$120 to \$140 a year is a welcome relief—and I thank the Government on behalf of the people of the Greenslopes electorate for this—there are other areas of need that go beyond financial subsidy and do, in fact, require a whole new outlook. I will refer to this later in relation to the Greenslopes electorate.

Queensland is faced with an increasingly ageing population, yet we have not come to terms with this, as is evident from the lack of suitable accommodation for these people. Many nursing homes have long waiting-lists, and accommodation for those not yet bedridden but needing care is even more scarce. This situation is aggravated by working families being transferred away from their home towns and also by the need for the daughters, traditionally the nurses and caretakers for aged and invalid parents, to go to work. Too often the aged are encouraged to sell their homes to buy entirely unsuitable units in three-storey walk-ups, which later become a problem when they are faced with the task of climbing stairs. This type of accommodation contributes to the loneliness and social isolation of our senior citizens. Greenslopes is such a dense unit area and, with about 25 per cent of the population aged over 60, is in the midst of this dilemma, which must be faced. Can the Government not encourage the unit builders and developers to come up with a new concept in accommodation to cater for these people? Perhaps something along the lines of a retirement village complex would be appropriate. I would like to see some incentive scheme established to entice builders to supply more suitable and more specialised local accommodation.

If we are to be an efficient, progressive State, we must face the fact that so many of the State's human resources are wasted. Long waiting-lists in child care centres reflect a growing need of children and their working or sole parents. On the other hand, so many willing and experienced senior citizens are left to waste energies and skills that could be sent for the benefit of the community, particularly the young. It is not simply a matter of money; the need is for more thought, an acceptance of the social realities of today, and a willingness to co-ordinate the available human resources for the benefit of individuals and the State as a whole. This Government must lead the way in helping people to help themselves. By focusing creatively on the real needs of older citizens and by working to fill those needs, Queensland can serve its own self interest, which means that the State's quotient of wisdom, experience and stability will grow. It is important, if the problems of the ageing are to be resolved, that the private and voluntary sectors of our society join hands, create new alliances and pool their resources of concern and imagination. We must make business as well as Government more responsive to the needs of older people.

A great deal has been made of the fact that now, for the first time, the National Party has urban representatives. I intend to point out that urban progress and development has been under way for some time. The State Works Department, under the control of the honourable member for Burnett, is playing a major part in redeveloping the inner

city area, where, in the past 20 months, major projects worth \$61m have been initiated. These have created some 60 000 man-weeks of direct employment for people in the construction industry. The latest State Government project approved in this area has been the construction of the \$22m State Government office block in Alice Street. Over on the south bank is the ongoing development of the Queensland Cultural Centre, with work continuing on the construction of the performing arts building and the museum building.

The first stage of the Queensland Cultural Centre, the Queensland Art Gallery, is already catering for the cultural pursuits and enjoyment of thousands of Queenslanders and visitors, thus adding another venue for our growing tourist industry. This major State Government project is helping to transform that area of our capital city into an area of enjoyment, recreation and education for the citizens of Queensland.

Further down George Street, we have seen the completion of the new Courts of Law complex, which has provided the city's commercial centre with another important facility. Overlooking Coronation Drive, the new Children's Court, which is now well advanced, will be the focus of Queensland's revised juvenile justice system. In South Brisbane, work is under way on the State's first college of tourism and hospitality, a centre which will have a key role to play in training personnel for the State's rapidly growing tourist industry. A short distance from here, work is now well under way on the latest restoration project, The Mansions, the history of which extends back for the best part of a century. These are all signs of growth and of the State Government's forward-planning program to cater for such urban growth. It is, as I have mentioned, also a program that has helped create considerable work for the private sector through the construction and associated industries.

Mr Deputy Speaker, as you can see, it is primarily the city and its immediate environs that have been the recipient of this magnificent and praiseworthy effort. It is now my task to ensure that the disparity between the central city and a near-city electorate is rectified. I refer, of course, to the Greenslopes electorate. A great deal has been expended, quite understandably, on newly populated and growing areas to the extent that old areas such as Greenslopes are now becoming seriously disadvantaged, with a backward trend in local employment and facilities. I request that this imbalance be urgently rectified to ensure that the needs of the Greenslopes electorate do not become, as present trends indicate they will, the economic and social problems of the near future. I refer particularly to stagnating small business, dwindling local employment and an acute lack of facilities for the elderly.

I shall now outline the needs of the Greenslopes electorate. Large, modern drive-in shopping centres have enticed shoppers away from their traditional local centres. This commences a vicious circle, whereby the resultant closing down of businesses means fewer services and commodities are available, thereby attracting fewer shoppers, leading to even more closures. Such large centres cause people to drive out of their own areas where previously many could have walked or driven shorter distances. The sheer size and bustle of large drive-in centres is disconcerting to many elderly shoppers. What the Greenslopes electorate needs is a return of its former business. There must be a revitalisation through a much-needed replanning of the major commercial centre—Coorparoo Junction—to provide the volume and variety of shops and businesses that is presently lacking. I propose that the Small Business Development Corporation assist the electorate in establishing a chamber of commerce to stimulate local business. It should then be able to organise the commercial centre to maximise its underrated potential to service the community. Ultimately a local self-help spirit should be fostered with emphasis on buying locally to support the community.

I mentioned earlier that about 25 per cent of the electorate of Greenslopes is aged over 60 years and that we must provide for the growing number of senior citizens. For too long our youth-oriented society has looked on our elderly as a burden. This is a deplorable attitude and denigrates the contribution that the aged have made over a lifetime. It overlooks individual talents and skills which so many still possess but which are stifled through a lack of opportunity. I therefore stress that the misguided idea of segregating the elderly from the rest of the community by providing facilities aimed only at their group must be discontinued.

The excellent cultural and entertainment areas that are provided in the central city cater mainly to the younger age group in our society, as the elderly often find the city traffic difficult to contend with and the long walking distances a health problem. Therefore, these people are being left out of much to which they are entitled and have paid for. They should be provided with an area for interaction and communication where they are within easy reach of their homes and friends and which is part of their everyday familiar environment and of their ordinary routine—the shopping area, where they can use skills and talents and participate in cultural and community co-operative pursuits. To this end, I propose that a Governmental committee be set up to investigate the building of a community cultural centre, the advantages of which I will now explain.

A community cultural centre placed in the vicinity of the commercial heart of the Greenslopes electorate, would solve both the business and social problems of the electorate. I envisage that, predominantly, it would be an open-air area, as in the case of an environmentally beautiful square, where shoppers, pensioners and visitors could rest and have a snack while viewing, for example, a dramatic presentation by nearby schools. The area could also contain a small building complex for both cultural displays on loan from the city centre and for local functions. The advantages of such a centre are obvious. It would bring people back to shop in their own area, which would encourage local businesses to upgrade services, thereby leading to a reversal of the decline trend mentioned earlier. This centre, being for community use, would provide an area now crowded with unit dwellings, with a realistic entertainment and socialisation venue so desperately needed in this electorate. Further it would provide for interaction between all sections of the community in being a place of special interest for some, or just a resting place for shoppers and walkers.

The geographical position of the Greenslopes electorate is another important consideration. Being a nine square kilometre heart of the near southside electorate circle, its facilities can be used by the nearby encircling electorates of Chatsworth, Bulimba, South Brisbane, Kurilpa, Yeronga and Mt Gravatt.

Honourable members might say, "bright ideals by a new member". Perhaps that is so, but I assure members that my idealism is grounded in realism. I must face the realities of a declining small business sector and an ageing electorate. I am an industrious person, and I have come in with a new broom to sweep clean the cobwebs of old unworkable ideas and to replace them with workable proposals. I know also that this Government derives its strength, resourcefulness and astuteness from an ability to listen to, utilise and implement new ideas and skills welded to native wisdom and experience. I did say earlier that now was the time for a new outlook, and I venture to suggest that, in the project I have outlined, the community could elect to provide part of the funding for such a facility and thus foster within its numbers a spirit of co-operation and a degree of self-determination. Such a project would aid private enterprise in the electorate. It would provide more local employment. It would redress the imbalance in economic and social opportunities and community services that threatens to turn Greenslopes into an economically and socially depressed community, thereby, in sum, realistically carrying out the stated objectives of this National Party Government, that is, the advancement of private enterprise and the balancing of economic and social opportunities and community services, these being in line with its philosophy of caring for human life and happiness.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wright, adjourned.

SUPPLY

Vote of Credit—\$1,700,000,000

Mr SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services for the year ending 30 June 1984—

From the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland the further sum of \$765,000,000;

From the Trust and Special Funds, the further sum of \$875,000,000; and

From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account, the further sum of \$60,000,000.

Committee

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

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1983-84, a further sum not exceeding \$1,700,000,000 towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, received, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Committee

Vote of Credit—\$1,700,000,000

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

- “(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1983-84, a further sum not exceeding \$765,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.
- (b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1983-84, a further sum not exceeding \$875,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.
- (c) That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1983-84, a further sum not exceeding \$60,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (5.35 p.m.): I move—

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

The Bill appropriates an amount of \$1,700m for expenditure on the normal services of the Government. An amount of \$765m is appropriated for expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$875m from the Trust and Special Funds and \$60m from the Loan Fund.

The Bill will provide supplementary appropriation to the amount of \$2,345m already provided under Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1983. It will ensure sufficient supply for the Government to meet expenditures well past the end of December. By this time, Parliament will have dealt with the Budget legislation itself.

The Government has not run out of supply. In fact, had the State Budget been passed by Parliament on 1 December, the day on which it is now proposed to present it, there would be no need for the further supply provided for in this Bill. The additional supply now sought will enable the Budget to be debated in accordance with parliamentary processes.

Mr Speaker, opportunity is usually taken for some comment on the economy to be made when an Appropriation Bill is introduced. However, I do not propose to adopt that course today. As I have said, the State Budget will be presented shortly, and a major economic statement will be included with the Budget documents.

However, I do want to highlight the completely irresponsible scare tactics of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues during the election campaign with respect to supply. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. Quite clearly, the State did not run out of supply in early November as he continuously predicted; but he is always wrong. If the conduct of the Opposition during the campaign was not outright deceit, it clearly showed a great lack of knowledge in matters of public finance.

Before dealing with these matters, I want to briefly outline just what an Appropriation Act does. I am sure the honourable members on the other side of the House will welcome this little talk. They might learn something.

The Constitution Acts require that all Government expenditures be appropriated by Parliament. In some cases, appropriation is provided for permanently in legislation. The servicing of the public debt and salaries payable to judges are examples of this. In all other cases, appropriation is provided for by various Appropriation (or supply) Acts that are passed by the Parliament from time to time.

The Appropriation Act, that usually is passed at the conclusion of the Budget debate, authorises expenditures for the balance of that financial year, in accordance with the approved Budget. This Act complements previous authorisations provided for in earlier Appropriation Acts for that year.

It provides also for bulk supply for the July to August period of the succeeding financial year. A further Appropriation Act is then passed early in the financial year. That Act provides sufficient supply through to November/December, pending passing of the Budget and the main Appropriation Act for the year.

This has been the pattern for a number of years. However, there is no limitation to the number of Appropriation Acts that can be passed. We thus have this Bill to provide for a further bulk supply into January because of the delay in the presentation and passing of the Budget.

Supply has nothing to do with whether the Government has money in the bank or not. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition is listening to these things so that he does not make a fool of himself in the future. The fear generated by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government did not have enough money to pay staff was completely irresponsible; so was his contention that the Government would run out of supply in early November. It would be laughable if he were not the Leader of the Opposition.

At all times, revenues such as taxation and Commonwealth payments, continue to flow to the Treasury. The Government is always liquid. There is no such thing as the Government being broke. It would be, of course, if the Leader of the Opposition was in charge of the Treasury.

Again the deceit of the Leader of the Opposition has been exposed. He has been proved wrong again on this issue, just as he was proved wrong in his allegations over the Stanwell Power Station. Now is not an appropriate time to remind him of that. Mr Speaker, can anyone tell me when he has been right? That would be quite interesting.

I will now deal with the details of the scurrilous claim made by the Leader of the Opposition that the State would run out of Supply. He and his so-called experts even went so far as to predict the date. It is like predicting the end of the world, and I would not be at all surprised to hear that he had a go at doing that. I am sure he recalls the date. I repeat it for the interest of honourable members. He said, "I predict—I know—that by 14 November the State will run out of Supply." Yet we are still operating. For the benefit of all honourable members, I state the obvious: today is 24 November and the State is still going strongly. The State has met all its commitments and will continue to do so. The State has not run out of Supply, as the Leader of the Opposition would have had the people believe. He tried every deceitful way he could think of to win the election, but this one did not cut any ice. If it was not a deliberate attempt to deceive the people of Queensland, obviously the Leader of the Opposition made his claim simply without a knowledge of the facts. He did not understand the very elementary processes of funding Government activities. He did not have sufficient understanding or expertise to realise how far off the beam he was. He was right out in the wilderness. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I will tell him where and why he was wrong. It might help him and, my goodness me, he needs all the help he can get.

Firstly, he continued to claim that available Supply for 1983-84 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund was only \$920m. This was the amount of Supply provided for in Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1983 to cover the period from September to 30 November. The total Supply available at that time for 1983-84 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund was, in fact, \$1,620m. I ask the honourable member where he was when Parliament passed Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1982 in November last year. Surely he would have been aware that that Act provided \$700m for carry-on Supply for the July-August period of 1983-84. This has been the procedure in this House for decades and surely as Leader of the Opposition he should have had that much knowledge of how the State is run.

Secondly, total Supply is not just the \$920m which the Leader of the Opposition threw round in all directions; nor is it the \$1,620m that I mentioned as the true figure of Supply for consolidated revenue at that time. The total Supply provision was \$3,905m for all funds, comprising \$1,620m for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$2,100m for Trust and Special Funds and \$185m for the Loan Fund. I can hear the Leader of the Opposition saying, "What a whale of a time I could have had with my socialistic plans with all of that money at my disposal."

Thirdly, the Leader of the Opposition based his expenditure projections on the total expenditures of \$652m from consolidated revenue to the end of August. He assumed that all expenditure was made against Supply. He was, of course, wrong again. Almost \$30m of this expenditure was by way of permanent appropriation and therefore does not affect the Supply position. He was wrong on three counts out of three. He couldn't do better than that, could he? If it were not so serious that a leader of a political party could be so ignorant of the simple basics of administration of the State, or deceitful, it would be comical.

It is a pity that I have to take up the time of the House in giving lessons in public finance. I suggest that the honourable members on the Opposition benches do some study on these matters before they again try to deceive people for their own political gains and ends. Their campaign just did not work. The people have seen through them. The people want a Government that knows what it is doing and knows where it is going. That's why we are here today on this side of the House.

I will not dwell further on the inadequacies of the honourable members on the Opposition benches. Their lack of knowledge—or their outright deceit—is exposed for all to see.

Mr Scott: Who wrote that for you, Joh?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is a good speech, isn't it?

As I have said, the Bill will provide for authority for normal expenditures by the Government pending passing of the Budget legislation. It is in many respects a technical piece of legislation, but it is vitally important to the processes of Government. It will ensure that the people of Queensland continue to receive the good standard of services they have come to expect from this Government.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (5.46 p.m.): It is very important for all honourable members to understand the importance of any money Bill. I am sure that all honourable members on the Opposition benches will agree that it is a great shame that the Premier-cum-Treasurer, in his first speech in this Chamber as Treasurer of the Government of Queensland, did not see fit, on this very important money bill relating to the appropriation of millions upon millions of dollars, to give any explanation of the expenditure through the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds, or the Loan Fund Account. He simply delivered the usual tirade of semi-abuse that we have come to expect from him.

The Premier's claims about the inaccuracy of the Opposition's statements on money supply cannot possibly be sustained. It is a fact that the former Treasurer of this State (Dr Edwards) advised that money would last until mid-December. The Premier-cum-Treasurer of Queensland advised that the date was early December, and Treasury sources were quoted on the radio program "AM" as stating that it would be mid-November. Today is 23 November. I admit that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Wright) initially referred to the money supply running out in mid-November.

The very fact that this Appropriation Bill is being presented to cover the period until the Budget justifies the claim that the State is running out of money.

Government Members interjected.

Mr **WARBURTON**: Then let the Premier and Treasurer or the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) explain why for two successive pay periods the State's public servants have not received the 4.3 per cent wage increase that resulted from a flow-on of the National Wage decision.

I refer to the rather startling statement made by the Premier and Treasurer today in answer to my first question at question-time in which he denied knowledge of officers of his department speaking to officers in other States about the operation of public accounts committees. Those honourable members who were here would certainly have heard the Premier's denial. On the one hand, the Premier is constantly denigrating moves to bring about accountability through the activities of a committee that would be appointed by this Parliament; yet, on the other hand, he is prepared to use to his own ends the reports and the work carried out by public accounts committees of Labor Governments in southern States. I refuse to accept that the Premier and Treasurer is unaware of the discussions that recently took place, discussions that included the June 1983 report of the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee into the recording and accounting requirements for statutory authorities. It is evidently good enough for the Premier to recognise the necessity for certain public accounts committees to operate and he is evidently prepared to call upon them for advice and assistance, but he continues with what has now been shown today by his answer to me to be hypocritical opposition to a public accounts committee being set up in this Parliament.

In early August this year we debated the Appropriation Bill (No. 1). The Treasurer (Dr Edwards) at that stage went to some pains to defend his Government against assertions that Queensland's budgetary situation was worse than that in other States. Statistics were forthcoming from the Australian Bureau of Statistics which no doubt caused a great deal of pain and embarrassment to Dr Edwards and his Government.

The Government's defence of the \$1,100m deficit claimed by the Australian Bureau of Statistics was that the bureau's publication purported only to show the level of funds needed to be raised by the State to fund its expenditures. Dr Edwards said that the figure of \$1,100m was high because capital expenditure on infrastructure was high as a result of resource development in this State, and in Queensland's case a significant proportion of these long-term funds is provided by coal companies and the like by way of security deposits for railways, ports and other works.

If we examine more closely the official publication which relates to Government financial estimates, as we were invited to do by Dr Edwards, we see that in Queensland's case the deficit, or the State Budget debt if we could more appropriately call it that, rose dramatically from \$370m in 1981-82 to \$1,113m in 1982-83, and it was this dramatic one-year increase of over 300 per cent that we believed required State Government explanation in some detail.

Prior to 1981-82 the Budget debt incurred on an annual basis had been fairly constant at between \$220m and \$230m over a number of years. Interest payments on the 1982-83 Budget debt are shown in the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication as being \$368m. To add to the problem, the State authorities debt outside the Budget went from \$361m in 1981-82 to \$895 in 1982-83, increasing in one year by over 250 per cent. The total debt of all State authorities rose in one year from \$894m to \$1,900m, and it is this dramatic increase, mainly in borrowings, that the Government has as yet left unexplained.

The former Treasurer consistently referred to the coal export industry as Queensland's glamour industry, and it is reasonable to assume that the loans resulting in the debt are directly related to Queensland's resource development projects. But we are not told the details of the borrowings, and all efforts to obtain a break-down of the borrowings have been thwarted by the Queensland Government, and in particular by the former Treasurer, Dr Edwards. We should be advised, too, when the debts fall due. That is the crucial question, because there is reason to believe that Queensland will feel the full force of loan repayment demands in the mid to late 1980s, particularly if resource development in Queensland continues its present rate of decline.

Already major developers are feeling the brunt of the economic downturn, particularly the coal industry where \$120m worth of coal-mining equipment presently lies idle, mainly owing to cuts in coal imports and a reduction in prices by Japan.

On 23 March this year the former Treasurer said that no borrowings as such had been undertaken by the State Government in respect of infrastructure projects. He said that in response to a question asked in this place, yet clear evidence is to be found in the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1982-83 publication that Queensland's deficit or indebtedness incurred in 1982-83 soared from \$894m to \$1,900m, with interest repayments on the total public sector debt rising to an estimated \$556m. There seems little doubt that this Government put tremendous faith in the State resources boom which, as an eminent economic analyst claims, has now gone bust.

The rate of coal industry development particularly has slumped to a level that must cause tremendous worry and concern. Queensland mine operators are claiming that rail freight charges on their product are excessive and have made Queensland coal uncompetitive on the world market. Coal royalties and freight charges have certainly boosted State Treasury coffers so far this year. Last year's levy of \$262m represented 20 per cent of total State tax revenue. If the claims by coal companies are correct, what they describe as excessive freight charges have caused the loss of contracts worth millions of dollars and could finally result in mine closures and loss of employment.

The executive director of the Queensland Chamber of Mines very recently summed up the present situation in Queensland in saying—

“We used to have the edge in Queensland over our competitors because mines are close to the ports and this is what has made Queensland so successful. It is fair to say all the development and growth of Queensland is resource related.

Now the rail charges are the world's highest and we are uncompetitive.

In the past, Mr Bjelke-Petersen has blamed higher wages for making coal uncompetitive. But there is no doubt that rail freight and not wages is the single most important factor.”

Mr Pinnock's claims are fully supported by Mr Graham Tucker, chairman of Allied Queensland Coalfields, who paints a very concerned picture about the future of Queensland's golden goose industry, unless the Queensland Government is prepared to accept its lost revenue share as the result of the economic downturn.

Mr Tucker, in his recent annual report, said—

“In these times of price and demand difficulty for coal, the State Government monopoly system of transport should take its share of the loss thus imposed on the coal trade.

If it fails to do so it will run the distinct risk of losing all the benefit of the carriage of coal which could arise from mines being forced to close.

The State cannot be expected to be a participant in the profit of the industry in good times—and I for one have no objection to this concept—unless it accepts that it must also be a participant in losses when the world demand and price situation, imposes a downturn on the whole trade.”

So we can see that our State, which was riding high on a previous resources boom and locking itself into a resource-based economy, has got financial problems from which we will have trouble extricating ourselves.

If the coal industry leaders are correct, the future scenarios involve either a retention of high State taxes on the industry, resulting in possible mine closures and resultant job losses or, alternatively, new State Government coal rail freight deals, resulting in less revenue flowing into the State Treasury coffers. If the last-mentioned option is the one chosen by the Government—some reference was made to that yesterday in the Governor's Opening Speech, and again today—it remains to be seen how the Government adjusts to the obvious reduction in State revenue that will ensue.

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

Mr WARBURTON: I would prefer to see the entire system of royalty payments and structured rail freight charges for Queensland's coal industry completely revamped with a view to establishing a fair and equitable royalty system that will allow companies to plan within parameters of certainty. Any State Government has a responsibility to

ensure that the State is appropriately compensated for granting mine-owners rights to mine, and for the depletion of non-renewable resources. It must also ensure that the royalty system takes into consideration the size of expenditure required to develop the deposits, together with the associated risks, makes provision for variability according to company profitability, and provides for equity for both parties.

The present system, which was forced upon the industry by the Queensland Government, includes rail freight charges calculated to include cost, interest and redemption and profit components. These charges amount to a quasi-resource-rent tax of a rather crude form. I consider the present system perpetuated by the present Government to be ad hoc, discriminatory and sadly lacking in respect of equitable return to both the State and the companies. A more rational system of royalty payments is needed, one that takes into account the fluctuation in international markets, the risk factors, high social and industrial development costs, wage structures, mine locations and many other relevant factors.

Currently, Queensland has a small royalty charge on production and a quasi-resource-rent tax in the form of structured rail freight charges for mineral lines. A logical and more equitable mineral taxation system is desirable if both the coal mining companies and the people of Queensland are to continue to benefit from mining investments. The establishment of a two-tier royalty system, with part A comprising a charge on production and part B comprising a percentage of gross profit, would ensure a fair and equitable return from the exploitation of the State's resources and, at the same time, allow variability according to mining company profits and the health of the industry.

Most importantly, stability and predictability have to be priority objectives, with companies being able, within conditions of certainty, to make long-term investment decisions that eventually will be of benefit to the State of Queensland. There seems to be little doubt that the Queensland Government's mind was boggled by the resources boom that took place in this State. It was as if the Premier and his Ministers were fitted with blinkers. They could see the golden eggs rolling in but were unable to grasp the fact that then was the time to capitalise on what was happening.

In September of this year, Professor Ted Kolsen, a Professor of Economics at the University of Queensland, criticised the Queensland Government, and the Premier in particular, for not encouraging or promoting labour-intensive manufacturing industry. He said—

“Manufacturing industries are the cushion on which a resource based economy must fall back when it gets into trouble. Whether you like it or not, they are the ones that employ a hell of a lot of people. And when the problem becomes one of employing people rather than development as such then we haven't got the right policies. My serious concern is that he's inspired absolutely no confidence where initiative is needed, when growth is subdued, or has actually declined. I think we can expect very little from this Government in that regard because it has shown very little understanding of the underlying problems of the economy.”

In the light of the very recent critical statements on the Queensland economy by industry leaders, economists and others, it is reasonable to say that the Queensland Government is skating on a very thin layer of ice.

Despite the resource development revenue and boasts about a low-tax State, the Commonwealth Grants Commission in its 1982 report on State tax-sharing and health grants clearly shows that Queenslanders are not receiving the levels of service and revenue effort to which they are entitled.

In respect of moneys on a per capita basis provided by the State for education the Queensland Government only provides 82.8 per cent of the national average—the least of any State. In health, moneys provided by the State on a per capita basis represent only 74.4 per cent of the national average, again by far the lowest of any of the Australian States. In respect of moneys on a per capita basis provided for law, order and public safety, the Queensland Government provides 92.5 per cent of the national average, and in total social services and business undertakings, only 80.6 per cent and 79.4 per cent respectively. Queensland's total expenditure is currently 82.6 per cent of the national average whilst all other States are above the national average. If this is the sort of treatment meted out to Queenslanders in what the present Government tells us are the good times, what are we to expect if State revenue from resources development projects reduces, as it would seem may have to occur in the near future?

Whilst the Government continues to pump out its propaganda as to how well off we are in Queensland, the facts show that under-spending by the Bjelke-Petersen Government on services to industry as calculated by the Commonwealth Grants Commission was \$11.4m for 1980-81. Such an assessment indicates the poor level of assistance and encouragement for industrial growth offered by the Queensland Government. State Government industry assistance measures are clearly deficient and even if the needs estimate was fully allocated, it would take years to overcome the accumulated results of neglect.

Queensland's agricultural industry contributed \$2,800m to the economy in 1981-82 or about 25 per cent of the State's Gross Domestic Product—down from more than 52 per cent in 1960-61. Despite the professed concern of the National Party for the interests of the rural sector, that party has been shown in successive Commonwealth Grants Commission reports to have provided less than adequate financial and technical assistance to our rural based industries. The neglect of areas such as soil conservation, water resources, agriculture and livestock production, the sugar industry and the provision of adequate transport services is precisely shown by the Grants Commission.

Currently 57 per cent of resource projects announced by the Queensland Government are in limbo (Department of Commercial and Industrial Development Major Development Projects and Proposals 1982). Projects shelved or postponed include—

- Rundle (\$5.2 billion);
- Alcan Australia Limited Aluminium Smelter (\$1.1 billion);
- Lend Lease Coke Plant (\$1.2 billion);
- Accor Coal Liquefaction Plant, Millmerran (\$2.8 billion);
- Occidental Petroleum Chemical Plant (\$2.3 billion).

Of the 83 projects listed by the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, it is estimated that 48 are indefinitely postponed or cancelled.

If Queensland is to successfully tackle the present problems and develop effective strategies and policies to maximise its future growth potential, there must be the utmost co-operation between the public and private sectors. Queensland's public sector contributes about one quarter of Queensland's Gross Domestic Product and public sector demand is vital for the health of the private sector. An example of this interdependence is the provision by the public sector of services and facilities such as roads, railways, electricity, water supply, health, education and welfare and the development of orderly and fair business practices and marketing systems.

It is therefore obvious that Governments, through the public sector, have a direct and active role to play in partnership with the private sector.

Indicative economic planning, which is widely used in the EEC, in Japan and in North America to identify and maximise future growth opportunities, seemed unknown to the Queensland Government. Planning is essential in modern economies, yet the present Queensland Government adheres to the nineteenth century live-in-hope philosophy of laissez-faire capitalism. Efficient economic management cannot be provided by a Government which believes that governments have no role to play in economic management.

That brings me to a point that I feel obliged to make in the light of the Queensland Cabinet's rejection of the Federal Government's request for it to play a very important participating role in national economic formulation. The most significant event in Australia's recent economic and political history has undoubtedly been the National Economic Summit Conference which in April of this year brought together representatives of Government, unions and the private sector. The final communique from that conference gave recognition to the need for all sections of our community to work together to meet the challenge of what was at that time, and still remains, our nation's gravest economic and social crisis in 50 years; hence my absolute dismay and concern at learning that the Premier-cum-Treasurer of Queensland refused to participate on the economic planning advisory council established to continue the process of consultation begun at the National Economic Summit Conference. One would think that the political leader of our State would have felt a heavy obligation to join with the other heads of Government and industry to work together in the interests of economic recovery.

Surely one could rightfully expect that the person now responsible for the finances of the State of Queensland would recognise his responsibility to join with other Government and industry leaders to ensure the success of the council's functions, which are to draw together views on the economy and economic policies, to identify targets of the economy,

to provide perspectives on the medium and long-term outlook, to advise on ways of achieving maximum growth and to undertake a comprehensive review of the structure of taxation in Australia. The last-mentioned function alone should have been enough to ensure our State's participation in the interests of all Queensland tax-payers.

Let me cite what the Premier had to say when the invitation was forthcoming. I might add that the newspaper from which I shall quote was not the only newspaper throughout the nation that made this comment. The newspaper states—

“The Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, has refused a seat on the Federal Government's Economic Planning Advisory Council because it was made up of ‘all kinds of crackpots and lunatics’.”

After consultation with industry and community organisations, 11 non-Government members were selected. Let us examine who, in the mind of the Premier and Treasurer of this State, are “crackpots” They are the AMP Society general manager and director, Mr A. W. Coates; the CSR Limited director and general manager, Mr B. N. Kelman; the Confederation of Australian Industry president, Mr D. N. Hughes; the National Farmers Federation president, Mr F. M. Davidson; the Australian Council of Trade Unions president, Mr Dolan; the ACTU secretary, Mr Kelty; its senior vice-president, Mr Fitzgibbon; the director of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations, Mr Cutts; the secretary-General of the Australian Council of Social Services, Mr C. K. Menzies; and the director of the Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations, Dr J. B. Braithwaite. They are the persons whom the Premier and Treasurer of this State regarded as being “crackpots” and “lunatics” That was his excuse for not participating.

At the time of the economic summit conference only seven months ago, economic activity and unemployment were continuing to fall. Unemployment was rising, having reached its peak in Queensland of 11.5 per cent, or 124 100 people, in February 1983. In many instances, profits were depressed and wage-earners had to accept deferral of improvements or even maintenance of living standards. Despite some very sound initiatives taken by the Hawke Federal Government and some State Governments, unemployment figures remain horrendous, although honourable members must be encouraged by the recent drop in unemployment, which, Australia-wide, represented the biggest drop since 1978.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Due to a Labor Government.

Mr WARBURTON: Of course it was due to a Labor Government. Its initiatives and the way in which it has approached the unemployment problem in Australia have brought about that very welcome decline in unemployment.

The combination of falling unemployment, falling inflation and declining interest rates, although insufficient to cause any great excitement, provides some evidence of economic recovery, which it is hoped will boost community confidence and lead to increased consumer spending and business investment.

Queensland's economic position at present is vulnerable, to say the least. That is the message that the Opposition endeavours to get to the Government. Emphasis has been placed on large-scale capital-intensive schemes, heavily biased towards the resources sector, reinforcing our State's dependence upon the fluctuations of the international economy. Despite the Queensland Government's claims, official comparisons made with the other Australian States clearly show up the true deficiencies and the neglect.

There is a need for the Queensland Government to embrace modern economic planning techniques in the 1980s and up to the 1990s. Next year Queensland's fixed capital expenditure—that is, fixed assets in both the private and public sectors—is estimated to decline to \$2,423.8m from \$3,415.5m in 1983. That has been taken directly from the publication of the Australian Bureau of Statistics on fixed capital expenditure. Those are not the Opposition's figures; they are official statistics from the bureau. Such a drastic decline in expenditure will wreak havoc in the building and construction industry unless urgent Government action is taken to lessen the expected decline.

Technology, an ageing population, an imbalance in several of the State's economic sectors and uncertainties in international trade make it imperative that the State establish its own indicative planning unit and co-operate fully with the Federal Government and the Economic Planning Advisory Council. The Bjelke-Petersen Government remains unwilling to co-operate with either the Federal Government or the national economic advisory council. The Liberal members, when part of the previous Government, took a similar stand. They appear determined to continue with policies of obstructionism and confrontation.

Queensland's lack of planning and forward estimation has resulted in a system of political ad-hocery, decisions being made in isolation without thought to purpose, overall contribution, or even necessity. This is why the State is encountering its present problems. Making decisions on the basis of personal power relationships has led to Queensland's spending, per person, the least of any State on social services such as education, health and welfare, and in the provision of economic services, particularly, as I said earlier, to the rural and manufacturing industries.

Queensland's quangos are out of control, with no real accountability and, in most instances, no ministerial or parliamentary scrutiny. It would seem that at long last the Premier has recognised that by having two of his departmental officials visit New South Wales to speak to representatives of the Labor Government about the recent investigation into statutory authorities by the New South Wales Labor Government's public accounts committee. Perhaps when there is another opportunity to question the Premier and Treasurer on this matter, he might come clean on his attitude to those committees.

Queensland has 687 quangos, with assets of \$3m and an annual turnover of \$3,690m. They employ 51 000 people and have 4 000 elected or appointed officials. The vast majority of quangos do not report either to the Minister or to the Parliament.

Victorian studies show that Victorian quangos wasted or inefficiently used \$600m of public funds annually. There is no reason to believe that things are any different in Queensland. Quangos are publicly funded; they should be run efficiently. They should be required to provide a rate of return on investment moneys supplied by the State. If such a rate of return was established at, for example, even 5 per cent per annum, the net gain to Government funds would be \$40m per annum. Such a requirement would encourage efficiency and profitability.

The scandals in the Peanut Marketing Board, the Port of Brisbane Authority and the Small Business Development Corporation—the last of which was mentioned by the member for Greenslopes—and the financial mess of the South East Queensland Electricity Board, to name only a few, make an economic efficiency study into Queensland quangos essential.

To provide effective control over, and accountability of, quangos and to reduce the possibility of their defaulting, a parliamentary public bodies review committee needs to be established to oversee all statutory authorities. That is the only body that could publicly scrutinise the organisations mentioned and fully report the true situation to the Government. To date, all that the Bjelke-Petersen Government has done is order departments to count their quangos.

I now wish to refer to one of the most serious problems still confronting this State—unemployment. Job creation should be the Government's main priority; but nothing epitomises the utter neglect of this problem by the Queensland Government than its almost total lack of action on this front. Queensland will need in excess of 35 000 new jobs each year just to stop unemployment from rising, but Queensland is not coming anywhere near creating those jobs.

During the election campaign, one National Party advertisement was, at best, a distortion of the facts and, at worst, quite frankly, nothing but deceit. That advertisement claimed that over the past three years the Queensland Government had created 45 000 jobs. To get anything like those figures takes a great deal of statistical juggling and manipulation. What the National Party Government did, of course, was to highlight comparisons that showed increases and ignore those that showed decreases. The official Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that over the past two years, and especially over the past year, Queensland has had a very bad record in job creation. The latest year-to-year comparison shows that Queensland lost 15 600 jobs during the year October 1982 to October 1983. After New South Wales and South Australia, that was the largest number of jobs lost and, when population relativities are taken into account, on a per capita basis it was the largest employment decline of any State.

The appalling fact is that more than 30 000 school-leavers are presently coming onto the job market at a time when the State's youth unemployment level, which stands at close to 20 per cent, has not shown any decline of significance during the past three months. In the next two months Queensland's unemployment level can be expected to grow to 13 or 14 per cent of the work-force, with youth unemployment growing to about 30 per cent. Unfortunately, this is what Queensland can look forward to unless the Government is prepared to stand up and do something about it.

At this time last year I predicted that Queensland's unemployment level would increase from 6.9 per cent to approximately 10 per cent in early 1983. The then Minister for Employment and Labour Relations continued with this Government's false propaganda that everything was all right in Queensland. He said, "Forget about unemployment. We are the great State of milk and honey. Unemployment figures cannot possibly go up."

I am sorry to say that I was incorrect. I underestimated the jump in unemployment. It hit 10.9 per cent in January 1983 and 11.5 per cent in February. This time round it will, unfortunately, probably hit 13 or 14 per cent, and I wait with interest to hear from the current Minister the explanations for this increase. The excuses will be very interesting to hear.

One of the major reasons Queensland achieved the fastest-growing level of unemployment of any State over the past year, and the worst relative performance in the job creation area, is the fact that the Queensland Government remains the only State Government not to introduce specific job creation programs of its own accord.

All the Queensland Government has done is rely on Commonwealth initiatives. Firstly, it was the wages pause program, which Queensland initially refused to endorse, only to be drawn in after every other State had agreed to it. And how fortunate it was for the Queensland Government to be finally dragged into another Federal Government initiative, because the wages pause job creation program saved the Queensland Government from an embarrassing \$53m deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I will have more to say about that when the Budget is brought down on 1 December. Far from hiding the fact that the Government had manipulated the wages pause funds to balance the books, the then Treasurer, Dr Edwards, in a press release on 12 July, praised the Government on how clever it was to use wages pause money to balance the books.

The only losers were, of course, the unemployed, who had their hopes and expectations raised by the wages pause job creation program. They naturally thought that the wages pause was about job creation, and so did the thousands of Queensland workers who were prepared to make the wages sacrifice in order to see their unemployed fellow Queenslanders obtain jobs. How wrong they were. This Government was juggling the money and not using it for the purpose for which it was designed.

The Queensland Government conveniently saved money from the wages pause, which even more conveniently met the revenue shortfall resulting from lower than expected interest earnings. We still do not know the full list of projects supposedly funded by the wages pause and one suspects that some of these so-called additional projects were normal Budget programs anyway. We do not know because the Government refuses to publicise the information. How is the public expected to know?

Every now and then stories come filtering through the media about job creation projects funded by wages pause funds. They are still coming through. I saw in one of my local newspapers that the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services has announced developments round the Cabbage Tree Creek area to be paid for with wages pause funds. The wages pause funds were created in the last Budget, not this one, yet the Government has held onto the funds and not spent them. In the meantime the unemployed continue to suffer. However, we do know something of importance. Of the \$15.9m reaped from the Commonwealth up to 30 June 1983—and this has not been denied—the Queensland Government spent only \$1m on job creation. It was received from the Commonwealth for job creation—to put people to work. The receipt of this money was very convenient for the Government in its so-called balancing of its Budget.

As I mentioned previously, Queensland is the only State not to initiate job creation projects of its own accord. In this financial year, 1983-84, Victoria plans to spend \$21m of State funds on its employment initiatives program and NSW has budgeted to spend \$45m on its special employment schemes as distinct from budgetary expenditure. By comparison the Queensland Government is to spend nothing.

For the benefit of Government members I will detail where this money is to be spent in the other States. It may sink in that something needs to be done urgently. It may give Government members an idea of the trail that they should follow to try to help the thousands of unemployed Queenslanders.

Victoria's \$21m is to be used to offset the 30 per cent self-funding requirement of the Community Employment Program. The people involved in local government in Queensland have, quite rightly, been somewhat critical of the imposition placed on many local authorities that could not afford the 30 per cent contribution. They had to go cap in hand to the Community Employment Program people and prove that they could not afford to make the contribution. Those members who have been in local government know the difficulties confronting all local authorities and their real need for financial assistance. The Victorian Government is at least adopting a sane approach to the matter. It is to spend a total of \$21m to offset the 30 per cent self-funding requirement. Imagine the reception that Queensland local authorities would give to a Government proposition in these terms: "We will be fair dinkum for once. We will spend money where it should be spent for the sake of employment, for the sake of decentralisation and for the sake of keeping ratepayers' costs down. We will make arrangements through the Community Employment Program to pay the 30 per cent." No-one can tell me that that would not be a good scheme.

I hope that Government members who are listening to this debate will at least consider this matter. I am not asking them to agree to it at the moment but, for heaven's sake, let them consider it and try to get it through to those who say they run this Parliament.

Mr Gunn: That is right.

Mr WARBURTON: The Minister said, "That is right." That is an admission, if ever I heard one, that the Minister and his Cabinet cronies run this Parliament.

The Premier has departmental officials talking to people involved with public accounts committees in the south. At least he could consider looking at what another successful Government has done. If he were to do that, the \$41,268,000 received from the Commonwealth Government for the Community Employment Program would be boosted to almost \$54m in Queensland. That would represent a considerable boost to any State's employment program. If the Queensland Government, for once in its life, adopted an enlightened approach such as that, approximately 3 500 new jobs would be created both directly and indirectly, in addition to the original estimate of 11 000 jobs that the Community Employment Program is estimated to create in Queensland.

In New South Wales, the \$45m allocated for special employment schemes is to be used to fund a youth corps scheme, a youth employment pay-roll tax rebate scheme under which persons under 21 years of age will be exempt from pay-roll tax during their first year of full-time employment, and a group apprenticeship scheme providing pay-roll tax rebates. Surely that is worth considering. The money is to be used to fund a group-apprenticeship scheme providing pay-roll tax rebates. That is something that the National Party Government promised at the election before last. Of course, it did not honour that promise.

The money will also be used to fund a country apprentices training assistance scheme and an out-of-trade-apprentices scheme. That is something at which the Government should look, because at present about 450 to 500 out-of-trade apprentices have no hope of getting the sort of employment that they want. Certainly the Government is assisting them through the TAFE scheme. Surely the Government would agree that what those young people want to do is work.

The allocation in New South Wales will be used to provide regional employment assistance funds and to fund a worker co-operation program. There are other schemes, including workers' compensation rebates, which are very important, the State apprenticeship scheme and a special council program. So the Government needs to consider a number of programs.

It is not fair for me to say to the Government that we expect it to come up with new proposals all the time, to come up with something that is different from what is being done in the other States. But surely it is reasonable to ask the Government to look to the other States to see what is happening in them. If something worth while is happening there, surely it is up to this Government to adopt a similar proposal. The Premier has sent people to the other States to see how he can best reorganise or restructure the statutory authorities, and how the accountability of those authorities can be improved. I only wish that he would be more honest about it.

If the Queensland Government was at all serious about the problem of unemployment in Queensland, it would move immediately to initiate at least some of the job-creation programs to which I have referred. Instead, it has sought to frustrate the introduction of the Community Employment Program in Queensland through the unco-operative attitude that it adopted to the setting up of the essential consultative committee to that program.

Mr Randell: That is not right.

Mr WARBURTON: I know that it is right. Because I know the story in detail, I would debate the issue with the honourable member anytime.

The control of the Community Employment Program in Queensland was eventually placed in the hands of the people associated with the casino unit. Obviously, that was because the people associated with that particular unit ran out of work. I offer no criticism of them, because anyone could see the way in which this Government reacted to the proposed casino development, the way it strutted around and the way it has, unfortunately, had to defer the proposals from time to time. As I said, I have no criticism of the people involved, but it is no wonder that they were shunted across to look after that important responsibility.

Another reason was that the Premier wanted to keep control over the decision-making process, and one suspects that a prime factor to be considered was the political affiliation of the applicants.

In every other State the Departments of Employment and Industrial Relations are to administer the program, yet in Queensland the Community Employment Program is to be directly under the Premier's Department. Of course, that esteemed gentleman will ensure that the program is directly under his control. However, I hope that the Federal Government is awake to this potential rot, and I have no doubt that it will keep an eye on the Queensland Government to see that the scheme is properly and fairly administered.

I now want to dwell on the National Party's employment initiatives as promised in the 1983 election campaign. And what a nice little bunch of platitudes they are!

Mr Goleby: Tell us about Hawke and his thousands of new jobs.

Mr WARBURTON: I am going to talk about this Government's proposals, not anybody else's. Mr Speaker, I am sure you will agree that such conduct is not very becoming of Ministers of this Parliament. One of the problems associated with the general behaviour of the House is that Ministers set a very bad example. I sympathise with you, Mr Speaker, because it looks as though they will continue to do so.

Promise No. 1 of the National Party's election campaign was to provide the right climate and incentives for business and industry to expand. As I said, what a nice little bunch of platitudes! How specific! That is the same promise as was made in 1980, and it has now been recycled.

During the past year, Queensland lost 20 000 manufacturing jobs and unemployment more than doubled. Still the Government says nothing specific, but claims that it will provide the right climate and the incentives for industry to be able to survive. The Government had better get going, because the manufacturing industry particularly has immense problems.

Promises Nos. 2 to 6 involve minor stamp duty concessions to the stock exchange and financial markets and, with the exception of one, bring Queensland into line with the stamp duty concessions that have been operating in New South Wales and Victoria for a number of years.

The maximum pay-roll tax exemption level is to be raised, but again Queensland is the only State not to provide significant pay-roll tax concessions to decentralised industries. That reminds me of another promise made before the last election, that this Government was going to appoint a Minister for Decentralisation. It has not done so yet, but perhaps the Premier or his deputy will advise the House when this promise will be honoured.

Lastly, minor incentives are to be given to a handful of apprentices.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many committee meetings going on in the House. I ask members to listen to the remainder of the honourable member's speech in semi-quiet.

Mr WARBURTON: The rest of the promises are either part of Federal Government programs or a grab-bag of promises to do with land tax. The only conclusion at which one can arrive is that the Queensland Government has some very peculiar ideas about what to do about the State's unemployment problem.

The first thing that I recommend the Government do is meet, as the Victorian Government has done, the cost of the 30 per cent self-funding requirement of the Commonwealth's employment program. Government members may shake their heads now. However, they should at least look at it. In all seriousness, as a responsible Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I urge the Government to at least look at what is occurring in Victoria and give it consideration.

Queensland has 132 local authorities spread throughout the State. If the Government gave the local authorities the assistance that they deserve through a similar type program, it would be doing a service not only to those local authorities and their employees but also to almost every person throughout the State of Queensland. The Government would be carrying out its responsibility to the people of Queensland if it provided the assistance that I have mentioned.

As I said earlier, that alone would create approximately 3 500 jobs. It would also eliminate the problems for local authorities and community groups in finding funds to meet the 30 per cent self-funding requirement.

Some things happened in Victoria with which I would personally disagree. If any honourable members would like to discuss with me the scheme fully, I would be only too pleased to do so. I would appreciate any initiative taken by any of the National Party members in this Assembly.

Secondly, I suggest that the Government should evaluate and examine carefully the job creation programs initiated by all other States. Those programs have received considerable praise. In its evaluation of the Victorian employment initiative program, the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research concluded that the program was very successful in assisting the long-term unemployed and that projects under the program were more labour intensive than usual Government endeavours. That is important. I have been critical of the fact that in the past far too many employment schemes and programs have been aimed at short-term results.

Mr Randell: If it is so good down there, why do they come up here looking for jobs?

Mr WARBURTON: It is rather disappointing to hear that sort of inane interjection. I have some respect for the honourable member's position, but I must make that comment to him. Unfortunately, when I hear that sort of interjection I have to say that there is very little hope for him in respect of absorbing the importance of the unemployment problems in this State. I have only asked him as a member of this Assembly, and as a member of the National Party, to give consideration to it. For him to come back and say, "Why, then, are people flocking to Queensland?" is, quite frankly, the most ridiculous remark that I have heard tonight from the Government side of the Chamber.

In the Brisbane region, at Cleveland, 82 persons were registered for every available job. I am quoting examples because the position is general throughout the State. At Inala, 108 persons were recently seeking every job. In the Woodridge area, 139 persons were seeking every job. That is serious. In Cairns 57 persons were registered for every job. In Coolangatta the figure was 98; in Maroochydore, 50; in Rockhampton, 21; and in Townsville, 25. The position has not improved for quite some time. It must be obvious from what I have said that the fringe areas of Brisbane in the heavily populated area of south-east Queensland are bearing the brunt of unemployment in Queensland.

The position is clear and I believe that I have outlined it. The text of my speech tonight has not been an endeavour to malign anybody on the Government side. However, it is only fair that every Government member should be prepared to suffer criticism. The main purpose of my speech has been to give an indication of what is happening in other places; to give an indication that the Government ought to reassess its position. Unless the Government is prepared to move along with the economic times and extract itself from what seems to have become total dependence upon resource development, apart from the rural industry of course, I am fearful of the consequences. It is my hope that the gamble pays off. I hope that within a very short time we see a lasting uplift in the economy, not just in the rest of Australia, but in Queensland as well.

Mr Goleby: Will you give us credit for the economic uplift you are talking about?

Mr WARBURTON: If the Government does anything that warrants credit, I will give it credit. However, at this stage I am critical of the way in which the Government has locked the State into a certain direction. My suggestion is that it drop that as quickly as it possibly can and concentrate on other measures. We may then have an opportunity to pull ourselves out of the mire that we are in at the moment. If it does that, I will be the first to congratulate it.

Mr SIMPSON (Coorooora) (8.8 p.m.): It is great to see the good sense of the Queensland people in putting this Government back in office again instead of being conned by the money muddlers in the ALP. The socialists would perpetrate in this State the mismanagement being suffered by all ALP socialist States. We have just heard the member for Sandgate pleading with us to put 30 per cent into the CEP fund because that is being done in Victoria—a State that is already bankrupt. Cain is putting taxes up by 40 per cent. Who is paying for it? The poor devils who are the producers. The socialists are flogging them, and that is why they are coming to Queensland. Socialism takes incentive and initiative away from the producers. The ALP is in favour of increased taxes. That was admitted tonight by the support for another 30 per cent for the CEP. That would lead to more taxes. This Government does not believe in more taxes. We believe that Governments should be heading in the other direction.

The performance of this Government has been proved in many ways. The first is the number of jobs that have been created over the last three years. Opposition members do not enjoy listening to these figures, but they know they are the facts. In the last three years 45 000 additional jobs have been created in Queensland, whereas the Labor State of New South Wales saw a decline of 42 000 jobs. In the same period Victoria, another Labor State, lost 16 000 jobs. South Australia lost 15 000 jobs. No wonder people from those States are coming to Queensland!

Mr Fouras: Which year are you talking about?

Mr SIMPSON: The last three years.

The best thing to do is to produce an economic climate that will encourage people to produce and will encourage private enterprise, not the socialist scheme of stagnation and envy under which "profit" is a dirty word. Instead of daring to come back in here, Opposition members should be hanging their heads in shame.

I was very interested to hear the references to a public accounts committee. All other States have those committees, so let me record how they are managing. Members of the Opposition should digest these figures and be prepared to hang their heads in shame. At 30 June this year New South Wales, another Labor socialist State, had a deficit of \$40.1m. The year prior to that its deficit was \$80m. How was that deficit reduced by \$40m? The Government simply flogged off many of those quangos, which were mainly grower bodies established for orderly marketing, but that State still has a deficit of \$40m whereas Queensland has a balanced Budget.

Mr Borbidge: Did you know that Queensland has the highest international credit rating of any State?

Mr SIMPSON: That is true. Businessmen cannot be fooled, either. That is something that turns members of the Labor Party green with envy. The other States cannot get that sort of credit rating.

At 30 June this year the Victorian deficit was \$135m. The Premier of that State has increased taxes by 40 per cent to pay for schemes that will artificially produce jobs. The way to produce jobs is to encourage private enterprise. The deficit in South Australia is \$57.1m and, in Western Australia, it is \$14.2m. No wonder members of the Labor Party hang their heads in shame.

This Appropriation Bill, which I am supporting, will give the Government the funds for the public sector. I harken back to a person named Whitlam, who dared to say that he would spend funds such as these without the approval of Parliament. He sought to defy the Constitution and ignore the Parliament. However, this morning the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) said that Parliament was not allowed to do its rightful job. Of course Whitlam, and now his successor, Hawke, would do away with the States.

As I said, Whitlam tried to abuse the parliamentary system and the Constitution and tried to spend public money without the approval of Parliament. It is the approval of Parliament that is now being sought. Thank God for the then Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, who refused to allow Whitlam to continue without Supply. The Governor-General told Whitlam to go back to the people and let them decide. They overwhelmingly backed the Governor-General but, since then, a great deal of garbage has been spoken about that incident.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That is why people spit on him everywhere he goes.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member is bringing down the whole fabric of the Westminster system.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: By laughing, Opposition members show that they have no respect for this House and no respect for this Appropriation Bill. Opposition members would be like Whitlam. They have made it clear that they would like to act without the approval of Parliament. We on this side of the House know that we need the approval of Parliament.

The Appropriation Bill that was passed in August provided sufficient funds to enable the Government to carry on until December; yet, in an attempt to gain votes, Opposition members frightened the electorate by saying that the Government would be bankrupt by the middle of November. It is not. Everyone has been paid. Following the passage of this Bill, the Budget will be introduced, and it will be another good Budget.

Opposition members have been doing a lot of twisting and turning. The honourable member for Sandgate read a Trades Hall document for more than an hour. Why are such documents brought down here? It is time that they were sent back. Surely Opposition members can do better than read such rubbish?

Opposition members have referred to freight rates. Earlier this year they said that freight rates in mining areas should be increased, but they are now saying that they should be reduced. Who will believe them?

Mr Borbidge: They want new taxes.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, many people over the border are talking about pay-roll tax. The New South Wales Government imposes a super pay-roll tax. An additional 1 per cent is imposed on any business with a pay-roll of over \$1m. That is the way to kill incentive; that is the way to kill job creation.

Mr I. J. Gibbs: What about the rent resources tax that Mr Wran wants?

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members dream up new taxes. Heaven forbid that the socialists should gain power in this State! They will reintroduce death duties and gift duties. They are the big taxers. They are not wanted in this State.

The wages pause job-creation scheme has been referred to tonight. Under that scheme, \$168m has been provided by the State, \$48m by the Commonwealth and \$10m by local authorities. In my electorate, a nursing home is being built with wages pause funds. The difference between this scheme and the Community Employment Program appears to be that this Government has placed a high priority on works that really need to be done and not necessarily programs that were just labour-intensive and would provide nothing for the future. Opposition members referred to the CEP, which was originally set up for the same reason. But the guide-lines have been watered down and projects no longer have to be job-creating or self-sufficient. Under this wages pause scheme, the shires in my electorate endeavoured to fund projects that were urgently needed, such as a new police station at Noosa Heads.

I support this Appropriation Bill because it is an indication of good management in this State. Every promise made by Government members prior to the election will be honoured. This Government has shown that it is not bankrupt. Thank goodness the people of Queensland were not conned by ALP promises! They knew that the ALP never keeps its promises. Opposition members tried to con the people, but they did not fall for it.

Mr HOOPER (Archerfield) (8.20 p.m.): I take this opportunity to thank the electors of Archerfield for returning me to this Parliament with an increased majority. As a matter of fact, there was an overall increase of 7 per cent.

Mr Stephan: Weren't you there very much?

Mr HOOPER: Fancy taking an interjection from the lightweight member for Gympie! He has been a member for six years. If we are to judge his chances by his performance in the House he will for ever grace the back benches. He is a poor speaker and a lackey of the Premier. I should not waste my time taking interjections from him.

Some booths showed an increase of 10 per cent, which was very gratifying indeed. This time there was no Liberal candidate. He got cold feet after two members of the Liberal Party refused to sign his nomination form and told him they were voting for me. He was worried he would lose his deposit, and would have done so. He showed some sense in not nominating.

It was very noticeable at the booths that the National Party people were very rude and aggressive. My National Party opponent had been a member of the National Party for only one month before he nominated. I understand he has now been promoted to the position of secretary of the local National Party branch, which is the Inala equivalent of being Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports. Mr Jackson's duties will not be very onerous. The Inala branch of the National Party meets infrequently in a telephone booth at the Inala Post Office, and it does so only if no-one wants to use the telephone.

It was quite obvious at the Acacia Ridge State School, which is a joint booth for Archerfield and Salisbury, that the Nationals were out after Mrs Kyburz. My people at the booth told me that the Nationals did not cease bucketing her. The Liberals at the booth could not see that. It just proves the point I have always made, that the blue-rinse set from Sunnybank Hills and Jindalee may be great at garden parties and so on, but they certainly make lousy booth workers.

It is not often that I give Mike Evans a pat on the back, but some of the Premier's Christian charity has finally rubbed off on me. Mike's appearance at the booths, mincing in his green tartan trousers, provided some comic relief for the booth workers on a long hot day. He looked like a cross between a leprechaun and a haggis.

The need for the introduction of summary offences legislation has been the subject of Opposition calls for years. Successive police Ministers have agreed on the need for the introduction of such an Act to control the fastest-growing industry in Queensland, that is, the prostitution industry represented by the massage parlours and escort agencies.

An Opposition Member: They know all about it.

Mr HOOPER: There is no doubt about that. I will take interjections. I might even name a couple of those who frequent these houses of the devil.

Despite the Government's saying for years that it would introduce such legislation, no Bill has yet seen the light of day. The Government says it is in favour, the Opposition most certainly is and so are the police who continually complain of the hardship of getting a conviction under the present law. All honourable members have watched with growing concern the increase in the number of advertisements in the daily press for so-called massage parlours and escort agencies.

Mr Lee: You found one in my electorate.

Mr HOOPER: It has gone on to bigger and better premises, no doubt because of the honourable member's excellent representations. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

Various ideas have been put forward in this House to restrict this advertising but, to date, no satisfactory solution has been found. I recall in October 1977 the Minister for Police (Mr Tom Newbery), in answer to a question about the increase in prostitution, suggested that under a Labor Government prostitution would grow like Topsy. After what we have seen in recent years, poor old Uncle Tom had his parties mixed. I think he meant the National Party.

I would hazard a guess that most of the massage parlour girls would have as much knowledge of a genuine massage as the Premier has of true Westminster parliamentary democracy.

For the information of new members, whose education I always try to improve, I point out that the new term for a call girl/prostitute/massage parlour attendant, as the honourable member for Pine Rivers would know full well, is a lady of negotiable affection. That rolls very nicely off the tongue.

I think that some of their clients in the advertising industry have put their heads together and decided on this very up-market term. I suppose that, as always, a fancy name change means increased charges. When the legislation is finally forthcoming, a massage parlour should be just that—a massage parlour. It should be staffed by genuine, registered, masseurs and masseuses.

I, in common with other honourable members, have heard numerous complaints over the years from people, such as the honourable member for Gympie, who wanted a genuine massage for health reasons; but they could not get one. They are as scarce as hen's teeth in this State. It is not possible to identify the genuine article in the newspaper ads. Many women's groups have complained that not only the prostitute but also her client should be charged, and I agree. The present law is very chauvinistic. If it is good enough to prosecute the prostitute, it should be good enough to prosecute the client.

I read recently where Mayor Koch ordered a morals clean-up in New York where prostitution is illegal. The radio station owned by the city of New York began broadcasting the names of men patronising prostitutes. I suggest that the honourable member for Gympie would be very vulnerable in that regard. Needless to say, that caused an almighty clatter. One can imagine the furore in Brisbane if that sort of information was broadcast in the breakfast program. The mind boggles.

Any legislation introduced into this House will need strong powers if the Government is serious about cracking down on vice in Queensland. It is common knowledge that where there is organised prostitution there is organised crime. The other evils that the spread of the massage parlour industry has spawned are an increase in the number of thugs and bouncers and stand-over men who make their living from the massage parlour girls, and, of course, the continual claims of police involvement and corruption. I have pointed out on many occasions that the prostitution industry in this State is the soft underbelly of the Queensland Police Force.

Thugs are never far away in case a client should prove difficult. I refer to recent incidents in some of the massage parlours in Brisbane. I have mentioned two thugs previously. They are the front men for Jeri Bellino, who controls most of the vice in this State. I refer to Geoffrey Luke Crocker and Hector Hapati, alias Hall. They are the men who go out and enforce what Jeri Bellino wants done in the massage parlours and escort agencies in this State.

I repeat what I said previously: Persons living off the earnings of prostitution should incur automatic gaol sentences. I feel that the owners of the premises used for prostitution should not get off scot-free. I find it very hard to believe that owners do not know what their premises are being used for. On a number of occasions in this House I have named absentee landlords and nominee companies that are represented by allegedly very respectable and establishment law firms round the city. A mention in dispatches has seen them shed their clients very fast, much to the mirth of the students at the "Grosvenor School of Law". I know that my good friend the honourable member for Salisbury would agree with that.

I recall an article in the "Gold Coast Bulletin" last year when a reporter did a story on a call girl's night on the Gold Coast with Rob Borbidge. The call girl was very frank but one of her remarks said it all. She said—

"The landlord doesn't give a damn about my prostituting, but if I kept a cat he would hit the roof."

So much for ignorant landlords!

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member referred to me in terms that I do not believe are accurate or truthful. I find them quite offensive.

Mr Hooper: You deny having a night out with a call girl?

Mr BORBIDGE: I have not had a night out with a call girl. I find the remark quite offensive, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr HOOPER: I withdraw it.

I have received many calls from elderly residents on the Gold Coast who have purchased units on the coast for their retirement only to find several prostitutes operating from the building in which their units are situated. Pleas to the managing agent on the premises usually fall on deaf ears because he is receiving a lucrative return from the proceeds of prostitution.

Mr BOOTH: I rise to a point of order. I do not know what any of this has to do with the Bill under discussion. It is just rambling rubbish.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr HOOPER: These people are very distressed about prostitutes operating from the building in which their units are situated. These elderly folk are very upset about harlots using their premises as a house of assignation.

Another aspect raised time and time again is the health factor. Some years back in this place we had the ludicrous situation of the then Health Minister (Dr Edwards) issuing statements left and right deploring the incidence of venereal disease in Queensland. On the other hand, the "Golden Hands" massage parlour on Ipswich Road, Moorooka, to which VD had definitely been traced, was operating with impunity. Dr Edwards must have done nothing, because the "Golden Hands" has gone on to bigger and better premises. It has been pointed out that this may be due to the excellent representations of the local member, my very good friend Mr Norm Lee.

As for the continued allegations of police and political corruption, I propose to read a letter from a police officer whose integrity I have no reason to doubt. It relates in part to the "non-existent" brothels and casinos in Fortitude Valley, which successive Police Ministers have told me are figments of my imagination. However, every current affairs program and most of the journalists in Brisbane—including the two sitting up in the press gallery—have been able to locate them.

Mr KATTER: I move—

"That the document be tabled."

Mr HOOPER: I will table it. I am surprised that some enterprising tour operator has not decided to run guided tours of these places in the Valley after the style of tours of Gold Coast night spots. I am sure that such tours would be very lucrative indeed.

The proposal to start a Chinatown in the Valley as a tourist attraction is being touted at present by all and sundry. I suggest that if this proposal has genuine Government support, the Valley clean-up start now. For a clean-up of the Valley to be effective, the police force has to get its act together.

The following incident outlines what I am saying. In early 1982 a serious incident occurred between the Consorting Squad, the Licensing Branch and the Task Force. In my opinion, a letter that I am about to read is further proof of what I have been saying for years. The letter is dated 12 October 1983 and it reads as follows—

"Dear Sir,

I have resisted commenting on the accuracy or otherwise of the ABC series Scales of Justice until I had the opportunity to see and evaluate all three episodes. While the Federal Opposition is trying to conduct a witch hunt in NSW to discredit that States' police force and corrective services division they would be well advised to refocus their attention on Queensland for it is the Police Force and Government Ministers of this State on which I am convinced the series is based. By way of illustration I pose the following questions:

- (A) Why is no Police action taken against illegal businesses conducted by the Jeri Bellino family? This family is the states biggest operator of illegal casinos, massage parlours, escort agencies and unlicensed bars. Three casinos operate in Brisbane's Fortitude Valley all within walking distance of the Valley Area Office Police Headquarters. Another operates within walking distance of the South Brisbane C.I.B. A fifth operates unhindered in Cairns and a sixth in Townsville.
- (B) Despite the 'Sunday Mail' having published the actual addresses of these casinos why is the only Police presence at some a red Falcon sedan (attached to the C.I.B. Consorting Squad), driven by the same notorious, grossly overweight

Detective Sergeant? Why is it that this officer (Christian name Ross) and his sidekick a Detective Senior Constable, also of ample proportions, (Keith), drink, gamble and disappear into back rooms of these premises with management but not take any action to close same?

- (C) Why do the same Consorting Squad duo plus many other detectives and indeed members of the Qld National Party drink and socialize at the following Bellino controlled premises—premises which sell alcohol well after 3 a.m. despite having no liquor license to trade to 3 a.m. In fact some of the properties hold no license at all—others hold restaurant licences permitting the sale of alcohol to bona fide diners to midnite
The World by Night Strip Club, Petrie Bight.
Pharoahs Nightclub, Adelaide Street.
Hollywood Disco, Elizabeth Street.
Cockatoo Bar, 677 Ann Street, Fortitude Valley?”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Although the honourable member's speech is edifying in some respects, it has nothing to do with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr HOOPER: With respect, Mr Speaker, it has.

Mr SPEAKER: I would like the honourable member to tell the Chamber whether he is going to come back to the Appropriation Bill at some time.

Mr HOOPER: I am going to. It has always been a practice in the Appropriation Bill debate to range widely, and I am interested in the amount of money that is allocated in the Bill to the Police Department for the curbing of vice in this State.

The letter further states—

“(D) Why is it when Jeri Bellino was recently confined to bed for a series of examinations at Auchenflowers' Wesley Hospital that two National Party Ministers as well as the ever vigilant Consorting Squad duo call on him to cheer him up? Mr. Bellino had all his meals 'sent in'—why did the C.I.B. duo have to deliver some?

Obviously the public needs to know the answers to this series of questions as a matter of urgency. It is frightening to think of the power that one man can have over senior police officers and worse still members of the State Cabinet. A final parting question, that only a body outside of Queensland, such as a Federal Senate Select Committee of Inquiry can answer truthfully, is did National Party Queensland State Director, Mike Evans receive a \$50,000 cash donation at his Spring Hill office on the morning of Thursday Sept. 8th, and was this donation from the Bellino family?

I regret that I cannot authorize the publication of my name and address; I have a family to support and we would all like to live a little longer.”

I table that letter.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

A Government Member: Is it anonymous?

Mr HOOPER: It is not anonymous.

For a clean-up of the Valley to be effective, the police force must get its act together. If it does not get its act together, it will have all sorts of problems. Nothing has been done for years. Over the years I have brought matters to the attention of this Chamber. However, nothing has been done about them.

The Government and the Police Minister must decide whether they are going to clean up the Valley once and for all or whether they are going to suggest to the “non-existent” casinos and brothels that they go and “non-exist” somewhere else. That is one of the problems about which something must be done.

I would now like to ask some questions of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General in relation to the proceedings against suspended policewoman Narelle Ann Saunders. As the Minister is well aware, Mr Justice Shepherdson has made some very scathing remarks about the police evidence in that case. The Crown Prosecutor, Mr A. J. Glynn, was

asked, "Was the tape your only evidence against the accused on this count?" Mr Glynn replied, "That is so." It is common knowledge that the judge would not allow the Crown to withdraw the charge but instructed the jury to return a verdict of not guilty.

Of the informant, Mr Justice Shepherdson said, "Someone, somewhere, has apparently arranged for this man, Douglas Mervyn Dodd, to fabricate a tape-recording." He also stated, "Dodd had committed perjury when he gave evidence in the District Court trial." Mr Justice Shepherdson then ordered the Solicitor-General to carry out an investigation. Bearing in mind that that was in August, we are still waiting for the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) to reveal the results of that investigation.

In October, he said in Bundaberg that, as the Crown Law Office had no investigative branch, he had placed the matter in the hands of the police. Is it any wonder that the Minister for Justice is in continual hot water with the Premier for his inept handling of the Justice portfolio? Fancy handing that type of investigation to the police! I make no apology for stating that the Police Department's Internal Investigations Section could not track an elephant through the snow if it defecated all the way.

I now ask the Minister: Why has Dodd not been charged with attempting to pervert the course of justice, perjury in the Magistrates Court, District and Supreme Courts, and conspiracy with the person who wrote the script for the tape? It is quite obvious that someone other than Dodd wrote the script for that tape. I point out that Dodd has neither the intelligence, the ability nor the equipment to have made the tape. It would also be interesting to know the identity of the female voice on the tape. I would suggest that it is the voice of a police officer who knew Saunders well. If that is the case, there would also be a charge of conspiracy between, probably, a female member of the police force and Douglas Mervyn Dodd.

Dodd admitted in the District Court in April/May 1983 that he had lied to the magistrate in the committal proceedings held in November 1982, intending to mislead the magistrate about his dealings with a man named Will with whom he had stolen guns.

As I have said, in the Supreme Court the Crown Prosecutor admitted that the tape was a fabrication. That was after Douglas Mervyn Dodd had given sworn evidence in the Magistrates, District and Supreme Courts that the tape was genuine. Dodd also swore to two different versions of what he had done with the tape after the date on which he claimed he made it, namely, 19 March 1982. He gave different versions of whom he gave it to, where it was kept and how he came to get it back. It is a fact of public record that Dodd was given bail on 15 April 1982 because he claimed he had a tape to incriminate Saunders. Dodd was driven to Stanthorpe by the police and allowed to leave the police station, drive off and seek the tape. When he finally returned with the tape, eight days later, the police made great play of that evidence. Unfortunately for them, the forger was not very bright technically, because background music and a call-sign for Radio 10 were made after the date when police said they took the tape into custody.

It is quite obvious that Dodd's perjury has cost the State a fortune. Suspended police officer Saunders has been on trial on three charges. The committal proceedings lasted one week, the District Court proceedings lasted four weeks, and the Supreme Court hearing took five days. Therefore, I again ask the Minister: Why has not Dodd been charged? Who is protecting Dodd? It is high time that the Minister put a senior officer of the Solicitor-General's office on the case.

I assure the Minister that I do not propose to let the matter of Mr Dodd and his highly placed protectors in Makerston Street fade away. If the Minister has any respect for his oath of office as the senior law officer of the Crown, he will act on the recommendation of Mr Justice Shepherdson.

The Premier, as we know, takes great delight in outlining corruption in New South Wales; but at least Mr Wran has the guts to institute independent inquiries into any allegations. We all know that an inquiry in Queensland into matters such as I have raised would open a Pandora's box that would bring the Government down.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr HOOPER: No, I am not going over it all again. However, before I come to the conclusion of my speech, I will relate to the House some problems in the task force of the Queensland Police Force. The task force had information from two prostitutes named Shirley Ann McDonald and Susan Margaret Byriel that large-scale corruption in certain Valley night-

spots involved police and that an attempt was to be made by representatives of southern interests to take over illegal gambling and prostitution—that is, massage parlours and escort agencies—and that violence would be resorted to.

The task force and the Licensing Branch were investigating the allegations when they were told by members of the Consorting Squad to leave a night-club, because they were controlling all operations in the Valley. Consorting Squad detectives then proceeded to identify members of the Licensing Branch, including undercover operatives, and members of the task force who were present. Isn't that lovely, Mr Speaker, when one section of the police force identifies members of another section? I know it sounds incredible, but it is true.

Mr Austin: It is better than Carter Brown.

Mr HOOPER: The Minister would not have the intelligence necessary to read Carter Brown. Fancy him talking! I do not mind taking interjections from any member of the Government, but I hate to take interjections from political rats. He won his seat as a Liberal; but, as soon as 30 pieces of silver were dangled under his nose, he deserted the Liberals and accepted a position as a National Party Minister. However, Mr Speaker, I do not wish to incur your wrath.

Constable Peter Sticher furnished a lengthy and comprehensive report on the events of that evening. On 4 February 1982, Detective Inspectors Flannigan and Wightman of the Police Department's Internal Investigations Section interviewed the two prostitutes. On Friday, 12 February 1982, and Saturday, 13 February 1982, Inspectors Flannigan and Bradbury patrolled the night-clubs in the Fortitude Valley and city areas. The reports of Inspectors Flannigan and Wightman would make very interesting reading; but I would bet any honourable member that, when the Police Minister asks the commissioner for a copy of the report, he will be told that it does not exist. As a senior police officer told me some months ago, the best piece of equipment the Queensland Police Force has bought in recent years is the paper shredder.

The allegations I have made about those police warrant a thorough investigation by the Minister responsible for police. To ensure that justice is done, a senior officer of the Justice Department should be seconded to the Internal Investigations Section of the Queensland Police Force to supervise the investigation and to see that justice is done. It is ludicrous to have Caesar investigating Caesar.

In the few minutes left to me I wish to make some comments on the new Brisbane Women's Prison.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr HOOPER: I would take the honourable member's interjection but I have only six minutes left. However, as I have said before, if the honourable member for Surfers Paradise had another brain it would be lonely, or, alternatively, if he had another brain, he would be half-witted.

In some respects the new Brisbane Women's Prison could be referred to as the Taj Mahal. It is far and away much better than the old prison but its design and layout are nothing short of a disaster. The bad design is responsible for the high cost of running this establishment. No-one suggests that a prison should be a palace. It is, after all, a place of correction where people serve a debt to society. Nevertheless, as the Premier is for ever reminding us, we live in a Christian society with all the values that entails.

Mr Katter: You are not a Christian.

Mr HOOPER: The honourable member certainly is not. He fell off his father's camel. In becoming a Minister of the Crown he has done well for a camel driver's son.

When I outline to the House some details of this prison, the need for a public works committee will become patently obvious. At the commencement of building the staff were told that it was not being built for them. To anybody who has ever made a tour of the prison, that is most obvious. Obviously the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) has not been there; he would not know where it is. If he did go there, he would only exacerbate the problem.

If the prison was not built for the officers or for the prisoners, perhaps the Minister could tell us for whom it was built. The senior staff were not consulted prior to the erection of the building. They certainly would have been able to point out any non-functioning areas. The present layout of the prison requires additional staff. For security purposes, it was suggested that gates separate the maximum security area from the main area. The staff were told that that would be done when money becomes available. Now that this Appropriation Bill has been introduced, money should become available to do something at the prison.

I will outline some of the problems at the Women's Prison. Red painted areas have been condemned and the red paint is being removed by two employees of the Works Department. That work will take some months and, while they are scraping and repainting, an escort officer must be with them. I do not know whether that is to protect them or to protect the female staff.

The officers' mess is on an upper level near the main gate area and access is by two flights of concrete steps, which also incorporate the prisoners' property room and linen room. Officers' meals are prepared in C Block and carried to the mess on trays. Officers have requested the installation of a shower for when they do double shifts, in case of an accident or for when they handle a dirty prisoner.

A large amount of money has been spent on furnishings but, I feel, not with a great deal of thought. Although new chairs have been purchased for stage 3, I am told that the fabric on them is not easily cleaned. Bearing in mind that many of the prisoners when first admitted have scabies, lice-infected hair, syphilis, gonorrhoea and other infectious diseases, the chairs become a hygiene problem.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HOOPER: I assure the honourable member that those prisoners do not come from the electorate of Brisbane Central.

That is not a reflection on all of the inmates but a fact of life is that a number of inmates who have been sleeping in parks or have been on drugs or alcohol are infected on arrival, so the officers and other inmates are naturally uneasy about their own health.

I wish to make a few quick comparisons. The old female prison consisted of two dormitories and nine cells, and its lowest number of prisoners since 1973 was 15 and the highest since then was 63. The maximum staff in the old prison was 25. Stages 1 and 2 of the new prison contain B Block, which has 41 cells, and C Block, which has 16 cells, a total of 57 cells. Stage 3, which has just been completed, has 16 cells, making a grand total of 73. The lowest number of prisoners in the new prison has been 31 and the highest has been 53, with a total staff of 31.

I will now list some of the unsatisfactory aspects of the new Women's Prison. In the refuse room, there is a walk-in freezer which, for health reasons, cannot be used. The laundry consists of two small washing machines and one dryer so that all heavy washing has to be sent to the male division.

As honourable members can see, the Brisbane Women's Prison has quite a few problems and the Minister should get his department to carry out some very necessary remedial work. Because the faults at the prison go unremedied, the tax-payer is meeting a great deal of unnecessary expense in the staffing and running of the prison. The Minister is not presently in the House, but I place on record that if he did his job effectively instead of scuttle-butting round after the Premier asking for his permission before making statements, it would be better for the people of Queensland and certainly for the prisoners incarcerated in Brisbane's maximum security prison at Boggo Road.

(Debate interrupted.)

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before we proceed, I inform honourable members that we have an important visitor in our midst. I would like members to welcome Dr S. Langi Kavaliku, Minister for Education, Works and Civil Aviation, Disaster Relief and Rehabilitation in the Government of Tonga.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (8.50 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this debate. The results of the recent election vindicated the policies of the National Party-led Government over the past 25 years.

The election results indicate that the voting public were not taken for a ride and were not taken in by the comments made by Opposition members during the election campaign.

It was quite obvious from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition during the campaign that he could not even do his sums. He made the sweeping statement that the Government was running out of money, and he even named the date when the money would run out. But a month or two earlier he said that the Government had a tremendous amount of money hidden in hollow logs, as it were. He said that the Government was too lousy to spend the money, that it wanted to keep it for a rainy day. Obviously one of his comments was incorrect.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I wish to hear the honourable member for Gympie in silence.

Mr STEPHAN: It was obvious that the last two Opposition members had nothing to say, and it is equally obvious that they do not want to learn anything.

In his usual derogatory manner the member for Archerfield set about extolling the virtues of massage parlours. One hears this every time he makes a speech. I wonder how he knows so much about them. I intended to interject and ask him, but it was not worth the effort. He might be very large in stature, but he has very little ability to make any impact on the community. I am convinced that if he did increase his majority at the last election it was primarily because he was not in his electorate very much and the voters were not able to form an opinion about him.

I also noted the comments of the honourable member for Sandgate. He referred at length to what has been occurring in some of the southern States. One could be excused for wondering why he is still a resident of Queensland. A large number of people are coming to this State and not very many are leaving it. Why is it that Mr Hawke has not even begun to create the 500 000 extra jobs he promised in the election campaign? Why is it that fuel prices have risen by 6c or 7c a litre—more if we take the devaluation of the Australian dollar into account—and not decreased by the 2c or 3c a litre Mr Hawke said they would? Opposition members have not given us any reasons why these promises have not been fulfilled. One could be excused for thinking that they are ill informed and do not really know anything other than what is written on the slips of paper that come down from Trades Hall.

Opposition members have referred to the CEP and asked why it has not been utilised to any extent in this State. My own council has gone on record as saying that the guide-lines that have been handed to them are so difficult to follow that it is finding it almost impossible to meet the requirements laid down for the projects it wishes to undertake.

Mr Borbidge: The Queensland Government asked the Prime Minister to review the guide-lines and he refused.

Mr STEPHAN: He did that for a very good reason. He hoped that the Queensland Government would not use all of the money.

A Government Member: He ran Queensland—

Mr STEPHAN: Yes, Wran is an also-ran in New South Wales.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: I take that interjection. I believe that he will be out after the next election. The local governments and councils are quite keen on the schemes that have been put forward by the State Government. They are very willing to use the funding under the guide-lines that have been set.

In Queensland, the Government has refused to impose the wide range of taxes that Labor administrations in other States have thrust on their citizens. In Queensland, there is no tobacco tax, no petrol tax and no financial institutions tax. During the last election campaign, my opponent tried to point out that Queensland was not the lowest-taxed State but the highest. I begin to wonder what naivety a man of politics can display in an effort to insult the electors by making such a ridiculous comment.

I will compare some of the taxes in Queensland with those in vogue in New South Wales and Victoria. The standard motor vehicle registration fee for a six-cylinder Commodore in New South Wales is \$265.30. In the Victorian metropolitan area, it is \$265.30. In Queensland it is \$234.

Mr FitzGerald: And there is no fuel tax here, either.

Mr STEPHAN: We do not have fuel tax.

On looking at the fuel prices in the three States, I see that in New South Wales the tax is 3.02c a litre, that Victoria has the same tax, and that Queensland has no fuel tax.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: If the honourable member will listen, I will tell him about the driver's licence fees. In New South Wales, for one year, a driver's licence costs \$15. In Victoria, for three years, a licence costs \$30. In Queensland, a driver's licence can be renewed for five years for \$10.

The tax on cigarettes should be well known to most of us. In New South Wales, a packet of cigarettes of a particular brand costs \$1.64, plus a 6c increase in tax imposed in November. In Victoria, a similar pack of cigarettes costs \$1.78, whereas in Queensland it costs \$1.42. The tax on cigarettes is one reason why a black market operates, with people buying cigarettes in Queensland and selling them readily in the southern States.

The level of pay-roll tax has caused me and many other people in Queensland to believe that it is still too high. From time to time, constituents point out to me how much they are paying in pay-roll tax. For instance, a company that was employing 30 people in 1978 and paying \$330,000 in salaries and wages had a monthly exemption of \$2,250 in pay-roll tax, and the tax was at 5 per cent. In 1983, wages and salaries increased to \$437,000. With pay-roll tax still at 5 per cent, the company had a monthly exemption of \$1,000, or \$15,000 a year. The management is concerned, because with what it contributes in pay-roll tax it could employ two additional staff and help alleviate unemployment.

I agree with small business operators who believe that pay-roll tax is being used largely to gather revenue. Without doubt, the exemption level must be increased. However, by making a comparison with New South Wales, members will realise how well off Queenslanders are, how little they pay, and how much encouragement that must be to our constituents. The level of pay-roll tax in Queensland is a good reason why people come to live in this State rather than stay in Victoria and New South Wales.

We receive complaints about the amount of money that the State Government is spending on education. It is interesting to note that, during the last 10 years, expenditure on education has increased by 300 per cent. During the same period Government revenue has increased by only 214 per cent. We can see that education has been given a high priority.

Generally, taxes take away from the producer and even the wage earner the incentive to work harder. When people receive a wage increase of \$10 a week, they have to pay \$4 extra in tax. Therefore, they have only \$6 with which to purchase the products that they need. However, the full amount of \$10 is taken into account when the cost of the product is being calculated. That is one of the main reasons for the continual clamour for increased wages.

I take umbrage at the comment of the member for Sandgate about the number of quangos in Queensland. He stated that the quangos are supported by the Government. I wonder whether he has taken the trouble to find out what these boards actually do.

Mr Neal: He would not have a clue.

Mr STEPHAN: That is correct.

The great majority of these boards are funded by industry. They answer to industry. They present reports to the Parliament. I wonder how many members of the Labor Party read these reports to find out what is going on.

Mr Randell: The Labor Party wants to create more.

Mr STEPHAN: Yes. As I say, in the great majority of cases the boards are funded by industry. They provide marketing expertise.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: We cannot ignore the orderly marketing question.

A great deal of promotion is required to sell the article that is produced. Time and time again I receive representations that increased amounts of money be spent on promotion. I even receive requests that Government money be spent on promotion by these boards; but those requests are not met. Industry takes care of promotion. It is a problem to sell our products at a reasonable price. The problem cannot be ignored; it will not go away.

As a result of the introduction of this Appropriation Bill and the presentation of the Budget in a week's time, we can look forward to progressive development in this State and to an increase in the number of people coming here from the south. Queensland is a State in which we are all proud to live.

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (9.4 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker, before making my contribution to this debate I wish to congratulate you on being elected Chairman of Committees. You are now the senior person at the table of this Chamber.

Tonight it is my duty to talk about something that is relevant to the appropriation of the State's money. I will record the misappropriation of tax-payer's funds by a very senior public servant.

Before doing that, I wish to comment on the way in which the election was called. I see the Premier standing in the lobby. People say to me that those who are destructive of the democratic system under which we live come from the extreme right of politics. I do not know why that is. They are always far more destructive of the things that people hold dear than is anyone from elsewhere in the structure.

The Premier has come in and taken his seat. His days as Premier are numbered. He does not have a very long political future. The things that he has done to the values that are held sacred in this State annoy me.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Give an example.

Mr SCOTT: The Premier has asked for an example.

A typical one is when he went to the Governor and claimed that he had a minority Government. He prevented the Governor from ordering him to call the Parliament together late in August—that is what the Premier should have done—or to go to the people immediately. The Premier forced the Governor of Queensland, the Queen's representative, to give him far more leeway than any Premier or Prime Minister of any Government in Australia has ever been given.

What did the Premier do? He immediately proceeded to misuse the trust placed in him. I notice that the honourable gentleman cannot face me when I am talking about these things, because they are quite true. That is why he is walking out of the Chamber with his tail between his legs.

I have said what the Premier did. He then appointed seven Ministers and proceeded to travel around Queensland handing out largesse as if it was going out of fashion. That was one of the factors that helped the Premier's party to its very slender win in the State election. He is a very destructive man.

I now turn my attention to Mr P. J. Killoran, who is the Director of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and who was a candidate for the seat of Cook.

Mr Casey: The failed candidate.

Mr SCOTT: Yes, the failed candidate, with a miserable 21 per cent of the votes. Probably some of those were straight down the ticket.

Mr Casey: He was rejected by the people he was administering.

Mr SCOTT: That is true; he was totally rejected. On the way to being rejected, he was also responsible for a great misuse of public funds.

I have three reasons for talking about this matter in the debate on the Appropriation Bill. I am talking about the expenditure and misuse of public money, the misuse of funds, and the misuse of the Westminster system, because Mr Killoran, the failed candidate, is back in his position as director.

I shall comment also on what makes a candidate, and why it is that the National Party stoops so low as to select candidates of such calibre. Admittedly, some jump into the National Party's hands. However, others go out of their way to get there.

The history of Mr Killoran as a candidate started approximately 12 months ago. My wife and I were in the far north of the Cook electorate when we heard rumours that he was going to stand as a candidate for the electorate of Cook. Actually, he was going to stand three years ago. If he had much common sense—he is very short on it—he probably would have realised that was a better time, because it would have been easier to dislodge me then. However, he did not quite have the intestinal fortitude to stand at that time. He flew some kites and there was a bit of smoke, but there was no substance to the rumours.

Of course, at that time he did not fully qualify for his superannuation. But three years later in 1983, he had passed the age of 60, and under the fairly generous conditions enjoyed by senior public servants in Queensland, he had reached the age for the maximum superannuation pay-out. It was the ideal time for him to strike. I might say that he had nothing to lose by being a candidate in Cook, because the part of the tab that the Government did not pick up was picked up by the National Party, and it did not cost him one red cent.

Mr Eaton: He wouldn't have lasted long if we had won the election.

Mr SCOTT: No, he would have had a very quick demise.

The first anyone heard of his standing as a candidate was rumour. However, the evidence was there, because the man never left the Cook electorate. For years I had known the role of the director, because I was a student of affairs in the Cook electorate long before I first stood for the seat in 1974.

Mr KATTER: I rise to a point of order. As I understand it, the honourable member himself was a public servant and, on his own admission now, he was running around the area at the time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is no valid point of order. However, I remind the honourable member for Cook that I want some relevance in this debate.

Mr SCOTT: I am speaking to the Bill, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am speaking about the misappropriation of public money.

Mr Killoran spent many months in the Cook electorate when he was being paid as a director in the public service. He was not directing the affairs of the DAIA; he was spending Government money on his campaign in the electorate of Cook. In a moment I shall be more specific. I ask honourable members to bear with me while I proceed.

Nominations closed on 22 September. At that time, that public servant, who was misappropriating public funds, was on Moa Island.

Mr KATTER: I rise to a point of order. The constant use of the words "misappropriation of funds" is quite wrong. I ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs has asked that the words "misappropriation of funds" be withdrawn.

Mr SCOTT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your direction. I was not using those words about him.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member return to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr KATTER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I must persist with the point of order that I raised. The statement is a reflection upon my Ministry, because that particular gentleman is still with the department. The accusation is that he misappropriated funds. That reflects upon the Ministry as it now stands.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Cook to cease provoking the Minister by referring to the misappropriation of funds.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. It is not the function of the Deputy Speaker to rule that a Minister can take points of order on behalf of a public servant. That ruling has been given on a hundred occasions in this Parliament.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister was not taking a point of order on behalf of a public servant; he was taking a point of order on his own behalf as a Minister.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not accept the Minister's point of order. I merely asked the member to return to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a further point of order. During the 12 years that I have been a member of Parliament, rulings have been made that on the debate on the Appropriation Bill a member can speak about any matter at all.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order 123A for arguing with the Chair, and I ask the member for Cook to proceed with his speech.

Mr SCOTT: I am referring to a matter relating to appropriation.

When nominations closed, Mr Killoran, who was announced as a candidate, was on a job in the public service at Moa Island. He was officially opening a Government airstrip. If being there and being a candidate is not a misuse of public moneys, I do not know what is.

There are more serious aspects to it, too. To use an expression bandied around by the Premier, the Minister might wind up with egg on his face. I have been told that the man used the departmental printing press of DAIA to print his election material. There is evidence to that effect. That matter was investigated by the State Service Union. There is evidence that Pat Killoran used the departmental facilities in Brisbane to have electoral material printed.

If the Public Service Board does its job, there should be an investigation, and the Minister should be involved in that investigation. These matters should be called to account so that it can be determined whether Mr Killoran misappropriated public money and used it in his campaign. He is alleged to have sworn junior departmental officers to secrecy. However, people subsequently ran paper through the printing machines to obtain an image of the material printed. I understand that the material subsequently printed is in the possession of certain people.

I would like to know who paid Mr Killoran's fare to north Queensland when he began his campaign. As I said, he could no longer hide that he was a candidate. He was on Moa Island opening the airstrip. I would like to know whether the department or Mr Killoran paid the fare from his place of employment, which is normally Brisbane, to Cairns and then to the Torres Strait area, or was that man able to start campaigning in the Torres Strait area, his fare up there having been paid by the tax-payers of Queensland? My next question is: When he resumed work, where did he start?

I have copies of a telegram that was sent out in the director's name over the DAIA radio. This is another misappropriation—and that is the only word I can use—of public money. The telegram, which is on paper headed "Radio Message. Department of Aboriginal and Islander Advancement Radio Network" reads—

"To: Chairman All Islands Repeat Chairmen and Managers all Gulf stations."

That means that it was to all the mainland Aboriginal communities and all the outer islands of the Torres Strait. It continues—

"From Pat Killoran Director

Ref. 2A/15/22/9

Wish to advise that today I have been nominated to the Cook electorate—not the very positive "I am nominating", but "I have been nominated for the Cook electorate"—

"and would appreciate the support from your people. Will visit yours shortly." That means "your community". It is signed "Pat Killoran". It was sent at 11 a.m. So he got in very smartly, just before nominations actually closed on 22 September.

Those telegrams went out to approximately 20 communities. I am not certain how much that telegram would cost, but quite a few dollars would be involved. I would like to sight the receipt for the money that that man paid out to have the telegram sent.

They are not the only telegrams he has sent. He sends long condolence telegrams, and I have an example with me. Public money is involved, so there is no worry about verbiage. Words can be sent out by the dozen. This is to one of the communities.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr SCOTT: I will not be sending him a telegram of sympathy, or of condolence. He has not departed yet. The telegram reads—

“I was deeply distressed and shocked this morning of the sudden and unexpected loss of 2 good people of (so and so) and hasten to convey to you and all relatives and their many friends my deep and sincere sympathy as well as those of Felicity who joins me in the sadness all you people will be feeling at this time. They were good people who served Almighty God and their fellow citizens truthfully and well so we are sure there will be a special place for them in the hereafter. We do hope that the many memories you have of the time they were spared to us on earth will help you carry the burden of loss.”

Mr KATTER: I rise to a point of order. There are certain things that are in poor taste to such a degree that they should not be allowed and most certainly should not be allowed in the debate on an Appropriation Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr SCOTT: Literally dozens and dozens of those telegrams and telexes were sent out. The Minister knows as much about it as I do.

When I was in Bamaga before the election and it was still unknown whether or not Killoran was standing, people said to me, “You only have to look at the volume of telexes going through this office to private people to know that there is something in the wind.” However, if the Minister condones that type of thing, let him keep interjecting. I love this, because his credibility as a Minister is being very seriously undermined. I know that he doesn't have very much credibility and he has long way to go, and he should proceed warily.

At some unspecified time Mr Killoran actually went on leave, and he began to campaign as an honest man in a very minor way. I say “in a minor way”, because he was still quite happy to use Government facilities and spend tax-payers' money. During his stay on Thursday Island whilst on leave, Mr Killoran lodged in Government accommodation normally available only to Ministers and the most senior public servants. The question I pose is: Who authorised Mr Killoran's use of the accommodation and who paid the cost?

Mr Burns: Joh.

Mr SCOTT: That is right, but Joh would not personally pay the cost. The tax-payer would pay the cost. I am referring to “Four Winds”, which is accommodation for Ministers and very senior public servants. Of course, Pat Killoran could never forget during the campaign that he was a senior public servant.

I have evidence that letters in Mr Killoran's name containing only explicit political propaganda were delivered by a community policeman during work hours to people living in Tamwoy Town on Thursday Island. The question must be asked: Who authorised the delivery and what steps are being taken to recover from the unsuccessful candidate in Cook, the one who lost the election with only 21 per cent of the vote, the cost of that exercise.

Departmental facilities were used in other places. I have examples of letters which commence with, “Dear North Queenslander”. The insipid nonsense contained in these letters was sent out at tax-payers' expense. Perhaps a little money came from the National Party but certainly none came out of Pat Killoran's pocket.

The public servants employed by the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement were totally embarrassed at being used in this way because it was a misappropriation of their time that was suppose to be used for the public good. The debate is about the appropriation of that sort of money. I have mentioned the very large number of personal telegrams and lengthy telexes that were sent.

I will mention very briefly the dance festival at Cooktown that was held before the election. The director was able to act like a great bloke and congratulate some very genuine people who were brought at departmental expense to dance in Cooktown. That was not for the benefit of Aboriginal culture but for the benefit of the director and the enhancement of his electoral prospects. At Aurukun I was told that he ordered \$3,000-worth of extra air charter to get people to Cooktown for the dance festival. Government money was used for that purpose. Of course, nothing appears in writing. It was done on the telephone. Aboriginal people do not like being used as political footballs, but they were certainly used by the director.

Evidence is available that an excessive number of trophies of all sorts were purchased by the director's department for presentation to school students participating in sporting events in the 12 months leading up to the election. The director presented them in his name. At the time a departmental public relations officer photographed the numerous presentations and many copies of those photographs were sent to the recipients with the director's compliments. So those enlargements, which were taken with a departmental camera and developed at departmental expense, were sent to the recipients.

Mr KATTER: I rise again to a point of order. If the honourable member is alleging a misuse of public moneys, I accept it as part of the debate on the Appropriation Bill. However, the honourable member should not be allowed to denigrate a person for what he did during an election campaign that was paid for by the National Party, as that is not part of the Appropriation Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I inform the House that a point of order cannot be taken on behalf of another person. A point of order can only be taken on a personal basis by a member who is in the Chamber.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. This is the fifth time the Minister has got to his feet with a facetious point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not take that point of order.

Mr KATTER: I rise to another point of order. I am not taking a point of order to protect the person himself. My point of order is that the honourable member is not speaking to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Cook to speak to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr SCOTT: I am certainly speaking to the Appropriation Bill.

Another example of the power wielded by the director and the misuse of departmental money is that while he was flying round on his campaign he used the radio of the aeroplane to ask a community to open an airstrip especially for him. That community used an airstrip at a different location, but he wanted to use the other airstrip as it was a little closer to the community he wanted to visit.

These are examples of a serious and gross misuse of Killoran's position as director and as a candidate. An investigation into these matters is warranted and an inquiry should be held into the alleged misuse of departmental funds. I will certainly see that such an inquiry is undertaken.

The director was responsible for the quick promotion of a liaison officer. Questions should be asked about the way this departmental officer, Felicity Joy Taylor, was promoted to a classification I-6 simply to work on the director's campaign. She then proceeded to flex on and off leave during the campaign. She appeared in all sorts of places in the company of the director and was no doubt of great use in furthering his electoral prospects. I would like to know how much of that campaign was paid for with departmental money.

It is rather interesting to note that Felicity Joy Taylor and Patrick James Killoran applied for his and her blocks of land in Chillagoe through the Mines Department. Lo and behold, one finds that the Mareeba Shire Council was approached and asked to expedite the matter of processing those blocks. I have here a letter from the Mareeba Shire Council to the Honourable I. J. Gibbs. It states—

“Council expressed extreme concern at the contents of your letter, particularly where it is indicated that it is the intention of the Mines Department to issue Miners’ Homestead Perpetual Leases in mining fields without the requirement of the applicants being bona fide miners.”

That was Taylor and Killoran in some strange sort of partnership, aided and abetted by the Mines Department. I would like to know where all this ends. I believe that Killoran should be called in by the Public Service Board and made to pay back the money so that the next time we are debating an Appropriation Bill there will be just that much more in the coffers from which the people of Queensland can gain some value. Has he any receipts for the payment of these moneys?

Killoran has a history of transferring people within the department, people in other departments who have fallen foul of him and people he claims have been promoting a brand of politics different from that of the National Party, which he as a very senior public servant espouses and supports. Recently a nursing sister working at a community under the Aboriginal Health Program was moved to another town at the behest of the Director of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement. That is just one example. Earlier in the year a liaison officer was transferred from a community. Apparently her only misdemeanour—if it was that—was to speak about a side of politics other than the National Party side.

The man then proceeded to campaign as if he had six hands and 10 pockets. He promised a first-class road to Bamaga. He said there would be no need for the Mason Shipping Line to call because all goods could be carried to Bamaga by road. He said that there would be a drop in prices. I do not know whether he is implying that, because Masons are carting goods into Bamaga, prices are higher than they need to be. This is the man who stopped the “Paluma” trading at Bamaga. That upset the people a great deal because it was offering some competition to the Island Industry Board. I can understand why public servants generally dislike politicians, because politicians—not so much those on the Opposition side but certainly those on the Government side—go round making promises as if money was going out of fashion, and it is the public servants who have to try to find the money to fulfil those promises. That was no trouble to Mr Killoran. He went out and promised all these things. He was all things to all people.

I want to read some extracts from his letters because they indicate the type of person that he is. How he can be left in his position as director I do not know. I want to quote from his “Dear North Queenslander” letter which was sent to one of the indigenous communities. I do not know why he had to patronise them and couch his letters in this type of language. It reads—

“Dear North Queenslander,

As we have spoken for a long time now, many people have been asking me to stand for Parliament, and now it is much stronger for the next election on October 22. This will be in your area, the Cook Electorate, as your Member of Parliament. I am answering these requests and offer my services.

You know that I have worked with you for many years and together we’ve come a long way.”

He goes on to refer to all the things he has allegedly given to the communities, such as the airstrips, the fresh water supplies—which, incidently, they do not have—the schools, the canteens and the community halls. He says “All of these things have been achieved”, implying that they have come from him and not from the department. The letter continues—

“As well as backing and supporting you, I need the added strength of your support now, to lead the talking in Parliament to achieve even more than I can as Director. I don’t think there is anyone else at all, who has lived amongst you for so long who can support your needs as strongly in Government.”

He was talking down to these people. A different style of letter was sent to people in the other areas. This is the literary style he adopts in this letter—

“My services are commended to you as one already in constant communication and close contact with the people that matter.”

I am not too sure who are the people who matter, but this man seems to know. He referred to all sorts of goodies.

Mr Casey: He signed the cheques.

Mr SCOTT: That is right.

This newsletter, in part, reads—

“The relief bridge at Cooktown was funded through my efforts at a time when all other avenues were negative.”

That is total and utter nonsense. The letter continues a little later in this vein—

“The access road from Cairns to Iron Range has been upgraded.”

Goodness me, some millions of dollars would have been involved. The letter continues—

“My involvement in the AUSSAT satellite argument has gone beyond a bureaucratic commitment. I attended the Alice Springs conference in June and have had a great deal of personal involvement in ensuring its launching.”

I wonder what he was doing over there. The letter continues—

“A further bore was harnessed at Croydon to upgrade water supply. Provided significant funds for upgrading of new water supply at Normanton planned to extend to include Karumba.”

These are wonderful things. He has solved all of the primary industry problems. He was a remarkable candidate.

Mr Alison: This has a lot to do with the Appropriation Bill.

Mr SCOTT: It has. The honourable member does not care about the misspending of public money. He is new in this place. He should try to be conscientious in the interests of his electors. He should give a little thought to the spending of public money.

I have referred to two different letters and I intend to read an extract from a speech made at a certain community which is terribly patronising in its manner. It refers to some wonderful things that this man has claimed all over the place. The Minister (Mr Bird) was with him. He spoke about, “the most gorgeous of girls” and continued—

“when I look around here today I can see that now adding up that it’s a few years since I was here and the same girls are here and like me are now a few years older but nevertheless, very nice.”

That is a terrible way of campaigning. It is no wonder the man did not even get close to winning.

Mr Casey: Do you reckon Katter will go that way too?

Mr SCOTT: I should say that the Minister will be history. The member for Cairns used to say, “Mr Katter does not matter.” He does now, because he is a Minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the subject under discussion.

Mr SCOTT: He made a very patronising speech and told people how he had spent public money for their benefit. He said—

“Do I make that very, very clear so that you understand I’m talking now of policies and things, because as the Minister said, quite a long time, quite a few years, many, many people have been saying you should get into Parliament, you could push a bit stronger, you could do it a bit harder because you’ve lived with and you feel part of both the Aboriginal and Island people, over more than 35-40 years and I decided this year that I was going to retire because I could cash in what they call your superannuation, I can invest that and I can get more money from that than I do get in salary now—so I’m working for nothing anyway.”

What a terribly generous man. He continues—

“Thats just one of the facts of life, I say it because it is true

So I had a talk with many, many councillors both in the Islands and on the Cape Peninsula areas and almost right across the board they said we would like you to go for one or more term, we want you to stay But because of the ‘closeness’ I suppose is the word, with the coloured people of the Cape York Peninsula area, the Gulf of Carpentaria and the Torres Strait I decided to offer my services to you people for one or at the most two terms, that is a maximum of six years if you decide you want me, you vote me in, I will go for one term and then I’ll say to you, have we done the job you wanted done, if you say no, I’ll go away, don’t worry about it—quite happily. Or I will stay for two terms and then I must go away.”

What a load of codswallop this is. He continues—

“I want some time to sit down and think and the reason I would go away then is that as you know the Cook Electorate was designed so a coloured man could be you representative.”

(Time expired.)

Hon. N. E. LEE (Yeronga) (9.34 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to support the Appropriation Bill. My leader (Sir William Knox) said on the night after his election as leader of the Liberal Party that we would support the Government at all times on money matters unless, of course, it did something completely silly. We will also give support to the Government on most occasions unless we see something similar to what happened today.

I agree with what the Premier said today. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr Wright) certainly did try to use scare tactics to influence Government employees, particularly when he said that the State was going broke. He wanted to debate the issue with anybody. He wanted to debate it with the Premier and with the Deputy Premier. At one stage he even wanted to debate it with the Under Treasurer and Under Secretary (Mr Hielscher). Thank heavens he didn’t, because he would have chewed the honourable member up and spat him out in little bits. Surely the Leader of the Opposition has enough faith in the Under Treasurer and Under Secretary to know that he would not allow any Treasurer to let the State go broke so that it could not pay its debts. He was attacking not only the Premier but also the departmental officers. I remind him that, under Liberal Treasurers, this State has had a balanced Budget since 1957. It will be interesting to see whether the 1984-85 Budget balances. I am sure that it will.

Mr Simpson: You will still get paid.

Mr LEE: I am not particularly worried about being paid; but like the honourable member, I believe that we earn our money.

The member for Sandgate spoke at great length—he spoke for too long—about the way that previous Governments and this Government were, through rail freights, taxing the coal companies out of business. He said that this was completely wrecking the industry and creating unemployment. If that is the case, why did the Governor refer to the opening up of six new coal mines? If the Government is taxing mining companies out of existence, why are six new mines opening in Queensland? That is a contradiction. That shows how poor was the attack that the honourable member made on the Government.

I was pleased to note that some \$18m is being spent on the erection of soot arresters at the Tennyson Power Station, which is in my electorate. The work is already half completed and I hope that more money is being appropriated to allow the work to be completed.

The honourable member for Luggage Point, Brothels and Massage Parlours—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! That is an unparliamentary statement, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it. He will refer to other honourable members by their correct titles.

Mr LEE: I apologise. It was a slip of the tongue. It was what I was thinking. I meant to refer to the member for Archerfield. He went on his usual trip round the massage parlours. He must frequent them. He even found one in my electorate. He told me not only where it was but also where the massage girls were living. I farm my electorate very well, and I did not know that it was there. He could tell me the street and the house number. He must certainly frequent massage parlours.

For years Aborigines wanted land. They were reported in "The Courier-Mail" of Wednesday, 27 November 1983, as saying that they do not want land now, but they want mines. So what do they want? They have been wanting land for years, and when they get some land they suddenly want what ordinary citizens cannot have; they want all the minerals and all the wealth that is down in the ground. I cannot have it.

I have a property at Roma that has a gas and oil well on it. The well is not being used at the moment, but it is an active well. I am not going to say in which direction it is from Roma, because if I do the Aborigines will go out there and find some sacred site on the property. And it will be around that oil well for sure.

It seems strange that suddenly the Aborigines want mineral rights instead of land rights. Their demands were reported again this morning.

Mr Menzel: It is sacred ground.

Mr LEE: As the member for Mulgrave said, if land contains minerals it is sacred ground; that is for sure.

During the run-up to the State election, the National Party minority Government announced projects worth many millions of dollars that would commence during or after the election. They were announced by all departments. I do not decry that for one moment—I wish the Government good luck, and the projects will be good for Queensland—but I want to know whether the projects will go ahead now. Many people tendered for these jobs in good faith, thinking that they will go ahead immediately. However, it is rumoured that many of the jobs will be delayed for up to eight or nine months.

Two factors arise from that. The first is that, if the projects are delayed for any lengthy time, the Government must ensure that it does not re-call tenders. That would be totally unjust to any contractor who bid for a job and won it honestly. The Government may decide to delay the project and re-call tenders to try to get a cheaper job. That would be unfair. There is nothing wrong with a contractor getting the ordinary rise and fall provision that is built into a contract for a delay of more than nine months. That may not be as good for the contractor as starting the job straight away, because he would be anxious to keep his men together in these hard times and it would be better for him to start immediately on projects.

It is also rumoured that the earthworks involved with the construction of the Stanwell Power House, which will cost some many billions of dollars, are going to be delayed for up to nine months. I hope that that is not so. However, I repeat that if they are to be delayed, the Government should not re-call tenders in the hope that it can get a cheaper job because of economic circumstances.

If a contractor, in good faith, tenders for that job and wins it correctly, he has every right to be given that job. He should be able to get the usual rise and fall provision, but no more. If he asked for some exorbitant fee because the contract was delayed, the Government would have every right to re-call tenders; but if he asked for no more than what is provided in the clauses of the contract, he would have every right to get the job.

Mr Prest: These are serious allegations. What do you base them on?

Mr LEE: Certainly not on anything the honourable member has told me. While I have been in the House he has never said anything that has been correct.

I now want to mention something that I read in an article contained in the London "Daily Express" It refers to "republican Hawke" and a royal welcome for him. I will read it into "Hansard" because it is really typical of what he is and of what the Labor Party represents. The article reads—

"Australia's Labour Premier Bob Hawke, who despises royalty, has arrived in Britain to spend two days with the Royal Family.

He took afternoon tea yesterday with the Prince and Princess of Wales. Today he has lunch with the Queen. This afternoon he will accompany the Queen Mother to the opening of the Australia Studies Centre in London.

Has the wild man of the Australian Left, who once appeared in the Guinness Book of Records for sinking two and a half pints of beer in 12 seconds, suddenly joined the Monarchist League and dropped his declared intention to turn Australia into a republic?

'I don't think we will be talking about kings of Australia for ever more,' he is quoted as saying.

Yet here he is in London, spending every available moment with the family he is determined to put out of business back home."

That is a reference to the traitor and the two-timer who is the Prime Minister.

I have been asked not to speak at length. I have great pleasure in supporting the Appropriation Bill.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (9.46 p.m.): Firstly, I thank the people of Chatsworth for once again electing me to represent them in this Assembly.

An Opposition Member: They could not have made a better choice.

Mr MACKENROTH: I agree. My wife and children agree also.

I wish to refer to the Queensland Housing Commission. It interested me greatly yesterday to hear the Governor state—

"The Queensland Housing Commission expects to provide record numbers of welfare and pensioner homes in 1983-84. Building programmes will be augmented by spot purchasing of existing houses to achieve a social integration of public housing.

Home ownership will continue to be encouraged through maintenance of Queensland's unique interest subsidy scheme. This offers modest income earners non-repayable subsidy of interest benefits. The Commercial scheme also will be maintained."

One year ago the then Treasurer (Dr Edwards) during his Budget speech told us that in the year 1982-83 he was going to inject \$277.1m into housing in Queensland and that that was going to be a record amount for Queensland. That was stated to the people of Queensland in August 1982. The Government, including the Premier and the Minister for Works and Housing, made great play of the work that they were going to do in Queensland through the Queensland Housing Commission.

It sickens me to pick up the Auditor-General's report that was published today and to read that in the year 1982-83 there was a lapsed appropriation of \$73,777,102, which means that 30 per cent of the money allocated for housing in Queensland was not spent in the last financial year. In August last year, the Government told us that it was going to do great things for housing in Queensland. In the Governor's Opening Speech to the Parliament yesterday, he told us that new records would be broken. However, when I read the Auditor-General's report today, I found that \$73m of last year's Budget for housing was not spent. That is something that should be examined by this Parliament and by all members of the public in Queensland.

It goes deeper than that. During the year, the Federal Government made available to Queensland \$15.9m from the wage pause funds to provide extra housing. Already we have a situation in which the Queensland Government has allocated \$277m for housing. For the 1982-83 financial year, the Federal Government allocated an extra \$15.9m for public rental housing. That is what that money was to be used for. However, the departmental appropriation account for 1982-83 shows that the appropriation for that year was \$277,118,437. The money spent, plus the lapsed appropriation, totals exactly that amount. At no stage during the 1982-83 financial year was \$15.9m placed into the account to provide additional housing.

What in fact happened was that the Queensland Housing Commission juggled its books. Simply put, it is a case of misappropriation of tax-payers' money. The books have been juggled to make it appear that more money was spent. \$13,150,000 was taken out of the fund to provide advances to borrowers and purchasers and was placed into the rental account; \$1.5m was placed into land acquisition and development for rental homes; \$11m was directed to the erection of new houses; \$600,000 went to maintenance, rates and so on, for rental housing; and some \$50,000 was expended in the rent of offices, travelling expenses, incidentals, and so on. The Budget should have been increased by \$15.9m. It was increased by some \$13.1m—not by the infusion of new Commonwealth money, but by transferring money that had already been allocated to the Queensland Housing Commission for the purchase of homes.

However, if the Minister tries to justify that action, I remind him that \$650,000 of that money was placed in the wrong accounts. It was directed towards travelling expenses for Housing Commission officers and maintenance of existing houses. Of the total amount of money that was then allocated—and that did not include the \$15.9m—there was a shortfall of some \$2.8m. A further \$4.8m of that money was not spent. Therefore, something like \$7.6m that should have been spent on public rental housing in Queensland was not spent. It is a disgrace. It is a complete and total misappropriation of tax-payers' funds by the Housing Commission.

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member continually refers to "misappropriation of funds". It is offensive to me and to my Government, and I ask him to withdraw it. There is no such thing. Funds are not misappropriated. He should not keep glancing up at the press gallery. I know that the reporters will record what he is saying. However, I wish to have him withdraw the term "misappropriation". It is not correct, and it is offensive.

Mr MACKENROTH: If it is offensive to the Minister, I will withdraw it and refer instead to the juggling of accounts. That is why—

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a further point of order. I will not accept the words "juggling of funds". That is not on. It is incorrect; it is not true. It is offensive to me, and I ask that he withdraw it and apologise.

Mr MACKENROTH: I will withdraw the term "juggling of accounts" and replace it with the term "subdivisional transfers".

An Opposition Member: Will you accept that?

Mr WHARTON: I will accept nothing that the honourable member says, because it is not true. He is making a fool of himself. I ask that he withdraw.

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I find myself in a very—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Minister's point of order is that he resents reference to "misappropriation of funds" or any other term that refers to the same thing. I ask the the honourable member for Chatsworth to discontinue.

Mr MACKENROTH: I do find myself in a difficult position. I do not know what to do. "Subdivisional transfer" is the term by which the Auditor-General refers to the practice. Therefore, I ask for your ruling on whether I can refer to the practice as "subdivisional transfers".

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a fine point, but the honourable member may use that term.

Mr WHARTON: It may not be right. Therefore, I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr MACKENROTH: Part 2.18.2 of the Queensland Housing Commission Departmental Appropriation Account for 1982-83 shows the figure of \$13.15m as "subdivisional transfers". I believe that money has been placed across on the subdivisional transfers so that the Queensland Government did not have to place in the Queensland Housing Commission account the \$15.9m that it obtained from wage pause funds.

If the Minister can show me anywhere in the accounts of the Queensland Housing Commission where that \$15.9m has gone, I will believe him; but it does not show up in the amount of money that was appropriated in the last Budget, when \$277m was appropriated for housing in Queensland. These figures show an appropriation of \$277m, an expenditure of \$203.3m and a lapsed appropriation of \$73.7m. Nowhere do they show an increase of \$15.9m for money that the Queensland Government received under the wage pause program. So the Minister owes the House an explanation and I hope that tomorrow he can provide it. I am sure that the 10 000 people now waiting for Queensland Housing Commission accommodation would like to know where that \$15.9m has gone.

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member said that \$15.9m has been misappropriated. That is not so. The money has been spent on rental housing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the honourable member use the word "misappropriation".

Mr MACKENROTH: I was very careful not to use the word "misappropriation"

Yesterday in his Opening Speech the Governor also said—

"My Government, jointly with the Commonwealth, has introduced the Mortgage Relief Programme . . ."

It is a pity that the Governor did not go on to say that his Government in the last financial year had failed to get \$3.1m. All the Government did was to bring in the scheme one week before the election to try to gain a few last-minute votes. Queensland people who are suffering from excessive rents and unemployed people who cannot afford to pay off their homes missed out on \$3.1m of Commonwealth funds because the Government would not take them. That is true; that is what happened. I will come back to the Housing Commission during the Budget debate.

I now turn to another comment made by the Governor yesterday—

"Added emphasis will be placed on meeting the needs of our youth, and the Youth Employment Support Scheme will be expanded."

My information is that in February 1983 the Commonwealth Government offered to the Queensland Government some 400 fully funded positions for four months under the Special Youth Employment Training Program. Although 400 young people could have been employed in Queensland, the Queensland Government refused to take the money because it would not create the positions for them. Fancy the Government putting a paragraph in the Governor's speech stating that it will do something about youth unemployment when in fact it has done nothing about it and has even turned down the offer of money to help relieve youth unemployment!

When one considers the circumstances in the Works Department, things are even worse. If he wishes, the Minister can jump to his feet and deny that the number of apprentices employed in the construction branch of the Works Department will be reduced from 121 in 1983 to 86 in 1984. Those apprenticeships will comprise 53 apprentice carpenters, 14 apprentice plumbers, 17 apprentice painters, one apprentice plasterer and one apprentice glazier. That is a cut-back of 35 apprentices. Reference was made to providing new jobs for youth, yet through his own department the Minister for Works and Housing cut back 35 jobs. The number of apprentices in the department's engineering branch will be reduced from 14 to 10. In all there will be a cut-back of 39 apprentices in the Works Department this financial year. How can Government members talk about doing anything for young people in Queensland when it cuts back on the number of jobs available in the Works Department?

The last thing I want to talk about tonight is something that seems to have been put into the minds of National Party members at the meetings they must attend to be told what to talk about in this Parliament. Every back-bench member who spoke today referred to the broken promises of the Hawke Labor Government, a Government that has been in power for only nine months. Government members should not start to talk about broken promises.

Mr Gunn: Seventy hours in Government and he broke a promise.

Mr MACKENROTH: Would the Deputy Premier say that the National Party keeps its promises?

Government Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is too much cross-firing in the Chamber.

Mr MACKENROTH: I take it from the response of National Party members that they suggest they keep their promises.

Mr Goleby: That is why we got back.

Mr MACKENROTH: I am pleased that the Minister said that. I want to refer to the National's bible, "The Nationals put Queensland first", the policy speech of Joh Bjelke-Petersen on 5 November 1980. I want to deal with the policy under the heading, "Small business" We already know that the Government has broken 57 promises made in its small business policy, but let me refer specifically to this document. It states—

"We will also abolish payroll tax on the wages of apprentices from the next State Budget."

Government members should ask themselves, "Has that happened?" That was broken promise No. 1 from the National Party in 1980.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: Government members started to talk about broken promises, so they have brought this on themselves. The document continues—

"My Government will give preference in State contracts to Queensland companies which maintain their full quota of apprentices."

The Government cannot even give preference to companies which employ Queenslanders, let alone companies which employ apprentices. We even have the situation where the Works Department is to cut down its apprentice intake. Broken promise No. 2!

Let me go on—

"In line with our policy of the maximum possible community involvement in school life, we will increase the range of sporting, recreational and educational items provided in schools by parent and community groups which attract State Government subsidy.

My Government will guarantee that the next State Budget includes provision for ground staff, janitors, and administrative assistants in Queensland State Schools."

Mr Gunn: Yes, they do.

Mr MACKENROTH: Where is the increase in the range of sporting, recreation and education items? I certainly do not know about them, and I do not know of any p. and c. association in Queensland which knows about them. Broken promise No. 3. The administrative staff in Queensland schools has been cut back, not expanded. That is broken promise No. 4. The document continues—

"In line with the National Party's policy, reaffirmed at State Conference in July, the Government will include a Ministry of Family Welfare."

The Governor yesterday referred to next year as the Year of the Family. Three years ago the Government promised to set up a family welfare department. This has not been done. Broken promise No. 5. The document goes on—

"We plan to expand all family assistance programmes, especially family planning and crisis support centres."

Government members should talk to the women who had to fight this Government earlier this year to keep open the women's refuge at West End and ask whether the Government expanded the crisis support centres for families. The Government did not extend crisis support centres; it tried to cut them back. Broken promise No. 6.

Then comes the interesting one. I hark back to the election campaign and the dirty, filthy advertisements published by the National Party about the Labor Party. The Labor Party was trying to do something about young people in Queensland who are being fined for smoking marijuana. We wanted to do something to ensure that their lives were not spoilt. I can produce the National Party advertisements about the things that were to be done. I look at the 1980 policy speech and recall that the Premier said—

"We will legislate, in the new Parliament, to allow drug-use first offenders who are convicted before their 18th birthday to apply to have their convictions struck out, provided there have been no further convictions against them for any offence for a period of five years."

The Government intended to decriminalise the offence. I make the point that it was trying to achieve the same end as the Labor Party, but it simply became another broken promise of the National Party in the 1980 state election.

This year I almost felt sorry for first home buyers when I heard the National Party's policy speech, because the Premier said to the young people of Queensland that the National Party would abolish 50 per cent of stamp duty payments for first home buyers.

I prefer the 1980 policy speech in which the Government promised to abolish it completely. The young people were told, "We will abolish stamp duty for first-home buyers." In this lowest-taxed State, the young people were told that stamp duty would be abolished, but the Government did not carry out its promise. The Government now says that it will abolish 50 per cent of the stamp duty. I hope the people do not have to wait until the next election because the stamp duty relief might be cut to 25 per cent. That is another broken promise of the National Party.

The National Party's 1980 policy speech contained these words—

"Our Government will include a separate Ministry of Decentralisation."

Three years later we are still waiting for it.

The next promise is the one that really surprises me. I am amazed that the Premier could have said this to the people in 1980—

"In line with the National Party's clear policy of less Government, and of less control in the lives of people, we will review all statutory authorities and legislation to clear away any that are no longer relevant."

I know of no authority that was abolished in the last three years. In fact, several were created. Nothing was done to bring in legislation to do away with any. No inquiry was held concerning statutory authorities. The only inquiry made was in response to a request by the Premier to someone in his department to determine how many statutory authorities existed in Queensland. That is yet another broken promise of the Queensland Government.

In the Opening Speech His Excellency the Governor claimed that the Government had the best record for sport. In the 1980 policy speech, these words appeared—

"Our Government has always maintained a high level of support for sport, and sporting organisations, throughout Queensland. We will continue that support."

That is what the sporting bodies were told in the 1980 policy speech but, in the very next Budget, subsidies for sporting bodies, for training and the employment of staff were cut by 50 per cent. The people of Queensland were told that the Government provided the best level of support for sport and that the Government intended to continue that support, but in the very next Budget the Government cut the support by half.

I am sure the young lady who recently appeared in court and received compensation would laugh if she were to read in the 1980 policy speech—

"From January 1st, 1981, we will increase the limit for compensation to victims of crimes of violence to \$20,000—four times what it is today."

Three years later, when this young lady was awarded \$10,000 by the court, the National Party Cabinet tried to take \$5,000 away from her. That was despite the fact that three years earlier the National Party told the people it would increase the compensation by four times. It was not a matter of doing it at sometime; it announced that compensation would be increased from 1 January 1981. Clearly that is another broken promise.

The statement went on to say that the National Party would ensure by legislation that nothing would stand in the way of a victim claiming compensation awards made by the courts. The statement continues—

"Insofar as the rights of women are concerned, a number of cases of unintentional discrimination against women in Government service have been brought to my attention. I have directed the Public Service Board to review all Government Acts and Regulations to ensure that equal provisions for employment, promotion and opportunity apply to men and women.

We urge all community organisations to review their rules, similarly, to remove any discriminatory provisions."

I do not know of any action that has been taken by the Queensland Government to prevent discrimination against females in the Queensland Public Service. Certainly nothing has been done in the area that people can see, that is, the superannuation area.

That is what the National Party told the people in 1980. After looking through that document for about five minutes, I have found 13 clear broken promises of the National Party from the 1980 State election.

Members of the National Party want to denigrate a Federal Government that has been in power for only nine months. They should wait for at least three years before they start to throw stones at that Government. Here I am talking about a policy that was to be implemented within a three-year period. The National Party had the numbers in this Parliament, but it did nothing. I am sure that, if I sat down and analysed this document, I would find many more broken promises. This Government is a broken Government that deserves to be booted out by the people.

When members were talking today about increasing our representation on committees, I was surprised to hear a Government member say that the National Party members were elected by the people and that the people wanted them. The clear, simple fact is that they did not receive even 50 per cent of the votes. In fact, not more than 50 per cent of the National Party members were elected to this Chamber. If two scabs had not joined the National Party, it would not have been able to govern in its own right.

Let me examine the ranks of the so-called National Party. I will forget about the scabs from the Labor Party who, for the sake of opportunity, joined the National Party in the past. The member for Merthyr was elected as a member of the Liberal Party, but defected to the National Party after the election. The member for Wavell also was elected as a member of the Liberal Party, but defected to the National Party after the election. The member for Mansfield was previously elected as a member of the Liberal Party, but defected to the National Party during the last Parliament. He was re-elected as a member of the National Party. The member for Maryborough was a former Liberal Party member of this Parliament. The member for Aspley was a former Liberal Party candidate. They are five glaring examples of members who purport to represent the National Party.

Mr Alison interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: You say that you are proud to be a National. You are proud to be a National only because you want to pick up your superannuation cheque. Be honest about it. You had three attempts to get back.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr MACKENROTH: He baited me and I had to reply.

The Government is full of rats and scabs from other parties. At least no-one in the Labor Party has ever been a member of any other political party. We know where our blokes stand and where they will continue to stand. Can Government members guarantee the people of Queensland that the members for Merthyr and Wavell will be with them in three year's time? Can they give an iron-clad guarantee on that? They cannot. The situation is that half the members of the National Party are laughing at them in the corridors and saying, "Look at how we conned these blokes into coming over here."

Mr Borbidge: Who said that?

Mr MACKENROTH: It was said to me in confidence, and I respect that confidence. I will go back to the National Party member who told me that. He is the one who told me that he was going to vote for Col Miller, and I will ask him if I am allowed to tell honourable members. However, I doubt whether he will come good; he did not come good the other day.

Over the next three years this Parliament will be a very interesting place, because the power that these Government members have will go to their heads more excessively than ever before and the people of Queensland will soon realise what a reactionary, right-wing, Nazi Government it is that is in power in Queensland. That is what it is; it comprises fascists and Nazis.

What is the Government's simple answer to the prisoners who want to arouse some reaction to the bad conditions that they experience? Will it hit them over the head and kick them in the guts?

A Government Member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is a matter of civil rights. Nobody deserves to be treated like a dog, yet that is how the Government is treating the prisoners. One only has to look at what the Government is trying to do at the Edward River Mission. That is an example of the type of thing that the people of Queensland will get very upset about over the next few years. The Government can introduce any kind of electoral redistribution that it likes—that is what it will do—but it will be defeated because the people of Queensland will not continue to put up with a reactionary, Nazi Government.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (10.17 p.m.): I thank the Leader of the House for extending the list of speakers to enable me to refute some of the claims made during the election campaign by Government members against Opposition members. In particular, I refute the claim that Opposition members were using scare tactics about the Government's financial position during the pre-election period.

The Opposition knew the total allocations from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund put through by this Parliament. The Opposition knew that the Appropriation Bill in November 1982 was for the July/August period and that it involved an amount of approximately \$700m in consolidated revenue. It also knew that money was coming in from the Commonwealth and from the tax-raising revenue areas to which the Government has access. The Opposition claimed that it was illegal for the Government to use that money unless it has been appropriated by the Parliament.

I will traverse some of the facts very briefly. The Niemeyer report pointed out that the expenditure in consolidated revenue for the April/May/June period was \$306m per month. In July the Government's expenditure jumped up to something like \$340m and in August it rose to almost \$350m. The Appropriation Bill that was passed in August was for \$92m, and that was for the September/October period. That would be a reasonable estimate based on the April/May/June expenditures of some \$306 per month. When that estimate is contrasted to the expenditure that was incurred in July and August—some \$350m per month—it is quite clear that the Government was going to be in some difficulty.

As further proof of my claims, there was talk around the Chamber that this Appropriation Bill had to go through today as a matter of urgency. Concern was expressed that the Opposition was delaying the procedures of Parliament. It was important that this Bill went through today, the date being 24 November. Yet during the election campaign, the previous Treasurer said that the Government had enough money to last it well into December. The Premier said that there was money available for months and added that it would last well into December.

The announcers on the ABC radio program "AM" reported that the Treasury sources to whom they spoke—not Opposition members—told them very clearly that the money would run out in mid-November. That was in line with what the Opposition was claiming.

Further, I ask: If the Government did not need the money and if, as the Premier said tonight, the Government has enough money to last right up to the Budget, why is the Government putting through a Consolidated Revenue Fund amount of \$765m? If the Government needed only a few dollars to last for one week, or two weeks at the most, why put through revenue equal to 2½ months of Government expenditure? It does not make sense. It is not rational. It is not reasonable to expect the people to believe that the money was there. If the money was there, why have two public service pay periods gone by without the 4.3 per cent increase being paid?

Mr Gunn: I will answer that.

Mr WRIGHT: I want to hear the Minister answer it.

Why were private contractors not paid? Why was the holiday pay of some public servants not fully paid? Why was overtime reduced for police? Why were the week-end programs for the TAFE college cancelled? Why were the schedules ruined? Why were the small business programs cancelled? Hundreds of small businessmen wanted to attend the college at Bardon. The Government was not prepared to conduct the programs because it had no money. When the Government was challenged during its election campaign, it refused to release documents and the Premier refused to answer media questions about how much money was left. He kept saying that there were stacks of money.

Mr Shaw: Did you know that the Housing Commission has stopped conducting second appointments because there is no money?

Mr WRIGHT: I did not realise that. There is further proof that the Government is going broke.

The people have a right to know what was really going on. The Opposition's claims were true and the Government was on the brink of bankruptcy. All that saved the Government was Commonwealth funds, the juggling of money from other accounts and the very skilful house-keeping of Treasury officials. If the Government did not have public servants of such high calibre in the Treasury, it would have gone broke. Government members can forget about the criticism and the political scoring that they have tried in this Chamber today and tonight. The Opposition's claims were correct. The State was run without expertise. It was in trouble and, in fact, almost on the brink of bankruptcy.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (10.22 p.m.), in reply: I have listened with the appropriate degree of attention to another long lecture in negative thinking from members of the Opposition as their contributions to this debate. As usual, the ALP is interested only in running down Queensland, not building it up. I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition entered the debate at a late stage and made a contribution. His questions will be answered. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition displayed his limited knowledge of financial matters and the ALP's complete hypocrisy on revenue to be derived from the development of Queensland's natural resources.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition claimed that our competitiveness overseas was being affected by the Government's revenue policies which were taking too much from this sector. Yet not so long ago in this House—during the debate on Winchester South—the ALP was saying exactly the opposite. It accused the Government of selling off its resources too cheaply. It accused the Government of not getting sufficient return to the State from new mining ventures and from existing projects. Opposition members cannot have it both ways. They are hypocrites, and they have proved it again tonight. My Government indicated in its policy commitments before the recent State election that there would be a review of rail freights to ensure the viability of existing and new projects. That is now under review. Members opposite are wanting to jump on the bandwagon, completely changing the stance they adopted only a short time ago. That is typical of the ALP. It is not interested in the role private enterprise can play in developing our resources. The Opposition wants only to bring the resources sector under State ownership and control. Its pretended policies of a different approach to resources taxation is just so much hot air.

The policy of the ALP can ultimately lead only to the nationalisation of the mining industry, which is what it wants.

The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition further showed their ignorance of financial matters and Government processes by claiming that the recent 4.3 per cent wage rise had been delayed and not paid to public servants and teachers when it was due. That simply is another ALP fabrication. The commission handed down its determination in this matter on 10 October 1983 with the proviso that the decision received an acceptance by the unions. Pronouncement that this acceptance would be forthcoming was made by the commission on 21 October 1983. A massive volume of schedules then had to be recalculated and redrafted and Executive Council approval obtained. This was completed on 17 November 1983. The increase will be paid on the first possible pay-day thereafter, which will be 7 December 1983. The rise will be back dated to 10 October 1983. So much for that.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition once again raised his old argument about the so-called \$2 billion deficit. This matter has been fully explained previously but, as is the case with other matters, members of the ALP are very slow learners indeed. The facts are that there are three funds: the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund. They all balance. As a matter of fact, the Consolidated Revenue Fund is in the unique position of having an accumulated deficit since 1859 of less than \$1m. Perhaps the honourable member would like to compare that with the results in other States, particularly those administered by his ALP counterparts. He would quickly find that Queensland has a record of astute financial management second to none, particularly in the period since 1957 when this Government led Queensland to new growth and prosperity.

The deficit in the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication is simply the difference in all revenues and expenditures in a particular year. The deficit is represented by capital assets funded by developers, borrowings and so on which will be paid for in the years to come from revenue generated by developments. The power stations, the railways, the ports and other assets represented by the deficit will be paid by users, not tax-payers. The alternative is to do nothing, just as State Labor Governments are doing—and as happened in this State prior to 1957—because of Labor's policies of stagnation. Other States would dearly like to have the economic development activity and opportunities that this Government has attracted to the State. We will not decline to take on the capital works needed to develop our natural resources, especially when the capital funds themselves are being supplied and serviced by the developers, not tax-payers. What absolute nonsense it would be if we did not create these opportunities and capitalise on them.

I turn now to the comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on job creation. Again he has shown his lack of knowledge or lack of responsibility. I feel sure that that segment of the speech was prepared for him by his masters in Canberra, who tried to sell a similar line to the public in the lead-up to the State election campaign. Again the ALP was being dishonest in its treatment of the facts. Queensland has advanced as far as if not further than any other State with the Community Employment Program.

On 16 November this year the State Government approved 34 projects under the scheme to create 325 jobs. These are announced and under way. A further 12 projects to produce 227 jobs were approved last week, but they are being held up. And why? Because a press release announcing the projects is still lying on the Federal Minister's desk awaiting his attention. So much for the ALP's professed concern for the unemployed in this State!

The honourable member's comments on Queensland's performance in the wages pause program were also way off beam. The State approved a total wages pause program of \$167.8m over a 12-month period. Of this, the Queensland Government has funded \$110m, the Commonwealth, \$47.8m, and local authorities, \$10m. The facts are that \$95.8m, or 68 per cent of the total funds, has been spent in the first eight months of the program. All the funds are fully committed and will be fully expended by early next year, with perhaps a few projects tapering off to finish towards June. It is estimated that these funds have provided directly some 6 000 man-years of work and perhaps 25 000 man-years of work all told when the multiplier effect is taken into account. On recent figures provided by the Commonwealth, Queensland is way ahead of all other States in proceeding with the jointly funded programs. There is no reason to think this is not still the case.

Apart from the special employment-creating effort of the wages pause programs, the State Government for many years has sought to maintain employment in the public and private sectors by ensuring an active Government capital works program, despite continuing real reduction in Loan Council allocations. That has been achieved by the diversion of moneys from the Consolidated Revenue Fund (and recently from off-Budget sources) to the Special Projects Fund. From there it is allocated to departments as a special supplement to their normal works programs.

Since the establishment of that fund in 1976-77, the additional allocations to works programs have totalled \$793m. The break-down is as follows:—

						\$m
1976-77	56.3
1977-78	65.8
1978-79	54.8
1979-80	84.4
1980-81	143.2
1981-82	250.6
1982-83	127.9

That huge sum represents additional capital works in all areas of Government. It has been made possible by sound budgeting and implementation of efficiency and economies throughout the service areas of Government generally. The Budget to be brought down next week will continue the policy, and with some pride I assure Opposition members that it will be a Budget that will be the envy of every other State and the Commonwealth.

In conclusion, I repeat that this Bill does not mean that the Government has run out of Supply. It will simply ensure Supply for the Government to meet its expenditures until into the new year, by which time the Parliament will have debated and passed the Budget. It will enable the Government to continue the progressive programs and policies that have won the confidence of Queenslanders over more than a quarter of a century.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Gunn, read a third time.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION AND HOME-OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act 1979-1982 in certain particulars and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (10.35 p.m.): I move—

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

It is the policy of this Government that legislation should be introduced to require the Governor in Council to approve new superannuation schemes or amendments to existing schemes of statutory authorities, which will ensure that a uniform approach is adopted for all employees in the public sector and that superannuation schemes operated by statutory authorities do not conflict with schemes operated by the Government for its employees. As the Builders Registration Board, which is constituted under the Act, operates a superannuation scheme for its employees, provisions have been included in this amending Bill that will give effect to this Government policy decision.

The Bill also includes provisions making minor alterations to the instruments of guarantee and indemnity lodged with the Builders Registration Board by directors of bodies corporate having paid up capital of less than \$100,000. The instruments were introduced to maintain the viability of the insurance fund established under the Act. However, it has become apparent that the instrument in its present form attracts ad valorem stamp duty of a quarter of a per cent.

It was not intended that this stamp duty would be payable and thereby impose an extra burden on a body corporate which is just starting out, as finances would obviously be limited. I therefore discussed the matter with the Honourable the Treasurer, and it is evident that the most appropriate course of action which will remove this obligation is to amend the present form of the instrument so that it may be assessed at nominal rates only. To achieve this, the instrument will be limited to \$100,000 by way of an amendment to the Act, with no reference being made to this limit on the instrument itself.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

MINING TITLES FREEHOLDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy), by leave, without notice:
I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Mining Titles Freeholding Act 1980-1982 in certain particulars and for other purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (10.38 p.m.): I move—

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

The Bill is a short one, but, nevertheless, it is an important one as far as the many lessees of miners' homestead perpetual leases and the holders of business areas and residence areas are concerned.

When the Mining Titles Freeholding Act was introduced in July 1980, its main objective was to provide for the freeholding of miners' homestead leases, miners' homestead perpetual leases, residence areas and business areas if an application for such freeholding was approved by the Minister.

In the case of a miner's homestead lease, the Act provides that the lessee can obtain a deed of grant in fee simple without any further payments towards the present unimproved value of the land. This is because, under the conditions attaching to this particular title, the land has already been paid for during the first 30 years of the lease.

However, the lessee of a miner's homestead perpetual lease or the holder of a business area or residence area is required to pay the unimproved value of the land as at the date of the application for freeholding. This is determined by the Wardens Court, taking into consideration a valuation supplied by the Minister and any valuation or evidence submitted by the applicant. There is, of course, provision for an applicant dissatisfied with the determination of the Wardens Court to appeal to the Land Court. The valuations supplied to the Wardens Court by the Minister have been unimproved values determined by approved valuers from the Lands Department under an administrative arrangement with that department. These valuations have in many cases been considerably higher than those expected by landholders. As a result, very few applicants for freeholding, other than lessees of miners' homestead leases, have followed through with their applications. Additionally, it is known that others have not even bothered to apply because of the cost factor.

Honourable members would be aware that with the introduction of the Land Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1981, the capital values of certain perpetual leases under the Land Act were determined for all time on the values which existed as at 31 December 1980. Thus an anomalous situation has developed. On the one hand we have the value used for the purposes of freeholding tenures under the Land Act frozen as at 31 December 1980. On the other hand, the value for the purposes of freeholding under the Mining Titles Freeholding Act is determined as at the date of application for such freeholding. The Government now seeks to remove this anomaly.

This Bill amends the definition “unimproved value” to enable the use of the valuation made by the Valuer-General under the Valuation of Land Act existing as at 31 December 1980, rather than the valuation determined by the Wardens Court as at the date of application. Of course, in those cases where there is no valuation for a particular block at that date, the valuation to be used is the one which first takes or took effect after 31 December 1980.

It is proposed that this valuation should be used, rather than the capital value as determined by the warden for the rental period current as at 31 December 1980, because the capital values determined by mining wardens are assessed at 10-year intervals, hence they vary greatly throughout the State. Honourable members would agree that use of the valuation made under the Valuation of Land Act is an acceptable alternative. However, the Valuation of Land Act provides for concessional valuations in those cases where the land is used exclusively for the purposes of the business of primary production. The Bill

provides that these valuations not be accepted for the purposes of freeholding under the Mining Titles Freeholding Act as they are not comparable with those for miners' homesteads in general. Instead, the Bill provides that the non-concessional valuation that would have been applicable had such a valuation been undertaken by the Valuer-General at the date of the last concessional valuation, which took effect prior to 31 December 1980, be obtained and used. Again, in those cases where there was no concessional valuation before 31 December 1980, a non-concessional valuation will be obtained as at the date of the first concessional valuation which took or takes effect after 31 December 1980.

The Minister will obtain a certificate of valuation of the unimproved value from the Valuer-General and submit it to the warden. The warden will also be informed of the amount, if any, that the Valuer-General has charged for supplying this valuation.

I would point out to honourable members that in those cases where the land has been valued at its highest and best use, that is, a non-concessional valuation, it is not proposed to charge for the supply of the valuation. This will be in the majority of cases.

In cases where the Valuer-General's value shown on the valuation roll is a concessional valuation, such as where the land is used for the purposes of the business of primary production, and a special valuation is required to be made for the purposes of freeholding, it is proposed that either the fee prescribed by the Valuation of Land Act or the cost incurred in making the valuation be charged, whichever is the lesser.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, under the existing legislation there is provision for an applicant who is dissatisfied with the unimproved value as determined by the Wardens Court to appeal to the Land Court.

Now that it is proposed to use, in the majority of cases, an existing valuation under the Valuation of Land Act in respect of which the applicant had the right of appeal to the Land Court at the time of the valuation, there is no reason why this provision which, in effect, would give the applicant a second right of appeal in respect of the same valuation, should be retained. The Bill removes this second right of appeal.

This is not the case where the land has a concessional valuation, and it will be necessary to obtain a valuation on a non-concessional basis. Therefore, in such cases, the Bill provides that if the applicant is dissatisfied with the non-concessional valuation, he will have the right of appeal to the Land Court.

As I indicated at the beginning of my speech, I consider that the Bill is most important as it allows the lessees of miners' homestead perpetual leases and the holders of business areas and residence areas to freehold their land at a fair and reasonable cost.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy), by leave, without notice:
I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Mines Regulation Act 1964–1983 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (10.48 p.m.): I move—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Bill has a twofold purpose. Firstly, it amends the provisions of the Act relating to the collection of statistical information. The need for the submission of production and statistical returns has been long established. However, this information has traditionally

been collected on a calendar-year basis, and, although calendar-year reporting was appropriate at the time of its inception, it is now inconsistent with the practices generally in operation in the mining industry and used by other data collection agencies. Consequently, difficulties have been experienced with miners maintaining reporting schedules owing to the necessity for them to prepare completely separate sets of figures for the calendar year when their returns to other agencies, such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Taxation Department, are for the financial year. The proposed amendments simply provide for the submission of this information on a financial rather than a calendar-year basis.

I might mention that this change-over to financial year reporting will also allow validation of data within the Mines Department, particularly in respect of royalty, as well as with other agencies such as the Queensland Coal Board and the Queensland Treasury. Additionally, the requirements relating to the submission of returns for monthly, quarterly or other periods have been broadened and clarified, as have the requirements for returns where operations have not been continuous throughout the year.

The Bill proposes that the existing provisions relating to penalties specifically for breaches of the requirement to lodge returns be removed, in order that the general penalty provisions presently contained in section 65 of the Act might be applicable. It is considered appropriate that this two-tier scale of penalties apply, thus allowing the imposition of a lesser penalty on a person who is not the owner, agent or manager of a mine.

Further, owing to the lack of evidentiary aids, proceedings against offenders have been seriously hampered. The Bill includes provisions designed to overcome this problem.

Secondly, the Bill also provides for certain penalties to be increased. Honourable members will be aware that a number of the penalties under this Act were increased earlier this year, and the proposed amendments merely seek to bring a measure of uniformity to the overall penalty provisions.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Education Act 1964-1974 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (10.52 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill has been drafted as a result of a review of the Education Act that was designed to repair any deficiencies that may have emerged with the passage of time.

The Act was passed by the Legislative Assembly in 1964, and amended in 1970, principally to provide for advanced education. It is worth while noting here that Queensland's universities and colleges of advanced education are established under State legislation. In 1973, the Act was amended to effect changes seen as necessary after three years' practical experience in the then new field of advanced education. The Education Act 1964-1973 was again amended in one particular in 1974 to give effect to a provision in the Age of Majority Act.

Experience in the application of such a major and central piece of legislation as the Education Act reveals that, from time to time, amendments are required to meet changing needs and, indeed, even new legal opinions.

Honourable members who were members of the previous Parliament will know that this Bill was introduced by me in August this year. That can be found in "Hansard" proof No. 1 1983, pages 103 to 106. The debate was adjourned to enable the Bill to be considered. In the interim, Parliament was dissolved, so the Bill lapsed. Its history, however, goes back further than that. A Bill containing many more provisions than this comparatively short piece of legislation was introduced by my predecessor, the Honourable Bill Gunn, in November 1981. The debate was adjourned to allow public scrutiny of the Bill, and this scrutiny led to some debate about principles such as the registration of non-State schools, maltreatment of children and registration of teachers.

The Government did not proceed with the Bill in that form but decided to concentrate on the more urgent central provisions of the legislation. Those provisions constitute the Bill now before the House.

The main provisions of the Bill are as follows—

Use of Schools

In the course of its general administration of schools, my department was given the legal opinion that because schools are built on land reserved for educational purposes, and that the Act, as it stands at present, is an Education Act, the use of school facilities for anything other than educational purposes is, strictly speaking, not lawful. The Government is anxious to encourage community groups to use the extensive facilities available in State schools. The Government has chosen not to restrict use of schools by the community as a result of this legal advice, but to adopt a commonsense approach to the question pending amendment of the Act. The use of the term "and for other purposes" in the amendment of the long title (clause 3) is intended to cover the use of schools for other than educational purposes.

Funds of a Parents and Citizens Association

While this provision raised some questions when it appeared in the previous legislation, we are persisting with it because, despite assertions to the contrary, it is a machinery provision clarifying what has always been the case—that funds of a parents and citizens association are legally owned by the Corporation of the Minister for Education. The Act already states that "property" acquired by an association is legally owned by the corporation and this has always been taken to include funds; and the Act has been administered on this basis. It has never been clearly stated, however, and that is all that is intended. An association is an unincorporated body and cannot legally own the funds. Somebody has to, and logically it should be the Minister. Introducing the Bill in July, I said that no change in policy is envisaged, nor, as one ludicrous suggestion was made, is it a sinister plot to solve the Government's financial problems by taking over all parents and citizens association funds in Queensland. I repeat those statements in order to reassure those members of parents and citizens associations who might still harbour doubts.

The Government recognises that a parents and citizens association works very hard for its money. The Act states that parents and citizens association funds must be used for the benefit of the children attending the particular school. On rare occasions there is a difference of opinion within a parents and citizens association about the use of funds and the Minister has had to execute his ownership powers to settle the matter. This has sometimes been questioned, but the explanation has been readily accepted. I emphasise that the funds cannot be in legal limbo. They must be legally owned by somebody, and that person has to be the Minister.

Joint Development Schemes

As with use of schools, we have been told that joint development of school/community facilities by the Government, parents and citizens associations and the local authorities should be legally covered. This is one of the essential provisions of the Bill and is one of the main reasons why the original legislation was reintroduced in its reduced form. Joint building schemes are a sensible means of providing costly community facilities using all available financial resources. Local authorities in particular have adopted them enthusiastically and I would hate to see them founder because of legalities. The provision affects every member of this House—indeed, every measure in the Bill does—and I believe that it demands unanimous support.

Parents and Citizens Associations

The Bill also legally authorises parents and citizens associations to borrow money and to employ people. They are doing both at the moment and, as with other provisions, the Government has used a realistic approach and has allowed the practices to continue pending amendment of the Act.

State Pre-school Centres

State pre-school centres are to be covered by the Act in a formal sense and are to be covered by certain particular provisions as set out in clause 16. The following sections that applied to State schools will also apply to State pre-schools: discontinuance of State schools; use of schools; inspection of schools; instruction to be free; exclusion of pupils; wilful disturbance of school; trespass; and transport of pupils.

Special Education

The special education provisions in clause 18 cover three main changes—

The Minister is authorised formally to contribute to special education if he does not provide it; that is, he can financially and by other means support special education outside the State system.

The agreement of the parent is required before a child who is below the age of compulsory attendance can be given special education. This is linked to the definition of “handicapped child”, who is a person up to the age of 18 years. In other words, the definition could include a child below the age of six years.

The Minister may require a report from a non-State special education institution to which he contributes. This introduces a measure of accountability which I believe honourable members will agree is justified.

The provision in clause 19 requiring the parent of a blind or deaf child to obtain a suitable education for the child is repealed. We feel that it is no longer necessary to single out these children and, in any case, if need be the general compulsory attendance provision would apply.

Compulsory Attendance

A defect in this provision is that a prosecution for truancy would have to prove in a court that a child had not attended any school on the day of alleged absence, instead of just the school that he or she normally attended. It is being remedied by requiring a child of the age of compulsory attendance to be enrolled at a school and attend that school. Opportunity is being taken to include in this section mention of exemption from attendance as a clarifying measure.

Traffic By-laws

Clause 28 of the Bill is a repetition of the clause from the previous Bill enabling colleges of advanced education to make by-laws governing traffic on their campuses. Parliament earlier this year enacted similar legislation for universities. Penalties are increased, as are other penalties in the Act, to relate to changed values. It is appropriate to emphasise that the Education Act does not confer any powers on the Government relating to traffic outside school and college grounds. This clause relates only to traffic movements within the colleges of advanced education. Perceptive members might notice also that clauses 26 and 29 amend certain sections relating to by-laws. These relate to clause 8, which applies the Acts Interpretation Act to by-laws insofar as the tabling and disallowance provisions are concerned. The same applies to regulations in clause 7. It is now drafting practice not to repeat these machinery provisions where they are covered by the Acts Interpretation Act.

I wish to repeat what I said when introducing the Bill in August. It could in no way be described as containing controversial provisions. It comprises measures which are essential to the efficient and legal functioning of the Government and which affect every member of Parliament in his or her role as the representative of a constituency which would expect that such things as community use of schools, joint development of school/community facilities, compulsory attendance and borrowing by parents and citizens associations should not be hampered by legalities which this House has the opportunity to correct.

I commend the Bill.

Debate, on motion of Mr Smith, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 11.4 p.m.