

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST 1984

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

PAPERS

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

Report of the President of the Industrial Court of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978

Traffic Act 1949-1982.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Builders Registration Board**

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.2 a.m.), by leave: I refer to a series of telecasts made this month by the television program "State Affair" concerning the Builders Registration Board. The latest was last night and, like all other items on the board in this series, told only part of the story. For example, it quoted the honourable member for Ashgrove's statement in this House the previous day. Despite my reply to the honourable member, which I delivered in this House yesterday, and in which I challenged him to come forward with facts to substantiate his claims, he has not taken up my challenge. Despite the fact that my statement was made available to "State Affair" yesterday, no mention of it was made on the program.

The program also featured an interview with the Reverend J. Woodley of the Uniting Church, and the clear implication was that I had, in a reply to a letter from the Reverend Mr Woodley, skirted over certain matters relating to disputes between builders and owners of dwellings under construction. That reply was made more than 10 months ago. In it I pointed out that most of the points raised by the Reverend Mr Woodley referred to the institution of arbitration proceedings, which are outside the board's jurisdiction.

I further pointed out that the Builders Registration Board was not intended and is not structured to arbitrate contractual disputes between owners and builders. The board believes that it already has a role as a low-cost conciliation tribunal in the housing industry as an alternative to arbitration or litigation.

I further explained that the arbitration clause found in some contracts is not mandatory and, although the philosophy of consumer protection is defended, it is suggested that there is a point at which the consumer should be prepared to protect his or her own interests by seeking legal advice before signing a contract which contains an arbitration clause.

My letter further explained that, to that time, approximately 11 000 complaints of defective workmanship had been finalised by the board and that the number of disputes that go to arbitration or litigation would represent a minor percentage of the overall number of complaints made.

Once the matters concerning the board were raised by "State Affair", the Builders Registration Board contacted "State Affair" and asked for an opportunity to answer live—that is, as the program was on air—the allegations that were made. This request was denied by "State Affair". Instead, a taped interview was made. What went to air was only a fraction of that interview—about three minutes out of 15 minutes of taped interview—with another segment being subsequently shown following discussions about the screening of the original segment taken from the interview.

“State Affair” has been informed that the board is still available for an on-air interview to discuss the matters raised.

Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: In response to telexes and telephone calls to my office this morning concerning an article in “The Courier-Mail” about the Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men to be held on the campus of the University of Queensland, I make this statement.

Police will keep a close watch on the Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men at the Queensland university this week-end, particularly the activities of those attending a paedophile workshop.

Under existing laws, police are powerless to stop the conference going ahead, if it is restricted to a closed audience and specifically designed for educational purposes. I suggest that this is an area which is being increasingly utilised by such undesirable groups. It is a loophole in the law which should be closed, without restricting legitimate educational seminars for doctors and those involved in psychology and other specific areas within the field of medical research.

I state emphatically that, as far as I am concerned, there is no room in Queensland for child-molesters, whether they be sexual or physical, and the police will do everything within the law to eliminate their practices from our society. However, as I have said, it is an instance in which this legal loophole is being used by such groups to openly flout the law under the guise of educational conferences. That makes it very difficult for the police to act. I am taking steps to see what can be done to block effectively the legality of this avenue to people who would endeavour to corrupt children. In the meantime, might I suggest to the university’s administration that they closely monitor the activities of such groups operating within the confines of the university campus.

Sydney AIDS Incident

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: I wish to advise honourable members that my department has received no information from the New South Wales Health Department in respect of the present AIDS incident in Sydney. As I understand the matter, it concerns only the transfusion of blood and not blood fractions. Therefore, it has no influence on the situation in Queensland, as all of the blood used in Queensland is collected here. None is received from New South Wales.

The Queensland Blood Transfusion Service continues to instruct potential donors about the issues of contaminated donations.

The tests referred to in the news reports concerning the present Sydney incident do not change the situation as far as screening of blood donations is concerned. The tests in fact are still not specific for AIDS, as they only identify exposure to a particular virus and do not indicate whether the patient does or does not have the actual disease.

The reports coming out of the present New South Wales incident appear to be confused and conflicting. We in Queensland are not sure of what precise evidence there is that the patients do have AIDS. A premature press release about potential laboratory tests which may or may not become useful at some time in the future does not contribute to the management of the present situation.

We are monitoring all developments in the area of laboratory testing and none of these presently allow specific identification of carriers from those who have developed immunity.

This present incident does not change the situation in Queensland at all. The Deputy Director-General of Health and Medical Services in Queensland (Dr Ken Donald), will be visiting the Centre for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, in September, 1984 to

discuss the developments there with the people responsible for AIDS control in that country.

Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.9 a.m.), by leave: I wish to make a ministerial statement concerning reports that the Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men will be conducted on the campus of the University of Queensland this week-end. I understand that the conference venue was decided because of my refusal last year to allow Queensland teachers to attend the conference held in a southern State.

The conference will discuss aspects of deviate behaviour. My concern centres on reports that the agenda includes such topics as child molestation or paedophilia, which is the fancy term that these people use. This is abhorrent and totally unacceptable. I view this conference with total repugnance.

As Minister for Education, I do not have direct responsibility for activities held on the University campus. Section II of the University of Queensland Act clearly indicates that the University Senate—

“Shall be the governing body of the University and shall have the entire management and control of the affairs, concerns and property of the University and may act in all matters concerning the University in such manner as appears to it best calculated to promote the interests and purposes of the University.”

It is my hope that those in a position of authority will act to ban this conference, the activities of which are contrary and offensive not only to me as Minister but to the community at large. Accordingly, I have sent the following telex to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland—

“I am extremely concerned that the Tenth Annual Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men will be held on the University campus this coming weekend.

I view with utter disdain the agenda section on child molestation (paedophilia).

Would urge Senate's urgent reassessment of permission for this conference to be held on the University campus.

The distinct public impression is that because this conference is being conducted on University property that the University as a body approves of this type of deviate behaviour.

In the interests of the good name of education in this State I believe it imperative that this conference is not held on University property.”

Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs) (11.11 a.m.), by leave: I wish to join with the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police and the Minister for Education by making a ministerial statement condemning the Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men. I seek leave of the House to table, and to have incorporated in “Hansard”, a ministerial statement to that effect.

Leave granted.

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

I would like to bring to the attention of this House that a Conference on Paedophilia is planned to be held at Queensland University this weekend.

Members of the Tenth National Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men are planning to openly advocate sexual activities between adults and children, activities which are obviously abuse of children and against the laws of this State.

The decision to hold two workshops on the vile practice of paedophilia reflects the degenerate standard of the entire homosexual subculture.

It is a condemnation of the Federal Labor Government that they have promoted the acceptance of homosexuals and their deviant behaviour in our community.

ALP Senator George George's research officer, Mr Greg Weir, was a member of the organising committee as was Mike Kennedy of the Prisoners Action Group. They disapproved of the decision to hold the paedophilia workshops but their reasons are interesting.

Mike Kennedy told "Outrage" (a monthly gay publication) that their disapproval was not based on their views of paedophilia as such but on the view that, in the present political climate in Queensland, a publicly announced paedophile workshop would be unwise.

But despite this division in the organising collective, the workshops are going ahead. I understand the vote was 16 for, 3 against.

To illustrate the effects of this conference, a member of the organisers, Alison Thorne, has already openly urged the lowering of the age of consent on Brisbane radio.

In the Melbourne Age, Ms Thorne is quoted as saying—"I believe children are in a position to consent and it depends on the definition of the child. What the media has been talking about is people aged between 10 and 16, and I believe that those people are capable of consenting."

Ms Thorne, a Victorian State School teacher, has criticised my colleague, Honourable Lin Powell, Education Minister, for refusing permission for Queensland teachers to attend last year's Homosexual Conference in Melbourne.

Bearing this in mind, I think it most disturbing that the Australian Teachers Federation, along with other teacher unions from around Australia, supported that conference and a seminar of "Gay Teacher Unionists" which drafted policy now accepted by the ATF. This seminar was convened by Bill Leslie, Assistant Secretary of the ATF.

This policy insists on the right to influence curriculum in schools to "enhance" understanding and acceptance of lesbian women and homosexual men.

It can be seen how similar conferences down south have been used to gain acceptance socially and legally in most cases, of these unnatural and destructive practices.

We must condemn the staging of such a conference and warn Queenslanders of this attempt to gain acceptance of deviant lifestyles.

Paedophilia is a serious moral and civil crime. In Queensland's Year of the Family, I urge this House to direct its attention to these anti-social, attitude-changing activities.

Homosexuals do not reproduce, they recruit, and they usually recruit children and young people, not middle-aged men and mothers with children. I believe that on these grounds, every decent Queenslanders should resist any moves by the lesbian and homosexual community to make these deviant lifestyles equally acceptable.

The Children's Services Act already provides protection for children who may suffer abuse through paedophilia. These provisions of the Children's Services Act will be strengthened even further in the proposed Family and Community Development Bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (11.12 a.m.), by leave: Contrary to reports appearing in today's press, the Opposition did oppose the Mental Health Act, Criminal Code and Health Act Amendment Bill yesterday in this Parliament. The press seem to believe that it was the Liberal Party that opposed the Bill. I point out to the press that in fact the members of the Liberal Party in this Parliament have taken up associate membership, under which they want all the entitlements of this Parliament but will not vote in the Parliament. In fact, the member for Stafford lost his seat in this Parliament because of the last time he voted, and he is not game to vote again.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have said on various occasions that personal explanations must relate to matters that affect members personally. I do not think that anything that the honourable member for Chatsworth has said so far has anything to do with a personal reflection on him, so I cannot allow him to continue.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: In this Chamber yesterday, the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs claimed that I

had asked him in the House whether a barge service out of Karumba would affect existing operators. He further claimed that I was acting on behalf of the Burke Shipping Line. This is utter rubbish. It is totally a figment of the Minister's imagination and in no way represents either my views or the facts. I challenge the Minister to table in this House evidence of the question that I was supposed to have asked.

Whilst I am at it, the Minister said in Parliament last week that he would table a newspaper article in which I demanded that rail freight subsidies to North Queensland be cut back. I challenge him to table that article. I am still waiting with bated breath.

What these two incidents prove once again is something that is common knowledge. The Minister never sees any need to relate to the facts what he says.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr De LACY: Finally, I think that the Premier should have a look at a Minister who has wilfully misled this House twice in six days.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Lockyer that this is a personal explanation. If interjections are being made, I cannot hear what is being said, and I want to hear what is being said so that I can decide whether it is a personal explanation.

Mr Milliner: Warn him under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will take no directions from that side of the House.

Mr De LACY: I want to conclude with the observation that the Premier should have a close look at a Minister who has wilfully misled this House twice in six days.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Wearing of Cycling Safety Helmets

From Mr Comben (300 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will enact legislation to make the wearing of cycling safety helmets compulsory.

Allocation of School Funds

From Mr Comben (280 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will increase the levels of cash grants and allowances to Queensland schools.

Licences for Coach Services

From Mr Lane (473 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to deny Australian VIP Leisure Tours and Deluxe Coachlines licences within this State, in order to allow Greyhound Coaches Pty Ltd, Ansett Pioneer and McCafferty to operate unhindered in Queensland.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1.

Deferred

2. Special Lease No. 45238 on Fisherman Islands

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police—

With reference to Special Lease No. 45238 under the Land and Harbours Acts in which Prospect Marine Pty Ltd was granted a lease for 30 years from 1 April 1983 covering 32.31 hectares of land on Fisherman Islands adjacent to the Boat Passage—

(1) Did part of the special conditions require that such reclamation or development shall commence within 12 months from the commencement of the terms of this lease and shall proceed at a rate satisfactory to the Minister administering the Land Act?

(2) Has the lessee complied with this condition?

(3) Does the lease provide that the land may be converted to freehold if reclaimed to the prescribed level during the first years of the terms of this lease at a cost of \$2,500 per hectare?

(4) Are there any penalty clauses in the lease for non-compliance with the lease?

(5) Is this land, designed for marina, tourist, recreational and residential facilities, rented at \$1,000 per annum?

(6) As the press releases associated with the marina some years ago suggested that international hotels, boatels and home units would be constructed on the site, when will some action occur and jobs be created as a result of this special lease over land in the heart of the industrial complex at the river mouth?

Answer—

(1) Yes, at a rate satisfactory to the Minister administering the Harbours Act.

(2) There is no record of any reclamation having been completed. However, the lessee was required by the lease conditions to comply with any requirements of the Brisbane City Council and, in respect of certain developments, the Marine Board of Queensland. My information is that an approach has been made by the company to the Brisbane City Council. I do not know whether an approach to the Marine Board is necessary at this stage.

(3) Yes. If satisfactorily reclaimed during the first five years of the lease, having regard to the initial risk and cost of development, the purchase price is \$2,500 per hectare. Thereafter, the purchase price would increase by a prescribed formula.

(4) Normal statutory penalties relating to forfeiture for non-performance of conditions apply to the lease.

(5) The rent for the first five years is \$1,000 per annum and for the second five years \$15,000 per annum. The rent for the first five-year period was assessed with regard to the cost of development in the initial stages and the unlikelihood of any profitable return in the early period.

(6) It is a condition of the lease that the lessee shall, within five years from the commencement of the lease, develop the whole or part of the leased land for marina, tourist, recreational and residential purposes to a value of not less than \$1m. A further condition is that the lessee shall, within ten years from the commencement of the lease, effect reclamation and development works and improvements of a value of not less than \$10m on the leased land. It is not unreasonable to expect the lessee to obtain any necessary approvals and requirements prior to commencing such developments.

3. Federal Budget Road Allocations

Mr LEE asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to the special needs of this State, in that Queensland still has thousands of kilometres of road which are either unsealed, too narrow or need immediate reconstruction, as stated in the 1984 NAASRA roads study—

(1) Does the 1984-85 Federal Budget provide for \$1,242m to be made available to the States under both the Roads Grants Act and the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program?

(2) Is he satisfied with Queensland's allocation of \$258.8 million?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The Federal Budget provides \$1,245m for expenditure by the States on roads in 1984-85. Queensland's allocation of \$258.8m is not sufficient to keep pace with the growing demands of traffic in this rapidly developing State.

For many years, the Commonwealth allocations have slipped in real value because of the effects of inflation. The ABRD fund introduced in 1982-83 provided a temporary improvement in that disturbing trend. However, the increase this year over the funds provided in 1983-84 is not sufficient to maintain the same level of improvement—in other words, the old trend is back.

The NAASRA road study showed that, in order to reduce road deficiencies, Queensland needs to spend approximately \$145m more per annum on its roads than was spent in 1983-84. I will be pressing the Commonwealth Government for further funding, particularly in the form of legislation to take over from the Roads Grants Act 1981, which expires next June. Later this year I will be meeting with my counterparts from other States and the Commonwealth Minister in order to press this matter.

4. Uniform Application of Laws

Mr LEE asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Did he see the "60 Minutes" program in which it was reported that a doctor in Western Australia was suspended from practising for three years, and fined \$250, for claiming a Medicare fee on an incorrect form, which did not cost the Government one cent, yet a Federal ALP Minister, the Honourable Mick Young, filled in a customs form incorrectly, causing his suspension as a Minister for the second time on full pay and no fine while still being permitted to alter his customs declarations?

(2) Does he see this as one law for the Federal ALP Ministers and another, much harsher, law for the people of Australia, who are not in Government office or favour?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I am aware of the program to which the honourable member refers. The punishment handed out to the doctor in question underlines the vendetta that the Federal Labor Government has undertaken against private medical practice in this country. Yet, when such a mistake is made by the accident-prone Mr Young, there is a carefully orchestrated whitewash to preserve his political hide and let him off scot-free.

There can be no doubt that the Prime Minister of this country has determined that there will be one law for his mates and members of his Cabinet and another for ordinary citizens. If he is to be consistent, the Prime Minister must now order that the standard customs regulations be rewritten to ensure that any person who fails to disclose dutiable goods or who fills out a customs declaration form incorrectly can be exonerated.

5. Federal Government Debt

Mr HENDERSON asked the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—

(1) What is the current level of the Commonwealth Government debt?

(2) How has this debt grown over the past year?

(3) How is this debt to be serviced?

(4) What is the immediate effect of such debt on the economic welfare of the Commonwealth of Australia?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The current level of the Commonwealth Government's debt, as evidenced by its total securities on issue at 30 June 1984, was \$46.9 billion. This figure has risen from \$39.1 billion at 30 June 1983, an increase of approximately 20 per cent.

However, it must be appreciated that this debt comprises two distinct sections; that raised on behalf of the States, and that raised for the Commonwealth itself. In this regard, debt raised on behalf of the States rose from \$16.3 billion to \$16.8 billion (or only a very modest 3.6 per cent) over the period. At the same time, the Commonwealth's own debt rose from \$22.9 billion to \$30.1 billion, an increase of 31.7 per cent.

(3) How this debt will be serviced depends on whether it has been raised by the Commonwealth for its own purposes (in which case it will be met from general Commonwealth revenues or from user tax-payers) or whether it has been raised for onlending to the States (in which case it will be a charge on State revenues).

It is worth noting, in this regard, that the Commonwealth's debt-servicing costs have risen dramatically in the past year, with interest payments rising by 29.4 per cent between 1983-84 and 1984-85. Debt-service charges are now virtually the same as defence spending. What a shocking state affairs!

(4) Because of the complex relationship between Government debt and the economy, the effects of such debt are numerous.

The principal effect of a substantially increased level of Commonwealth debt is to place in jeopardy the rate and extent of any economic recovery in Australia. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, the higher level of borrowing increases the demand for funds, forcing interest rates to levels higher than they would otherwise be. Secondly, the interest burden of such debt increases the revenue required to be raised in the future, with the consequent effect that taxation will be higher than would otherwise be the case. This has the effect of reducing the prospect of boosting the economy by providing taxation cuts.

The problems faced by the Commonwealth in this regard are compounded by the fact that this increased stock of debt represents an increase in the structural recurrent deficit of the Commonwealth, as the proceeds of debt raisings are used to meet the Commonwealth's general revenue shortfall. This position contrasts markedly with the position in Queensland where—

- (i) Debt is raised for State capital works, which contributes in a positive way to the Queensland economy. None of Queensland's debt is used to meet recurrent expenditure.
- (ii) Debt raised by Queensland semi-government and local government bodies is also utilised for capital works which contribute to the economy, and at the same time produces further income streams for such bodies, enabling them to meet the associated debt-servicing commitments.

The point was emphasised yesterday by the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating, in his address to a luncheon here in Brisbane. He made the point quite clearly that there was absolutely nothing wrong with debt incurred in the financing of infrastructure that generates future income. It was, as he termed it, "productive debt". It is the difference between "productive debt" (which is what Queensland is presently all about in the advancement of our State) and "non productive operating debt" (which is what the Commonwealth Budget is about) that apparently escapes the Opposition's comprehension.

6. Police Station, Logan City

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police—

- (1) Is he aware of the critical need for a police station on the eastern side of the Pacific Highway in Logan city?
- (2) When is it intended to establish this long-awaited police station?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Land has been acquired for the provision of a police complex at Daisy Hill. The project will be proceeded with as soon as funds are available, having regard to the priority of police building works throughout the State.

I am aware of the honourable member's concern about a new police station at Daisy Hill, which is in the Woodridge electorate. The problem is compounded by the fact that the Gold Coast Highway dissects the Woodridge police division. I have received deputations from the local authority, chambers of commerce, the progress association and the National Party. I appreciate the honourable member's concern about the matter.

7. Commonwealth Employment Program

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

(1) Which local authorities in Queensland have availed themselves of grants under the Commonwealth Employment Program?

(2) How many schemes have been accepted and which shires have been successful?

(3) What costs are involved?

(4) How many men have been employed under these local government CEP schemes?

(5) What schemes have been undertaken by the Logan City Council, at what cost, and how many men have been employed by the Logan city scheme?

Answer—

(1 to 5) The matters raised in the honourable member's question do not fall under my control and I suggest that he address his question to the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer.

Mr D'Arcy: I do so accordingly.

8. Workers' Compensation

Mr BORBIDGE asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

With reference to the recent triennial review of workers' compensation premiums—

(1) What is the extent of the major competitive advantage the Queensland workers' compensation system gives employers in this State?

(2) Is there any move by Canberra to implement a national workers' compensation scheme and what would be its effect on Queensland business?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Queensland has by far the lowest workers' compensation premium rates of any State. For example, in the open-cut section of the mining industry, the rate in Queensland is \$2.77 per \$100 of wages paid, compared with \$12.75 in New South Wales and \$15.19 in Victoria. The rate paid by dairy-farmers in Queensland is \$3.83, compared with \$12.73 in New South Wales and \$11.06 in Victoria. I can cite similar comparisons.

In addition, Queensland has been able to maintain its unique merit bonus scheme, under which individual safety conscious employers with a good claims record can reduce their premiums by up to 60 per cent.

Those factors give industries in Queensland a distinct competitive advantage when compared with other States.

The honourable member is no doubt aware that the platform of the present Federal Government includes the introduction of a national compensation scheme. This would incorporate workers' compensation. That proposal has been aired in the media in recent times. If a national compensation scheme were to be introduced, there would be a number of disadvantages to Queensland in relation to workers' compensation. They are—

1. Premiums would rise dramatically owing to Queensland employers subsidising employers in the other States.

2. Administration of such a scheme would almost be a nightmare.

3. The common-law rights of individuals would be abolished.

4. Pension schemes in lieu of lump-sum payments and common-law claims have proven very costly in the United States of America and Canada.

5. Funds from the present workers' compensation scheme providing for semi-government and local government loans will be taken from the State, thus lessening the ability of this State to provide loans for labour-intensified programs.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I ask for your ruling on the Minister's lengthy answer. Today is an allotted day for the Address in Reply debate. Question-time will cease at 12 noon.

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

Mr LESTER: The Opposition does not like the truth.

I table a chart indicating premium comparisons for Queensland and the other States in certain key industries.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

9. Fire Services Levy

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

With reference to his statement that many large companies are not insured with insurance companies in Queensland and therefore are not contributing to fire services in Queensland—

(1) What are the names of these companies?

(2) What action has been taken to ensure that these companies will contribute to fire services in Queensland in 1984-85?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I am pleased that the ALP shares my concern that all Queenslanders should meet their fair share of the cost of maintaining fire services. It was for this reason that the State Government replaced the unpopular insurance-based fire levy last July with a property fire levy, which now shares the cost of fire protection fairly among all residential property-owners.

It is worth noting that those residential property-owners who are now complaining about paying the new levy were very happy in the past to receive the full protection of their local fire brigade at a cost subsidised by those prudent home-owners who carried full insurance. A similar unfair situation will be overcome when the property fire levy is extended next July to cover commercial and industrial properties in Queensland.

In the course of finalising this levy, it has become apparent that a significant number of companies are currently not contributing to fire service costs. This has arisen from the failure by some companies, which insure interstate or off shore, to provide the State Fire Services Council with a return indicating the extent of their fire insurance risk.

Having taken steps to introduce a much fairer system of fire brigade funding, the State Government is certainly not prepared to accept a situation in which a selfish minority of companies cheat the system by receiving their fire protection at no cost to themselves. I am not prepared to reveal the names of those companies at this stage, as immediate steps will be taken by my office to recover the contributions due for 1984-85.

10. Commonwealth Letters Patent

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the apparently clandestine manner in which the Letters Patent have been changed relating to the office of Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia by the Federal ALP Government?

(2) Were there discussions between State and Federal Governments before these changes were made and, if so, what was the nature of those communications?

(3) Did the Queensland Government agree with these proposed changes?

(4) What significance do his advisers place on the changes of the office of Commander-in-Chief in and over the Commonwealth of Australia and of the changes in procedures associated with the appointment of Administrators of the Commonwealth?

(5) What will be the position of State Governors in future as regards being appointed Administrators of the Commonwealth?

(6) Are there any other changes in the Letters Patent which should be brought to public notice?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I am aware of the issue by Her Majesty the Queen of new Letters Patent relating to the office of Governor-General. As the Prime Minister pointed out in his ministerial statement on 24 August 1984, the matter has been under consideration by successive Commonwealth Governments over a number of years. The Queensland Government was not consulted.

(3 to 6) The ramifications, if any, of the issue of new Letters Patent are being examined.

11. Government and Crown Employees

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) How many public servants were employed by the Queensland Government in various classifications as at 30 June of each year from 1974 to 1984 inclusive?

(2) How many Crown employees were employed by the Queensland Government as at 30 June of each year from 1974 to 1984 inclusive?

Answer—

(1) Statistics have not been kept in a form which would enable the information requested to be provided.

(2) The following figures cover employees subject to the Public Service Act, and other Crown employees, but exclude areas such as hospital boards and statutory authorities—

Year	Total Crown Employment
1974	84 260
1975	90 104
1976	93 076
1977	95 139
1978	94 640
1979	96 126
1980	96 774
1981	95 492
1982	98 250
1983	101 783

Figures for 1984 are currently being finalised.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Coal Rail Freights

Mr **WARBURTON**: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his no doubt being aware of the wide-ranging criticism of his Government's policy on coal rail freight charges by influential industry organisations, leading mining companies,

the OECD's International Energy Agency and, presently, the giant Queensland mining company, MIM Holdings Ltd.

I also refer the Premier to the accusation by MIM's chairman and chief executive (Mr Bruce Watson) that the Queensland Government is insensitive to the issue of rail freight charges and the fact that the State Government made four times as much money from MIM's operation for the year ended 30 June than the company itself did. As this is typical of the Government's mismanagement of such an important part of the State's narrow-based economy——

Government Members interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: I will speak louder so that the Premier can hear me above his ministerial rabble.

In the interests of this State's extremely valuable coal industry, what steps will the Premier take in the immediate future to redress the damaging effects of present Government policy?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I have a prepared sheet ready for the answer, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Quite conveniently, "The Courier-Mail" has published part of that company's report, which interestingly points out that coal production doubled to 3.15 million tonnes. So the company is in a pretty good position, and the chairman has contradicted himself.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition of all the days and years past when the Labor Opposition very severely criticised the Government by using big posters displaying such things as: "Half a tomato for a ton of coal". The honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) was very vocal in his criticism and claimed that the State was not getting enough. Now the Opposition is taking up the cudgels on behalf of MIM.

The management of MIM have been critical, but they conveniently overlook the fact that they entered into a contract, a head of agreement, with the Government over the level of charges to apply. They signed that agreement with their eyes and ears open. They entered into the agreement before they spent a single cent on developing the coal mines. They knew exactly where they were going—at least I hope they did—because they decided to enter into the agreement before they spent any money. They made a commercial judgment to proceed with the projects on that basis. Now, in order to pay for their own mismanagement, they are calling on tax-payers to buy them out of the contract.

Of course, the facts are that the State Government has recognised the downturn in coal prices and responded to the coal industry's call for assistance. The assistance involves a concession of 10 per cent to all companies, which will be worth something like \$300m to them over the next three years. That means that every Queensland family will have to forego \$470 in lost revenue as its contribution to assisting the industry—money that could have been expended by the Government on facilities such as homes and so on.

The Queensland tax-payer is footing that bill, but I have yet to hear one word of thanks from MIM for that contribution. It has never voiced its appreciation. It has continued its campaign of trying to capitalise on a claim based on a false premise, as was indicated in "The Courier-Mail" when it said that its exports would increase dramatically.

The State Government has also agreed to assist by a moratorium on rail freight escalation for 12 months and a 50 per cent reduction in the agreed level of escalation after 2 years, as well as allowing lower rates for the haulage of coal at less than the contracted volume. Those are all very important factors that must be taken into consideration.

It is significant that, in announcing its \$27m profit in today's press, the company refused to be drawn into revealing the proportional contribution of coal operations to the overall profit figure.

It is also of note that at the height of the dispute on rail freights, when the company was crying poor, it suddenly found \$4m to buy shares in an overseas company. No doubt some people who have been retired or retrenched from the company in recent weeks would be asking whether that money could have been better spent keeping them in employment.

My Government retains the view that the long-term prospects for coal are sound and that is evidenced in the recent upturn in sales, so much so—I emphasise this—that the Railway Department cannot carry all the coal that the companies want to ship.

Exports are escalating rapidly—the companies have referred to a figure of 8 000 000 tonnes, which is double their capacity—and will increase next year. So I do not think that the statements that the companies persist in making are very fair. The Government has been more than fair, and it is about time that the companies recognised that.

Coal Rail Freights

Mr WARBURTON: In view of the Premier's response to that question, I refer him to the MIM Holdings Limited release of Wednesday, 29 August 1984, which states—

“Government charges continued to represent a major cost, despite MIM's lower profit. Mineral royalty outlays increased by 24%, payroll tax payments by 21% and rail freight outlays by 43.2%. The company estimates the Queensland Government's profit of the MIM group's rail freight payments in 1983/84 of \$86.7 million to be \$43.1 million.”

I refer also to the comments made by none other than Mr Fussell, who happens to be the executive general manager and a director of MIM Holdings, that Queensland is on the same path that was taken by British Columbia a decade ago. In view of those comments, and the Premier's response to my first question, and as this is undoubtedly further conclusive evidence of his Government's destructive role in respect to this State's important mining sector, I ask: What does the Premier intend to do about this matter before more mining companies close down and before the workers of Queensland, as has happened in the case of MIM, have the gate shut on them? I believe that my question is deserving of a serious reply from the man who is Premier and Treasurer of this State.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition seems to forget the role that he and so many other people in the Labor movement have played in connection with strikes that have escalated costs and caused problems for the mining companies. They cost the companies millions and millions of dollars. When the men were out on strike, never at any time did I hear the present Leader of the Opposition say a word against them.

I was very interested to hear the honourable member speak about bigger profits for some of the bigger organisations. I almost collapsed when I heard him talking as he did.

The Government is being more than fair with MIM and the other companies. They signed the agreements with their eyes and ears open.

Mr Warburton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question. Whether or not he believes he is getting an answer to his liking, the question is being answered by the Premier.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition obviously does not know that the company asked for the 10 per cent and that the Government gave that to the company. It even went well beyond that. The figure is frozen at 10 per cent until June next year and, beyond that time, the increase will not be more than 50 per cent of what was agreed.

There are many facets to this question. MIM is doing very well. The dramatic drop in copper prices around the world is the main reason for the company's trouble. If Mount Isa Mines wishes to indulge in this campaign, the Government will start a campaign in relation to the company's poor management and poor judgment in signing the agreement that it did.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is hard to believe that there are so many capitalists on the Opposition benches.

This year, 800 more men are employed in the coal-mining industry than were employed at the same time last year. Production in the mining industry has increased, and it is being maintained at the higher rate. Today, the railways cannot carry all the coal. The Government is continually being requested to provide more trucks. The Railway Department has been putting some of its older trucks back into the system to meet the increased demand.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The continued objections by the member for Brisbane Central, together with many other interjections from Opposition members, are preventing me from hearing what the Premier is saying. I ask for a little less quiet so that the Premier may continue with his answer.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Opposition members think it is a joke because I made a slip of the tongue. I want quiet, not "less quiet".

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Because I know that the Government has been more than fair to MIM and its coal-mining company, I could not care less what MIM says or how many times the company repeats its comments. The company will not get more than it has received. It has received more than it asked for; it is getting a rate much lower than the figure set in the agreement it signed. I repeat that the company will not get anything more.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members opposite may shout, yell and think of this matter in terms of half a tomato for a tonne of coal, which they used to talk about.

The Leader of the Opposition has made a bad start. He made a bad choice this time, because he will not win.

Action by Mr Wran on Mini-steel-mill

Mr NEAL: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the latest panic move by the New South Wales Premier and Federal ALP president (Mr Wran) to prevent the establishment of a mini-steel-mill in Queensland? Is the proposal by BHP only another example of industry deserting the constraints of socialist government to benefit from the private enterprise philosophies of this Government?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Now we will see where Opposition members stand on this issue. We can get an additional 1 000 jobs in Queensland. The members of the Labor Party in New South Wales are putting a socialistic stranglehold on private enterprise to stop BHP from coming to Queensland to provide those 1 000 jobs. It is nothing less than industrial blackmail by the New South Wales Premier. He has his back to the wall.

Because he is in trouble in so many directions, as he moves round he is kicking everybody possible in the shins. He is trying to blackmail BHP. The Government will support BHP or any other mini-steel organisation that comes here. Irrespective of what Mr Wran says or does, Queensland will get a mini-steel-mill.

There must be something terribly rotten in New South Wales when companies such as BHP are coming over the border all the time. Every week they are coming here from New South Wales. Obviously Mr Wran is an extremely worried and frustrated man. He is kicking out in all directions. Now he is trying to kick BHP. Queensland will get a mini-steel-mill; that is dead certain.

Queensland Submission to Grants Commission

Mr BURNS: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, I refer to the failure of Queensland to argue in its submission to the Grants Commission for country water supply and sewerage schemes. I ask: Why is the Queensland National Party Government the only State Government not to subsidise the operating costs of country water supply and sewerage schemes? Why did not Queensland argue in its submission for the inclusion of debt-servicing costs on country water supply and sewerage capital works?

Mr GUNN: I thought that I answered that question the other night when I replied to the debate on the Appropriation Bill. Possibly the honourable member was not in the Chamber during my reply.

Mr Burns: You did not answer this.

Mr GUNN: I did. I also referred to the cost of road maintenance, which does not come within the responsibility of the Grants Commission.

My answer on that occasion was that the Government has always been satisfied with the Grants Commission's methodology in this matter. It has always been accepted. No good purpose would be served in putting further submissions of this item. I explained that on the previous occasion, and stand by it. Over the years, the State has subsidised sewerage——

Mr Burns: You did not put the case for country people.

Mr GUNN: The submission was accepted on the previous occasion. As I say, on this occasion the Government was quite happy to accept the methodology and findings of the Grants Commission.

Mr Burns: You failed to put the case for country sewerage to the Grants Commission.

Mr GUNN: That is utter rubbish. I stand by what I said the other night when I replied to the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

Racing Industry

Mr KAUS: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing: In view of the controversy over the proper identification of horses in the thoroughbred racing industry, will he give consideration to introducing, by legislation, a form of positive identification for horses that must be placed on, and be easily seen on, any horse that is permitted to race in Queensland?

Mr HINZE: I think it is fairly common knowledge that I made that point right at the start when the problem with identification arose. At that particular point in time I said that all horses racing in Queensland should be branded with a freeze brand. I now state emphatically that, this session, I will be introducing legislation in which I will include a provision for identification along those lines. That is something that should be accepted by the industry. I have had discussions with the Thoroughbred Breeders Association and Sir Edward Williams, the chairman of the principal club, the Queensland

Turf Club. The way is clear for the introduction of that legislation. I will also give serious consideration to blood-sampling on a random scale before racing takes place.

Assistance for Metal Trades Industries

Mr KAUS: I ask the Minister for Transport: Has his attention been drawn to a report in "The Courier-Mail" yesterday, in which the Metal Trades Industry Association called for emergency support from the Federal Government to assist the metal and construction industries which, it says, face bleak prospects? What action can be taken by the Federal Government in this regard?

Mr LANE: This is a very serious issue and all thinking members should be aware of it. I intend to outline what the Federal Government can do to assist the metal industry.

As far as I know, the Federal Government makes no contribution to the heavy metal engineering industry in this State or any other State. It is time that the Federal Government recognised the need for employment in the industry. If it were not for the initiatives of the Queensland Government with the main line electrification program, and the rolling-stock and locomotives that will be manufactured in Queensland, many more hundreds of people would be out of work in the metal industry.

I have put forward to the Parliament a package by which the Federal Government can assist in funding to save jobs of employees in the industry. I am talking about fitters and turners, boiler-makers and their assistants, and all other metal trades industry employees. No-one on the other side of the House has spoken up for them. I wonder whether the metal trades industry unions are represented in the Labor movement these days.

At the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, I put forward a case to the Federal Minister for Transport making a plea for an injection of funds into the metal industry. The Premier put forward a similar plea at the Premiers Conference. Something must be done before it is too late to help create work in the industry. Today, in Victoria, my colleague the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) is meeting with Senator Button and he has a case to put forward as well.

I am involved because the manufacture of railway rolling-stock provides an obvious opening for the injection of funds into the metal trades industry. Because the Federal Government's Australian National Line—Mr Hawke's shipping line—pulled out of north Queensland, more container wagons are desperately needed to replace the transport previously provided by ANL to carry tobacco south. Containers are also needed to carry beer and other commodities north. Almost 88 000 tonnes of non-petroleum products have been carted to north Queensland regularly by ANL. The railways must now take over a considerable part of that task, and the support of the Federal Government would be appreciated in providing additional wagons.

I would like to hear a word from Opposition members on behalf of the metal trades industry employees; I would like to hear them express interest in the future of those people.

Mr J. Sieben

Mr JENNINGS: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Has he been able to offer any assistance to the brilliant swimmer, Olympic gold medallist and world record-holder Jon Sieben to enable him to further his career in Queensland?

Mr McKECHNIE: I am pleased to say that the Government has been able to offer some assistance to Jon, and I think that the partnership will be a very worthwhile one. It is well known that he plans to go to the Alabama University in a few months' time to undertake a business course. The Queensland Government, through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, has offered Jon a cadetship, and Jon has accepted it.

He will start work on Monday. With other cadets, he will be trained in tourism in Queensland.

In addition, when Jon is in the United States to "test the water" in his university course, he will be working for the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation by doing what he can to bring more tourists to Queensland. His name is well known in America and throughout the world as well as here, so his contribution to the corporation will be an excellent one. He has been selected not only because he is a gold medallist and the holder of a world record but also because he has the right personality for the type of work that he will do for the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

I might add that Queensland's tourism market is growing. America, particularly, is interested in sending more people to this State. The sum of \$2.2 billion is in the pipeline for the development of tourism in this State. That sum is approximately \$1 billion more than Victoria has allocated to tourism and nearly \$800m more than New South Wales has made available.

The measures that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation takes to promote tourism in this wonderful State are very effective. Queensland is getting more tourists and it is encouraging more development, thereby creating more jobs.

Jon Sieben will play a very worthwhile role in sending American tourists to Queensland. As well, he will be able to develop an excellent career for himself in the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Detective Senior Sergeant R. Dickson

Mr COMBEN: I ask the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police: Since May, has the Commissioner of Police sent a number of senior police officers, including Inspector Ryan, to Mareeba to seek out possible complaints against Detective Ross Dickson and to check his old files for the purpose of bringing departmental charges against him and then sacking him after some sort of trial?

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member's question is astounding. Senior Sergeant Ross Dickson was serving in the Queensland Police Force at Mareeba and he was under transfer to Townsville. He pursued a course that was in support of the Queensland Police Union, and he has relentlessly pursued that course since I became Minister for Police. That course is to try to obtain appeals against unapplied for transfers.

Senior Sergeant Ross Dickson was nothing but a puppet of the union in its attempts to gain appeals against unapplied for transfers. I make it perfectly clear that neither the Commissioner of Police, the Government nor I will change the present system. It would be impossible for the Commissioner of Police (Mr Terry Lewis) to control the police force if appeals against unapplied for transfers were allowed. It is already difficult enough for him with appeals against transfers, without opening up an avenue of appeal against unapplied for transfers.

Mr Goss: Are you going to charge him?

Mr GLASSON: Senior Sergeant Ross Dickson arrived in Townsville on 21 July this year. Therefore, he conformed to the requirements of his transfer, and no charges are pending against him in regard to that transfer.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with the debate on the Address in Reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Resumption of Debate—Third and Fourth Allotted Days

Debate resumed from 28 August (see p. 247) on Mr Borbidge's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr ALISON (Maryborough) (12.1 p.m.): I wish to reaffirm my loyalty and that of the people of my electorate to our monarch, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I wish to

congratulate His Excellency Sir James Ramsay, our State Governor, and Lady Ramsay, on the wonderful job that they are doing in representing our monarch in this State. Sir James is a very approachable and most sincere person. Together with Lady Ramsay he is doing a wonderful job in this State.

I am very proud to be a member of the first National Party Government in this State. Since 1957 the National Party, firstly with the Liberal Party in coalition, has been governing this State wisely and well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask honourable members if they do not wish to resume their seats, not to wander round the aisles, but to leave the Chamber.

Mr ALISON: I said that the National Party has been governing this State wisely and well, firstly in coalition with the Liberal Party, and since last October in its own right. I am very proud to be associated with and to be a member of the Queensland Government. The National Party has placed emphasis on creating the right atmosphere for private enterprise to flourish and permanent jobs and prosperity for Queenslanders. It has brought tremendous growth, development, prosperity, wealth and well-being to everyone in this State. As a result of that encouragement to private enterprise, with particular emphasis on decentralised industries, the Government has created great news for Maryborough over the past few months.

Some months ago the State Government awarded a \$20m extension to the ASEA-Walkers contract for the construction of 24 additional rail passenger cars for the electrification scheme in Brisbane. ASEA-Walkers now holds contracts for 228 carriages. The extension to the contract of 24 carriages means that, in all, 252 carriages will be built. Of that number, 168 carriages have already been delivered to the Queensland Railway Department for use in the electrification of the Brisbane railway system. The total value of those contracts exceeds \$199m. The extension to the contract will provide work for 100 men for six months and will take the contract through to June 1986.

The next good news for Maryborough, as a result of the Government's decentralisation policies, and the greatest piece of news of all that the electorate of Maryborough has had for many years, was the announcement by the Premier (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) of the \$90.9m contract to Clyde ASEA-Walkers for 70 heavy-duty electric locomotives to be used by the Queensland railways on the coal lines. Walkers Limited of Maryborough will be playing a major role in the construction of those locomotives. The contract will result in the employment of approximately 45 000 man-weeks, of which 27 000 man-weeks of employment will be provided in the Maryborough firms of Walkers and ASEA. That 27 000 man-weeks of employment in the Maryborough workshops will keep 200 men employed for a period of three and a half years. I understand that Walkers Limited will have to set up a special workshop along the lines of its very efficient railcar production facility for the construction of those locomotives and that it will use a renovated building that had been used previously for manufacturing components for the Boyne Island smelter at Gladstone. Clyde Engineering in Brisbane will manufacture the traction motors and the electric control cubicles, and the rest of the work will be done in Maryborough by Walkers and ASEA.

Although it will be some months before those additional jobs come to fruition, the granting of the contract to the company immediately gives confidence to ASEA-Walkers and staff for the future and no doubt will influence the management's thinking when coming to a decision on whether or not to retain staff.

Last Wednesday the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) made a detailed statement in the House on the background leading up to the letting of that contract and another contract to Comeng/Hitachi for the construction of 76 locomotives, as well as the reasons for splitting the contract. That will have the effect of advancing Stage 2 of the electrification project.

The Minister made it clear that the decision was taken by the Queensland Government because of the prices that were available from these companies and also because it was

considered these prices were unlikely to be on offer in the future. Of course, there was also a need in Queensland for a major project that would stimulate the heavy metal engineering industry, which has been in a downturn for some years. In awarding the contracts to the two firms, one in Brisbane and one in Maryborough, the Government has provided a stimulus to the economy of many other Queensland centres, as the two manufacturers will be availing themselves of the services of a range of subcontractors. Comeng/Hitachi and Clyde/ASEA-Walkers were given the opportunity of lowering their tender price by \$6.1m to match the price of the lowest tenderer.

In "The Courier-Mail" of 20 August, the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr Wright) said—

"A 'Stanwell-type smell' hung over Queensland's decision to let contracts worth \$189 million for electric railway locomotives."

Unfortunately, the member for Rockhampton went on to cloud the whole issue and deliberately misled the people of Queensland. I do not believe that he misunderstood the situation at all; I believe that he deliberately and selectively used certain information, which was probably fed to him by a disgruntled tenderer.

Plenty of examples of the fact that the former Leader of the Opposition is not very good with figures are available. All honourable members will recall his claim that Queensland had the highest per capita loan indebtedness in Australia. The Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) very quickly put that claim to rest, and Mr Wright was wrong again. According to the arithmetic of the member for Rockhampton, the State Government's projected deficit for the financial year just concluded was \$30m; but after a rethink on the matter, he came up with a good, round figure of \$80m. In fact, Queensland had a surplus of something under \$1m in revenue accounts. Again the honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Wright) was wrong.

Mr Hartwig: Do you think Mr Wright will be wrong when he gets to Canberra?

Mr ALISON: He will have a great deal of trouble. He might not even win preselection.

I mention these matters to indicate that the former Leader of the Opposition and the ALP, in this State in particular, has a credibility problem. With the people in my electorate, not only does the honourable member have a credibility problem; he and the ALP generally have been proven to be very unsympathetic towards provincial and country areas. Obviously, the former Leader of the Opposition is chasing the votes in Queensland where the numbers are and has said, "To hell with decentralised industries in the rest of the State."

Mr Vaughan: What about the three-car units that can be driven from only one end? They tell me the men in the Railway Department aren't very appreciative of them.

Mr ALISON: I am not aware of any problems in that line. I am quite sure that the honourable member is putting too much emphasis on any problem that there might be.

In "The Courier-Mail" article that I have mentioned already, the former Leader of the Opposition made it quite clear that he believed Walkers should not have got the contract. He obviously took the side of Comeng/Hitachi and suggested that the company should have been awarded the entire contract. Of course, there are more votes in Brisbane and, obviously, that has affected the political judgment of the honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mr McPhie: Has he got any?

Mr ALISON: That is a moot point.

In the pages of the Maryborough "Chronicle", I invited the former Leader of the Opposition to come to Maryborough to explain to the unemployed of that city and the workers at ASEA-Walkers why the railway contract for 70 electric locomotives should

not have been let to Clyde/ASEA-Walkers. The honourable member does not seem to be in a rush to meet the workers at Maryborough. I know that some of the union leaders would like to meet him, too.

In the "Chronicle" of Wednesday last, the former leader of the Opposition did a somersault and claimed that he was not against Maryborough getting the latest locomotive contract. He also claimed that under a Labor Government firms such as Walkers would be given preference to maximise employment benefits and the use of local material. That is distinctly interesting, particularly when it is Labor Party policy—I quote from the transport section of the Labor Party platform—"To modernise railway workshops to enable the manufacture of locomotives, rail motors and rolling stock." That policy of a Labor Government of gearing up railway workshops to manufacture locomotives is a natural corollary of its basic platform to socialise industry and for Government take-over of the major sections in industry and commerce.

Socialism has not yet worked anywhere in the world. Members can make a study of Sweden and France, to begin with, to say nothing of the communist countries, and they will find that nowhere has socialism—democratic or otherwise—improved the wealth of any nation or the well-being of its people. Certainly, socialism creates an elite at the top. Everybody is supposed to be equal; but under socialism and communism there are some who are more equal than others. Socialism inevitably brings about a reduction in production and in the wealth of a country, and a downturn in the working conditions and real income of that country.

I take this opportunity to remind my colleagues on this side that this National Party Government, provided it sticks to its policies of encouraging private enterprise to develop and improve the wealth of this State, has nothing to fear from a socialist party like the ALP. My colleagues on this side must never forget that we have nothing to fear from a socialist party provided we stick to what we have been doing—implementing National Party policies.

Mr Hartwig: And create jobs.

Mr ALISON: Yes, which create jobs.

In conclusion on this point, I congratulate Walkers Limited and ASEA of Maryborough and Clyde of Brisbane for winning this contract. Walkers have been building locomotives since 1873, and since then have built over 700, including a recent series of 149 hydraulic diesel locomotives.

Mr Hartwig interjected.

Mr ALISON: They certainly have the best record in Australia for building locomotives, and, of course, the electric passenger trains one sees running round Brisbane. They are of world class. That is not my opinion but the opinion of people who have travelled and know something about the railways of the world.

Walkers Limited has a world-wide reputation for technical excellence and, backed by the world-renowned technological excellence of ASEA, the Swedish company, there can be no doubt that the locomotives they build in conjunction with Clyde of Brisbane will again be of world standard and of great benefit to this State in helping develop the railway system.

Mr Vaughan: Did you say a Swedish company?

Mr ALISON: ASEA has its head office in Sweden.

Mr Vaughan: Didn't you give Sweden a bit of a serve before?

Mr ALISON: Not at all. I will have to give the honourable member a copy of my speech.

I also want to take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to the union representatives from Walkers and ASEA, who twice met with me in my electorate office and gave me their views about and concern for their future and that of their families. There were about 18 men at the first meeting and about a dozen at the later meeting. Trevor Davis is the chairman of the combined union committee, and the information and the views that he and other delegates gave me were very helpful. I reported to the Premier (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) on both meetings. I believe that this Government has displayed its understanding and sympathy to these men and their workmates in granting this contract of 70 locomotives to the decentralised firm of ASEA-Walkers.

I now want to make a few comments on the Elections Tribunal that was held earlier this year. In particular, I will be endeavouring to offer some constructive comments, and also to cite some comments made by Mr Justice Thomas that I think the Attorney-General should take on board with a view to amending the Elections Act.

On 13 January this year, Mr Peter Nightingale lodged a petition with the Supreme Court of Queensland seeking that it be declared that I was not duly elected, which would, of course, have resulted in a by-election for Maryborough. Four grounds were set out in the petition: firstly, the petitioner alleged that there was a contravention of the Act in regard to a certain advertisement which had been shown, allegedly with my knowledge and consent; secondly, Mr Nightingale alleged that 11 voters had more than one vote; thirdly, he alleged that 29 votes were incorrectly dealt with by the returning officer, Mr John Beck; and, fourthly, he alleged that four voters were disfranchised because they were issued with the wrong form by the presiding officer.

Mr Davis: Will you be able to go through the case history?

Mr ALISON: There might be some things that the honourable member does not want to hear, but he will cop it, anyway.

Those electors were seen by the presiding officer to be not on the roll, and it is alleged that he gave them the wrong form to complete.

Mr Justice Thomas presided over the Elections Tribunal, which sat in Maryborough from 26 March to 30 March and was then adjourned to the Brisbane Supreme Court where it sat for three days from 3 to 5 April. His Honour delivered judgment on Friday, 13 April, so from now on I will not knock Friday the 13th.

In relation to the first allegation of an illegal advertisement and my knowledge of and consent thereto, His Honour found—

“He (that is Alison) had no knowledge of illegality or of facts capable of showing that an offence would be committed. It is equally impossible to infer that Mr Alison consented to any illegal practice.”

The ALP tried to have me disqualified. That is what it was all about, but members of the ALP did not say that because it would have made them appear to be bad sports. They tried to nail me with the advertisement that they alleged was illegal. They wanted to have me disqualified from holding office for three years, but they fell flat on their faces.

As to the allegations of double voting, His Honour found—

“In summary, it remains possible that there were two instances of double voting. It remains equally possible that two extra names were erroneously marked off. At the end of the day, I am not satisfied that any elector voted twice or that any personation of voters occurred during the course of the election.”

Mr Peter Nightingale, the ALP candidate, claimed that 29 votes were dealt with incorrectly by the returning officer. Eventually over 70 votes were challenged by either Nightingale or me. Mr Justice Thomas found that no votes were allowed improperly by the returning officer.

As to votes treated as being informal or disallowed entirely by the returning officer, Mr Justice Thomas allowed 14 to be counted and five to be treated as official errors and taken into the count. Of the 14 that had been wrongly disallowed, His Honour gave me 10 and Mr Nightingale four. Out of the official errors, he gave three to Mr Nightingale and two to me. In summary, that means that 12 votes were added to my count and seven to Mr Nightingale's count, and that gave me a majority of 13.

Mr Innes: Would you say it was a case of Nightingale singing and Alison coming out square.

Mr ALISON: That is an apt statement.

As I understand it, all of this cost the ALP \$37,000. Mr Beattie got egg all over his face because this garrulous gentleman made a few statements in the period from the date the petition was lodged to the time of the judgment. He claimed that a by-election would be held. My legal advisers said that that was most improper. When one gets to know what Mr Beattie is all about, one realises that he would be the last to worry about what is proper, what is ethical, or what is correct.

Mr Hartwig interjected.

Mr ALISON: He tried for Archerfield but he did not have the numbers.

Mr Nightingale, the ALP candidate, came out of this appearing to be a man who was not prepared to accept, in the first instance, the will of the people.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ALISON: The honourable members' logic escapes me.

I will deal now with some of the matters raised by Mr Justice Thomas—and a few other points. With reference to section 103 (1) (b), His Honour discussed at length, in pages 6 to 14 of his judgment, the submissions as to the principles upon which the Elections Tribunal should act in ruling upon the validity or invalidity of questioned votes. His Honour referred to several sections of the Elections Act, including section 79, which prescribes the mode of voting; section 102, which specifies informalities that are not to invalidate a vote; section 103, which gives cause for rejection and circumstances of non-rejection of ballot papers; and section 145, which deals with the principles of trial.

Section 103 (1) (b) states—

“A ballot paper that has upon it any mark or writing not authorized by this Act to be put thereon which in the opinion of the returning officer will or may enable any person to identify a ballot paper or the elector, shall be rejected at the close of the poll.”

His Honour raised problems about the correct approach for the Elections Tribunal to take before differing from a returning officer's opinion on whether or not a mark on a ballot paper may enable any person to identify the ballot-paper. In summing up, Mr Justice Thomas said that he concluded, with some reluctance, that he must adopt the approach required by the Brian Hatch case of 1972. In his final remarks on this particular point, on page 14 of his judgment, he stated—

“If the legislature intended the tribunal to have the power to review all matters de novo or, alternatively, to delete the special reference to the opinion of the returning officer in section 103 (1) (b) this could be accomplished by a simple amendment. Without further comment, I draw attention to the possible desirability of some such amendment.”

No doubt the Attorney-General will look at this problem encountered by Mr Justice Thomas.

Section III, which was also referred to by Mr Justice Thomas, deals with political articles to be signed and the definition of author, which gave His Honour some problem.

Section III provides that all political articles printed and published in any newspaper, circular, pamphlet, etc., shall be signed by the author, giving his or her true name and address at the end of the said article, report, letter, etc. On pages 3 and 4 of the judgment, His Honour, Mr Justice Thomas, discussed the legal definition of "author", and ended up his comments by saying—

"It is not necessary for me to express a final view on the meaning of the section because even if I adopt the petitioners submission in the circumstances of the present case there is no reason for Mr Alison to assume that the eventual authoriser would not personally contribute to the proposed pamphlet."

His Honour canvassed the submission that the word "author" can refer only to the writer or creator of the relevant material. He also referred to a previous judgment in which it was assumed that the requirement of a similar section dealing with "author" was that disclosure of the identity of the person proffering the advertisement was sufficient.

To sum up—differing viewpoints seem to be that the word "author" in relation to section III could mean the writer or creator of the relevant material or, on the other hand, the identity of the person proffering the advertisement. It seems to me that the Attorney-General should have this matter looked at as well to clear up the problem by perhaps defining "author" in an amendment to the Elections Act.

Mr Fouras: Do you suggest that it would be easier for people to bodgie stuff up during a campaign?

Mr ALISON: No, I was not getting at that at all. I was making the point that, if His Honour had problems in defining "author", I do not know how an ordinary person would be able to do it. Obviously the matter should be clarified with an amendment.

I want to refer to errors and omissions by presiding officers and poll clerks. It is my belief that a high performance should be expected from them, and that they should take their jobs very seriously and fully acquaint themselves with the requirements of the Elections Act as it affects them in the carrying out of their duties. I am not saying that anyone should expect a perfect performance because, after all, these officers are human, like the rest of us. However, it is very clear, from what came out in evidence before this Elections Tribunal, that a number of presiding officers and poll clerks are simply not shaping up to their responsibilities in this very serious business of an election, and the Attorney-General should turn his attention to this problem.

The returning officers have clear instructions on training the presiding officers and poll clerks under their authority, and I believe that the returning officers carry out those instructions. It is clear, however, that something further must be done to stop at least some of these very silly and irresponsible mistakes that were made in the last election in Maryborough and, one would expect, in all the other electorates.

It is quite obvious that some of the presiding officers and poll clerks are either incompetent or just simply do not take their positions seriously enough and should be sacked. I respectfully suggest that the Attorney-General should look at ways and means of weeding out these people and employing competent and responsible people as presiding officers and poll clerks, and also that he might review the method of training them.

One of the mistakes made by a presiding officer affected four absentee votes, which came, apparently, from the one area of Queensland to the returning officer at Maryborough for counting.

Mr Hartwig: Each for you?

Mr ALISON: I just do not recollect that.

Each of these ballot-papers contained the same initial on the top left-hand corner. It appeared reasonable to assume that the initial was placed there by the presiding officer who attended to their issue, as was the legal requirement some years ago. Now, of course,

as honourable members would know, presiding officers are not to initial ballot-papers. There is absolutely no excuse for such a silly error, which could possibly have disfranchised these voters.

In another instance, two absentee votes came to the returning officer at Maryborough. They were correct in every respect other than the addition of the political parties written alongside the names of the three candidates. It was obvious that the same person had written the names of the candidates. Therefore, it follows that they had obviously been written by the presiding officer.

Mr Milliner: I had 15 votes in one booth disregarded on that basis.

Mr ALISON: The matter reared its head rather dramatically in my electorate because it was a close go. Something has to be done to stop these rather stupid mistakes from being made. Obviously the returning officers are not reading their instructions.

The voters had correctly recorded their votes and, through this error by a presiding officer, these voters could have been disfranchised.

Three absentee votes were received by the Maryborough returning officer on or about 21 November 1983 after he had declared the poll and after he had returned the writ to the Governor. Those votes could not be counted. However, only one of the voters was entitled to vote. That person was disfranchised because a polling official had overlooked immediately sending his vote to the Maryborough returning officer. Again, I say that there was no excuse for that.

I now discuss absentee votes taken without appropriate declarations. Three absentee votes arrived in Maryborough and, although the envelopes in which the ballot-papers were contained were signed by the presiding officers and the voters, the required declarations were not on the face of the envelopes. Two of the three absentee voters were disfranchised because a presiding officer somewhere in Queensland did not know his job. The other voter was not entitled to vote.

Mr Hartwig: That's a shocking turn-out.

Mr ALISON: It certainly is.

Postal votes are covered by section 87 of the Elections Act, and the requirements are set out very clearly. Voters may apply up to 6 o'clock p.m. on any day before polling day for a postal vote, provided they meet the requirements. The returning officer must deliver the ballot-paper or cause it to be sent to the elector. The voter must vote by 6 p.m. on polling day. The ballot-paper must be delivered to the returning officer or the presiding officer, or be received by one of them by post within 10 days. It is all clear so far.

However, an amendment was made to the Act in 1983, and I think that it should be analysed very closely. Because of the re-count for the seat of Maryborough and on a consideration of scrutineering generally, it became obvious that, although the Act says that an elector must vote by 6 p.m., a scrutineer can, in the course of his duties, come onto names and addresses of people who have applied for postal votes and whose postal vote has not yet been received by the returning officer. It is physically possible for an unscrupulous scrutineer to track down those people on the off chance that they have not voted—even though it is illegal for them to vote after polling day, but when the ALP is involved anything can happen—and, if they have not voted, prevail upon them to vote in a certain way. Of course, it is also physically possible to make an incorrect declaration on the front of the envelope.

I am very concerned about this matter. I realise that in most electorates it does not matter, but when the result is close, it is important. The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General should reconsider this amended section and amend it again so that its provisions

are as they were previously. That would mean that the envelope in which the ballot-paper is posted must bear a date stamp no later than the date of polling day.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ALISON: What the member for Brisbane Central said is correct; it must be on that day.

That raises another problem. With the reduction in postal services, the envelope must be posted on a Friday. Be that as it may, that is the only way to stop any hanky-panky.

Mr Davis: Otherwise it should be taken to a post office which stamps the date on it.

Mr ALISON: Yes, or something like that, anyway. The ballot-paper must be returned to the post office somehow and not later than 6 o'clock on the polling day.

Having travelled through my electorate and round the State, I feel that there is a deep concern developing in the community at the restructuring downwards of the standards of Australian society by the Hawke Federal Government. The concern of the Australian people in March 1983 was largely for the failure of the Fraser Liberal-National Party Government to come to grips with the economic problems. The people of Australia voted the Labor Party led by Mr Hawke into power in the hope that it would do a better job on the economic front. It was a classic example of a Government losing power rather than a political party gaining power. Bill Hayden was right when he said that a drover's dog could have won the election for the ALP.

Economics overshadowed what the people of Australia should have realised they could expect the socialist Labor Party to do in the name of alleged reform. We are always hearing about proposed social reforms. Mr Hawke and his Canberra socialists have made some superficial, short-term improvements on the economic front.

Mr Hartwig interjected.

Mr ALISON: In a moment, I will talk about consensus.

Mr Hawke and Mr Keating have not come to grips with the deep-rooted problems in the Australian economy. I will not talk about the economic state of the nation today. Instead, I will concentrate on the restructuring downwards of Australia's moral and living standards.

Fundamental institutions of society—marriage, the family, the Christian belief in God, the flag—are all under attack on two fronts.

Mr Milliner: The first part of your contribution was good, but you are slipping now.

Mr ALISON: I am sorry that the member for Everton does not like what I am saying, but I have more.

Firstly, the aim of the Labor socialists is to convert Australia into a socialist republic.

Mr Prest: Tell us about tax evasion and trust accounts—things you know something about.

Mr ALISON: I know more about the taxation laws than the honourable member for Port Curtis. Some day I shall explain them to him.

Next, the minority pressure groups, the ratbags and the radicals on the periphery and at the centre of the ALP have convinced the Hawke Federal Government that they are entitled to preferential treatment.

Let me deal with some of the attacks that have been made on the institutions that constitute the framework of Australian society. I deal first with the recent decision by

the Australian Broadcasting Corporation board to grant its homosexual employees the same eligibility for benefits as that given to spouses of staff members. In effect, that places spouses of ABC staff members on the same basis as sexual deviates.

It is interesting to note that the chairman of the board of the ABC (Mr Meyer) said that he had no choice but to stand by the ABC's decision, which was made in line with Federal ALP policy outlawing discrimination against sexual preference. It is quite clear that all Mr Meyer is trying to do is implement Federal ALP policy.

I presume it follows that lesbian partners of female ABC members are also entitled to the same benefits as those given to women married to ABC staff members. That is an example of the downgrading of a Federal Government controlled semi-autonomous organisation. It is getting lower and lower.

Mr Davis: Don't you believe in autonomy for the ABC?

Mr ALISON: It is a load of rubbish to claim that the ABC is autonomous. It was set up by the Federal Government, and it is absolute rubbish to claim that the Federal Government cannot dictate what the ABC will do.

Obviously, the decision by the board of the ABC has the tacit approval of the ALP in Canberra. Apparently, the decision also receives the full support of the members of the Queensland parliamentary Labor Party, with the exception of their former leader, Mr Wright. Recently he was attacked by the president of the Queensland Branch of the Labor Party (Mr Ian McLean), the Opposition spokesman on Justice (Mr Bob Gibbs) and Senator Georges, who is one of the ALP senators for Queensland. Of course, one should not be too surprised by Senator Georges in his rush to defend homosexuals in the ABC. He is a well-known advocate of any ratbag group that rears its head and, of course, at the drop of a hat he is prepared to commit civil disobedience by engaging in illegal street marches on such issues.

Mr De Lacy: Do you think that this fixation of Government members on homosexuality is natural?

Mr ALISON: It is not a fixation. I shall put the honourable member straight. We on this side of the House are deeply concerned at what is going on in the nation. Ratbag groups and sexual deviates are being given preference. It is not a matter of equality; it is preference. That is what the Hawke Government is all about.

The former Leader of the Opposition (Mr Wright), to his credit, spoke against the ABC decision, whereas the Opposition's spokesman on Justice (Mr Bob Gibbs) criticised Mr Wright. Where do the other members of the Labor Opposition stand on this matter? The people of Queensland have a right to know. I suggest that probably most of the Opposition members would be afraid to voice their opinion in favour of the ABC decision, for fear of an electoral backlash. Somewhere along the line, Opposition members will have to stand up and be counted. So far, only two Opposition members have expressed their point of view. The others can rest assured that they will have to stand up and be counted, particularly in the run-up to the forthcoming Federal election.

The decision arrived at some months ago by the Federal Hawke Government to allow Federal members to take their de facto wives on overseas trips at tax-payers' expense is another attack on the family unit and a downgrading of the institution of marriage as well as of married women. It is ironic that the Hawke Federal Government has made such a big deal out of opposing sexual discrimination, and of bringing in this "Mickey Mouse" legislation known as the Sex Discrimination Act, whilst at the same time setting about through various Acts to rubbish the institution of the family and, in particular, married women.

Basically, the Australian community is Christian. The last census indicated that approximately 90 per cent of the Australian people stated their Christian belief and practise the Christian faith either nominally or actively. In contrast, the socialist Government that presently holds office in Canberra contains 50 Labor politicians who

refused to take an oath on the Bible. That same Government has removed the word "God" from the national anthem and from the oath of allegiance.

From comments that are made to me both in my electorate and outside it, it is apparent that those decisions by the Federal Hawke Government are shocking people and gradually making them realise just what the Hawke socialist Government is all about. On those issues I detect a ground swell against the Hawke Government. Although Australians are still concerned to some extent about the Hawke Government's economic policies—and well they might be—their biggest concern is at just where Mr Hawke and his socialist cronies are taking the nation in the so-called restructuring of society.

I turn now to the importation of hard-core pornography in video films. On this issue, too, the Hawke socialist Government stands condemned. We have heard reams of words spoken by the Federal Attorney-General (Senator Gareth Evans); but when one sorts out all the words into what they mean, one finds that the only thing that has changed in his proposal is that the material that used to be given an X rating is now given an R rating. The only ban by the Federal Government will be on child pornography, bestiality and incitement to terrorism. Hard-core pornography will still be freely available in Labor States such as New South Wales and Victoria. Last week, I was very pleased to be advised by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Neville Harper) that the Queensland Cabinet has now approved that legislation be prepared to outline controls in the video industry, and it is hoped that in this session of Parliament legislation will be introduced to control the problem at the point of sale.

Another decision by the Hawke socialist Government was the changing of the national anthem. That was done without reference to the people.

Mr Vaughan: That's not true.

Mr ALISON: It was done without reference to the people.

Mr Vaughan: What about the 1974 referendum? Tell the truth!

Mr ALISON: The point is that we were not asked whether we wanted to retain out national anthem. We were simply told by Mr Hawke that we could have one of the options that he listed. However, the existing national anthem was not included in his list of options.

It is obvious that we are heading for the same style of decision in regard to our national flag. A committee has been set up and funded by the Federal Government to investigate the matter of changing the flag.

Whenever Mr Hawke wants to side-step a difficult decision or set himself apart from some problem or other, he sets up a committee. It would be interesting to know just how many committees presently exist in Canberra and in other parts of Australia compared with the number set up by the Whitlam Government when it was in office. The Premier of Queensland (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) has said time and time again that the Hawke Government cannot make decisions. It simply sets up committees and then lets them make the decisions for it. That is an accurate summation of the Hawke Government and its so-called consensus. The only consensus on many decisions made by Mr Hawke is between the Federal Labor Government and the committee making the decision. I suppose that is what is meant by "consensus"

Yet another attack on the institution of the family was the decision made at the ALP National Conference to adopt a policy of abortion on demand. In some Labor States, a move was made to legalise homosexuality, prostitution and the private use of marijuana. All of those decisions pander to the minority and not to the majority. All of those decisions are downgrading our society, and that is resented by the people of this great country. Those are the issues that are going to be aired in the forthcoming Federal election.

As to the land grab for the Aborigines—less than 1 per cent of the Australian Aboriginal population now has control over about 30 per cent of the Northern Territory and about 12 per cent of the total area of Australia. Mr Whitlam introduced that land grab; Mr Fraser carried it on; and now Mr Hawke is trying to implement the land-grab policy. That, of course, is discrimination in reverse. According to the Hawke socialist Government, the Aborigines must be given preferential treatment because they are a minority group.

All of those fundamental changes being brought about by the Hawke socialist Government are not the standards of the majority of Australians. They are the standards of minority groups. They are the standards of the Hawke socialist Government and the Labor Opposition in Queensland. I will not let the Opposition forget that. Those are matters being discussed by the people of Queensland at present, and no doubt also by the people of Australia. In the forthcoming Federal election, the Hawke socialist Government will have to give a reason for its decisions. I believe that there is a slowly developing ground swell of Australian concern. That concern is turning to anger and will engulf the Hawke Federal Government at the next Federal election, regardless of the economic situation and, no doubt, the promises that will flow by the dozen from Mr Hawke and his Canberra cronies.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (12.38 p.m.): I congratulate His Excellency Sir James Ramsay on his wonderful official opening of the second session of the Forty-fourth Parliament on 21 August. My constituents in the electorate of Callide and I express our continued allegiance to the Crown. I thank my electors for their great vote of confidence in returning me to this Chamber as an Independent. In New South Wales, the Independents are doing very well; there are now six of them in that State Parliament.

I endorse the sentiments expressed by the member for Maryborough and express my horror and disgust at the recent attempt by the Federal Government to do away with the national flag and also its decision to reject "God save the Queen" as the national anthem. I support the Queensland Government's opposition to such a move.

After all the talk about homosexuals, gays, guys, lesbians, their associates and their activities, I assume that the technique has been updated in recent years. I have studied the "Oxford English Dictionary" and I cannot find the true meanings of "homosexuals" and "performances" May I suggest that on some quiet afternoon the doors of this Chamber could be locked so that members could witness a demonstration by some of these people who wish to promote such activities. If I have to vote on something, I want to know what it is all about. Seeing is believing, and I want to know the latest techniques used by guys, gays and lesbians. I have been reared in the country, and there is no way that the animal kingdom would tolerate such behaviour. However, some members of the community are having it forced on them—rammed down their necks—by certain other sections of the community from Canberra. I see on the front page of the "Telegraph" that the Minister for Education will try to stop the holding of a conference of gays, guys and lesbians scheduled for the week-end. That is being paid for by all the tax-payers of the State and nation. That is horrific!

Recently, I was interested to read an incredible statement attributed to none other than Sir Robert Sparkes of Jandowae advocating the formation of a new conservative political party. In fact, in March 1981, at the time of my expulsion at capitol hill, Sir Robert Sparkes said that I had the audacity to suggest the formation of a new party and that, for that reason, I must be expelled. Although that statement was utterly false, Sir Robert Sparkes hung me for it. Yet a week or so ago he advocated the formation of a new conservative party.

I suppose that people must become accustomed to change. An interesting point is that in 1972, when I stood for the Country Party, I and the nine other candidates had to give a written guarantee that we had been in continuous membership of that party for three years. Now, for 30 pieces of silver, in the morning a person can belong to one

party and in the afternoon he can be a member representing the National Party. I do not go along with those practices in party politics.

Because of good representation for the last 13 years, my electorate has done very well. However, I want a pre-school for Thangool, a major water storage for irrigation in the Callide Valley, the Rockhampton to Mount Morgan range road fixed, and the highway between Westwood and Gogango and the Yeppoon to Byfield road attended to.

The Government has done nothing about quangos, particularly those that do not follow the policy of free enterprise advocated by the Government.

I wish to comment on the recent racing ring-in and substitution for Fine Cotton at Eagle Farm, as it is very serious and concerns all thinking Queenslanders. Nothing short of a full royal commission should be instigated. The tentacles of this case spread not only across Australia but also into overseas countries as well. That is not good for Queensland racing. The Government has a Minister responsible for racing who has dedicated and applied himself generally to the betterment of racing. He has placed the racing industry in Queensland far and above that in any other State.

The dramatic event that occurred in the fifth race at Eagle Farm on 18 August was what has been called a ring-in, which means substituting one horse for another. That is not something new, nor is it confined to Queensland. Ring-ins have been carried out in all States. I suppose that when one considers the thousands of racehorses that go through the sale ring every year and end up at the barrier, it is miraculous that more ring-ins have not been attempted, and for that great credit must go to the stewards.

Everybody would agree that racing has really progressed in Queensland over the past five years and, as I said, credit for that must go to our Minister. But one could well ask whether, in the light of recent events, the administration of racing has kept abreast of the great improvements in track and grandstand facilities.

I want to pay tribute to the stewards and to the racing committee. Andy Tindall, the chief stipendiary steward, is paid a mere pittance for performing his exacting duties, although he is snowed under with work and has insufficient staff. In addition, he does not have the up-to-date techniques and the computerised records that are available to his counterparts in Melbourne and Sydney.

Mr Veivers: Where is the money going, Lindsay?

Mr HARTWIG: I make the point that he has to be given sufficient money. The Sydney and Melbourne stewards have all the technical facilities that he needs money to develop.

What did go wrong on 18 August? Within 20 minutes of the win by Fine Cotton in the fifth race, stewards made the announcement that the horse had been disqualified. They said that the horse which won the race was none other than Bold Personality, an open handicap winner. I ask: Why, then, was the horse's trainer, Haitana, left to wander round the course? He strolled down to the public bar on his own, sank two beers, and then, still on his own and, at that stage, showing no nervousness for his life, walked about 200 metres back to stall 114, picked up his gear and left the race-track. Nobody inhibited his progress; no questions were asked of him.

It had already been proven that he had rigged a race, or been a party to the rigging of a race. He had been a party to one of the biggest swindles in racing for a number of years. That occurred at the headquarters of racing in Queensland, if not in Australia. Why was that man not immediately taken into custody by the police? If a person enters a shop and picks up a pocket handkerchief, he is immediately accosted by store personnel, who call the police. The police have the power to remove that person to the police station. But a man who was party to a ring-in was left to walk round the racecourse for what I have been told was the best part of an hour. He was not even questioned—not approached by a soul—and during that time, apparently, he had no fear for his life. The racecourse detectives knew, the police knew and the stewards knew. Thousands upon

thousands of punters lost in excess of half a million dollars that was invested on the horse not only in Australia but overseas. Money went into book-makers' bags, on the TAB and into the pockets of SP book-makers.

It was an extremely serious crime, yet recently the Minister for Police was pleading with Mr Haitana to come back to Queensland and assuring him that he would be safe. What a load of rubbish!

I am reliably informed that some senior police officers in both Brisbane and country areas wagered sizeable sums of money on Fine Cotton. Is it true that one of the prominent rails book-makers in Brisbane laid scarcely a bet on Fine Cotton and that a book-maker friend in Rockhampton did not lay a bet on the same horse?

Only a royal commission with full powers can bring these people to heel. Who was the Sydney book-maker who was named on the "60 Minutes" TV program by Haitana? Is it true that a Sydney book-making firm, Grant Waterhouse, which operates a betting complex in Fiji, laid \$1,500 each way on Fine Cotton with a rival firm a few minutes before the race started? If, in an attempt to smear a man with a good reputation, Robbie Waterhouse was named on the "60 Minutes" program by Haitana, why is not Waterhouse allowed an opportunity to defend himself and clear his name, if he is the man who is believed to have been involved?

In recent years Queensland racing has had a few problems. In 1982, Mannasong was a ring-in and a man named Bill Stear was disqualified for life. I believe that Bill Stear was put up to do the job by Gillespie, a man named prominently in this episode. A few months ago, two horses in Brisbane named Wistane Myth and Aquataine returned positive swabs. No charges were laid although the racing constitution provides that when any horse is doped someone must be charged because somebody must be guilty. The problems that have been experienced are not good for the racing industry. Only a royal commission can put it right.

The racing stewards held an inquiry on Monday. I think they are meeting again today. Their inquiry is toothless without the presence of Haitana. It is akin to a 21st birthday party without the guest of honour being at the party. Haitana is the man who must be brought before a royal commission. All suspects must be brought before a royal commission. If they have nothing to hide, let them say so in a fully fledged court. Stewards have no judicial powers.

Mr Innes: What about the check on identification?

Mr HARTWIG: I am coming to that.

In the interests of keeping racing clean in Queensland the crooks must be brought before a court presided over by a judge with a jury.

I am told that a man named Gillespie connived with Haitana to substitute a fine Sydney performer named Dashing Solitaire for Fine Cotton in a race at Eagle Farm a week earlier on 11 August. Everything was set up for that day except that bad luck intervened. It was good luck for the racing industry that Dashing Solitaire injured himself while being loaded on to a ramp. But for that, the substitution could have taken place a week earlier. On that day, Fine Cotton had to be scratched, but he was in the running the following week.

Mr Haitana, crying crocodile tears, said on TV that he was forced to do it. I would say that Haitana had as much to do with this episode as anyone else, if not more. I believe that Haitana did not trust Gillespie and that Gillespie promised him the money after the race was won. In fear of not getting his \$20,000, Haitana invested thousands of dollars and told the world. He told all his mates.

On the night of the 18th, a relative of Haitana telephoned the "Sunday Mail" in Adelaide and asked whether Fine Cotton had won the fifth race in Brisbane. When told that the horse had won the race but had been disqualified, he immediately hung up. He had had enough.

I believe that Haitana was on the Gold Coast until last Wednesday. On Thursday and Friday he was in Adelaide. I have it on good authority that he is now in New Zealand. As a matter of fact, so much time has elapsed that he could have rowed a boat across the Tasman Sea by now. He has been allowed to go free. What has happened to the industry?

If Haitana had been scared, he could have told the stewards. He was fined \$20 by the stewards for making a late announcement about a jockey. He went to the stewards and produced a \$100 note—not bad for a bloke who was broke to the world! Still and all, he paid up. If he had wanted to come clean, he could have said to the stewards, “My life is in danger. The horse is a substitute. It is not Fine Cotton.” Many thousands of dollars could have been saved. Many people would have been saved the embarrassment of backing a no-goer. Haitana told all his mates to back Fine Cotton, and back him they did.

Mr De Lacy: You didn’t back Fine Cotton, did you?

Mr HARTWIG: No. I did not back Fine Cotton. I do not back horses that I do not know anything about.

Where does Mr North fit into all of this? Did a mysterious man named Mr North mastermind the whole affair? These questions have to be answered. Two Sydney bookmakers alone faced a pay-out of \$300,000.

To show how ineffective the stewards’ inquiry is—last Monday a witness refused to name the people who had placed a large sum of money with him to back Fine Cotton. Was he placing a bet for another man whose name I shall not mention? Under the rules of racing, the stewards have the power to deal with a witness who withholds information; yet no action was taken in this instance. If a royal commission were instigated, these people would be subpoenaed to appear before it. They would have to appear before the royal commission. They would be brought to heel.

I believe that this Fine Cotton affair was conjured up by a number of people. They have tentacles all round Australia. One of them has a criminal record as long as my arm. If those people are not dealt with, the door will be opened for acts of a similar nature. The public are entitled to be protected. Punters are entitled to be protected. Likewise, owners, trainers and jockeys must be protected from this sort of thuggery and corruption.

I have been reliably informed that Haitana will not speak with representatives of the media unless he is well paid. I have been told that he received \$20,000 for appearing on the “60 Minutes” television program. Of course, the producers of that program will deny that, in the same way as Haitana will deny that he was responsible for the ring-in.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr HARTWIG: Prior to the lunch recess I was making out a case for a commission of inquiry into racing in Queensland. I have spoken about Mr Haitana and the recent ring-in case. Some years ago a horse named Risley was involved in a substitution attempt. In that case, the stewards stepped in and stopped the substitution from taking place. The real Risley started, ran last and many people lost their money that day. The trainer went south of the border.

I call on the Minister for Racing to take positive action by way of a royal commission of inquiry. We do not want these cockroaches coming to Brisbane from States such as New South Wales which, I believe, are rotten to the core with gangsters and crooks of all kinds. They must be stopped. They must be shown that in Queensland the full force of the law will be applied.

I would now like to offer some constructive suggestions. All horses should pass through a check-point before entering stalls on a race-track. Most bandaging of fetlocks

occurs in the race stalls and it can conceal many markings. For that reason, if the check-point is at the saddling paddock, a change in horse is difficult to detect.

All new trainers must have registered papers and should establish their own identity and that of their stable-hands. All horses should be on course two hours before a race, not one hour, as is required now. Horses from Toowoomba and the Gold Coast leave their stables at about 9 o'clock in the morning to race in Brisbane. A trainer with stables adjacent to a Brisbane race-track leaves in enough time to be at the track an hour before the race. If all horses were at the track two hours before racing, the stewards would have more time to make checks.

All horses should be issued with identity cards on which the main markings are listed. The card should also carry a coloured photograph of the horse. If the strapper had carried such an identity card when Bold Personality entered the saddling paddock, it would have been obvious that he had a star while the photograph of Fine Cotton would have shown no mark on the forehead at all. An identity card would show the appropriate markings—in this case a star and two white fetlocks—and the stewards could say to the strapper, "Fine, on your way." It would simplify the stewards' job of looking for registration marks. When a horse is registered, the markings and every whirl in the horse's coat must be identified. Stewards are very particular in that regard.

Greater security is required in the stables and on the race-track. At the Brisbane racecourses on race day, only one or two attendants can be seen in the laneways between the stables. The other horses have been left and their attendants are watching the races. That should not happen. The strappers should stay with the horses at all times. The onus is on the trainer to ensure that nobody nobbles his horses.

The Minister for Police is in the Chamber. He might know why there has been a delay in the racing authorities receiving a transcript of the "60 Minutes" interview with Haitana last Sunday. "The Courier-Mail" has not received a copy of the transcript either. Perhaps the Minister for Police can say whether it is true that the police force has a copy of the transcript in which Robbie Waterhouse has been named as Mr Big. It is only at a commission of inquiry that a reputable man like Mr Waterhouse can clear his name. Haitana has smeared his name, and he should be given the opportunity to clear it.

I would also like to know whether Miss Pauline Pearse, the part-owner of Fine Cotton, is the same Pauline Pearse who has convictions for prostitution and drub abuse. Does Mr Diluzio have an interest in a Fortitude Valley casino? Those questions will be answered only if a full-scale inquiry is conducted into the racing industry.

I am sure that, like me, all other honourable members value the racing industry and are pleased with the manner in which it has been kept clean over the years. We do not want the racing scene infiltrated by undesirable elements.

I would ask: How many Queensland police are involved full time on this case? Why is it that, after more than 10 days, not one arrest has been made? The television, radio and newspaper reporters seem to have more information than the police have. Why did not the police move in on John Patrick Gillespie of Heeb Street, Southport, who is alleged to be so involved as part-owner of Bold Personality? Why are newspaper reporters alleging that their telephones at racecourses in Brisbane are being tapped? The stewards do not have the power to deal with all those serious matters that affect Queensland racing.

In races far too many reversals of form occur. One Saturday a horse runs last, and the next Saturday it wins. Book-makers are being given such a hiding that when a vacancy occurs within their ranks the applicants to fill it are few and far between.

I repeat that the only way in which the racing industry can regain its good reputation is by its having a royal commission conducted into it.

I turn now to the position in which farmers and graziers in my electorate find themselves. Today, most farmers in Queensland work on low rainfall, high overdrafts

and low returns. Over the period from 1980 to 1983, farm costs increased by 34 per cent, whereas prices for farm produce rose by only 12 per cent. A break-down of those costs reveals that farm fuel prices rose by 38 per cent, farm labour costs by 32 per cent, new machinery costs by 35 per cent, rates, taxes and services by 48 per cent, marketing services by 33 per cent and farm contract prices by 35 per cent. The grim picture of the financial plight in which Queensland farmers have found themselves over the past three years is a reflection of the trend that has occurred since the days of Whitlam in 1972.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Oh, leave poor old Gough alone. What else are you going to blame him for?

Mr HARTWIG: I have to give him a mention now and again. After all, he is the bloke who started it all.

Queensland's primary producers are expected to sell their products at 1970 prices. The public still want to buy cabbages at three for a dollar and potatoes at \$6 a bag. It is incredible that people on the land can even stay in business. They have to contend with droughts and low prices. Recently, the Queensland Graingrowers Association went broke, with the result that grain-growers lost millions of dollars.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the fact that the Government Whip has just entered the House wearing a coat that displays a whip. Does that indicate that he is a masochist?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr HARTWIG: Recently, I saw five farmers in the Callide Valley prosecuted—one of them, a young man with a family, for the third time—because they used water from the underground bores without a permit or licence. The Callide Valley is one of the richest areas in Queensland, so why has it not been allocated a major dam for irrigation purposes? Over the past 20 years or so that the Government has been in power, it has not come to grips with the problem caused by shortage of water.

When Neville Hewitt was a Cabinet Minister, he built three major weirs in the River Burnett watershed—next door to Callide—at Cania, Mundubbera and Waruma. The Burnett could not hold a candle to the Callide in productivity, yet farmers in the Callide are being taken to court by this Government and prosecuted for using underground water. In America, a land-holder owns the minerals under his soil and he owns the oil under his soil. If he is lucky, he becomes a millionaire. In Queensland, land-holders are taken to court for using the natural resources that lie beneath their soil.

If we have a billion dollars to fuel Expo 88 or the 1992 Olympics, why should we not initiate water conservation schemes that will result in increased productivity and mitigate the effects of old man drought?

As to the economy—during recent years, there have been spiralling costs caused by inflation, high interest rates and a huge increase in the national debt. According to an article written by Don Petersen in "The Courier-Mail" on 8 May 1984, the public debt has reached \$76 billion and each new-born child is saddled with an IOU of \$5,000. It is estimated that the national debt could reach \$105 billion within two years. Australia's economy and its financial future does not lie with Canberra. The Federal Government does not control interest rates. They are governed by a few individuals who control the World Bank. The World Bank policy is to keep people frustrated and downtrodden, and to keep at least 5 per cent of the population unemployed.

With the world population increasing by one million every six days, by the year 2000, short of disease or war, the world population will have increased to nine billion. The world cannot educate, feed, house and find jobs for the existing population. I attended a world conference in Lusaka, and I was told that the World Bank financed both sides during the last major war. Within 10 weeks of the war in the Falkland Islands, in which many young people lost their lives, the banks of England connived to loan the

Argentine Government \$2.5 billion because it was broke. Rothschild, a director of the World Bank, said, "Allow me to finance a state or nation and I care not who maketh the laws." In other words, he had no regard for the Government.

The Queensland Government must establish a State bank, and it should not interfere with trading banks. A State bank should be used to finance the construction of roads, bridges, schools and hospitals, and to assist local government. Today, the rating system of many local authorities has reached saturation point. Local authorities cannot continue to borrow money at rates of 14 per cent or 15 per cent and repay that money in seven to 10 years. The charge per tenement, whether it be for sewerage or water reticulation, is too great. Queensland is the richest State not only in this nation but also in the world. Why can it not guarantee finance to local authorities to finance their schemes? Local authorities must seek money on the money-market, and the money that it obtains must be repaid.

When the Premier and Treasurer visits Tokyo to obtain a loan, he gives as security a Queensland Government-guaranteed loan. The Queensland Government can do that for individuals. Why in 1984 should people be without houses? In Yeppoon, which is in my electorate, a man was charged with living in his car. Although that may sound silly to some people, it is true. People cannot afford to buy houses. They cannot even afford to purchase a block of land. Why should that be so? Loans should be made available over 50 or 70 years at a minimal rate of 2 or 3 per cent.

At a recent meeting in Yeppoon, 56 pensioners moved for the appointment of an administrator to the Livingstone Shire Council. The president of that body, Mr Bill Shuttlewood, said that he would like to know whether there was another shire with a similar population that employed a full-time chairman, a deputy chairman, a shire clerk, a deputy shire clerk, two engineers, two health inspectors, a building inspector, a town-planner, an accountant plus staff and 11 councillors on \$90 a day, three days a month. That is nearly \$3,000 per month for fees for councillors. The whole thing has gone mad. The rates on my 590-square-metre allotment are \$1,040.56 per year. Any drop in population at that beautiful seaside resort has been caused by the ridiculous charges levied by those who have been given the right to administer the shire.

My final point is on free enterprise. The Government is not backing the fishing industry to the extent that it should. A man from Victoria, his wife and their three children listened to the Premier's claims of his Government's free enterprise policy. As a result of that the man left Victoria where he had spent 19 years as a master fisherman and bought a house at Emu Park. He was the holder of a Victorian fishing licence. When he arrived in Queensland he was told he had to serve three years as a deck-hand before he could get a licence. What a load of rubbish!

In Australia, cattle numbers have fallen from 29 million to about 19 million. The value of exports has fallen from over \$2m in 1976-77 to \$1.5m in 1982-83. However, the alarming thing is that the beef consumption by Australians has fallen 19 kg from 69.1 kg in 1977 to 50.2 kg in 1983, which is one hell of a lot of meat! That must be of concern to the nation's cattle industry.

I am pleased to see that, under Thiess Brothers, the meatworks at Biloela has recommenced business and is killing between 300 and 400 head of cattle per week. That has created a tremendous avenue for employment for the people of Biloela and has generally improved the economy in my electorate.

Two power stations are being built in my electorate. I do not think that the Government will ever secure all the resumptions of land necessary for the Stanwell Power Station. I do not know how the Premier will get over the problem at the Expo 88 site over the river. Only 14 properties have been resumed in the past three years and the resumption of three properties is yet to be settled. As the Minister would know, there has been court litigation, appeals and all sort of things. The Government is 10 years too late. It should have got stuck into this 10 years ago, especially if it was really fair dinkum about Expo 88.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (2.33 p.m.): A television advertisement features a modern-day version of Elmer Gantry saying that he has had a vision—a Video Vision. The video is correct; the vision has turned into a financial nightmare for an entertainment-hungry public. The company to which I refer is Video Vision. In my opinion it is attacking hundreds of people in the community and, like a school of financial piranhas, is stripping them to the status of dollar skeletons.

The company is participating in what I believe to be illegal activities in the community. It is conning people. I issue a warning to the general public that they should be extremely careful in any dealings with this company. The sad fact is that, of the large number of people in the community who have been ripped off by these unscrupulous dealers—Video Vision—only a minority have been able to finally receive any financial satisfaction from the deal or refunds from the company.

I heard recently of the case of a fellow who had been injured in a car accident many years ago and whose only entertainment in life was an occasional outing with people who were able to take him and his wheelchair to the movies or something like that. He bought a television set and video recorder from Video Vision. Because of the illegal practices in which that firm engages, he was unaware of the amount he would be required to pay. When he ultimately found that he could not afford the repayments, the company took back the goods and then charged him \$500—which he gladly paid, I might add, to avoid paying the full terms of the contract—to cover what the company said was the loss incurred because he had had the items in his home for two days and they would have to be put on the market as second-hand materials. That is hog-wash, because the company has television sets for rental, and I will explain to members just exactly how that works.

I have here copies of the contracts used by that company. Members who look at them will notice that at the bottom is a section headed “Promissory Note”. The professional con men employed by the company point out to customers that they can hire a video recorder for X dollars per month, but usually then try to con customers into the purchase of a set. Most people are persuaded to sign a blank contract, which is filled in later. People should beware of doing that but, unfortunately, most people still do not take sufficient notice of the contracts they sign.

I conducted a check of some of the major stores dealing in video equipment. I found that one of the most popular brands of video cassette recorders is the National. A National NV 370 can be purchased for \$729 and a National NV 600 for \$899. The charming price that Video Vision charged for a similar type of set, including an amount for movie exchanges, was \$2,068.

Most people sign the Video Vision promissory note which is sent, I believe, to a company which has in the past acted most improperly in dealings of this sort—I refer to Australian Guarantee Corporation—or other companies which are prepared to put the money up front. People actually finish up paying as much as \$3,408—I have even heard of one person paying \$4,500—for a set which is basically worth \$750.

People sign a contract which has not been filled out. It is only later that they find they have signed a promissory note, which is a legal document. People need to be made aware that a promissory note is a legal IOU. Once it has been signed and sent to a finance company—in most cases to AGC—the signatory becomes responsible for whatever amount appears on the note.

In addition to the contracts, I have here a number of summonses which have been issued in the past to Video Vision customers who have found themselves unable to make the massive repayments required. A couple of elderly women sharing a home were taken to court because they could not afford the repayments. That episode ended up costing them \$2,681.

I hope that the media highlight this rip-off so that we can ensure that this illegal racket conducted by the highly unscrupulous company, Video Vision, is stopped. I have

enough evidence for me to say to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General that this company, because of its shyster practices, should be investigated by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

It is time to say that rumours are current in the video industry concerning the possibility of a gang war erupting in it. No operational checks are kept on the way in which the industry works. People in the industry are engaging in cut-throat practices. I believe that people who invest in a legitimate business to hire video equipment, and, more particularly, to hire video movies, should have some protection. Recently, a man in my electorate paid \$40,000 to set up a properly structured business. The business was open for only one week when the general store on a nearby corner started hiring video tapes at a cut rate of 50c or a dollar per movie.

I have been told by people in the industry whom I know that crime bosses are beginning to move into the industry in Queensland. I repeat my assertion about the possibility of a gang war erupting if some action is not taken. As a Parliament, we should be looking seriously at imposing on the industry restrictions similar to those applying to newsagents and allowing only a certain number of franchised video shops to be set up in an area.

Very recently, I was told what happened in a group of office blocks at Redcliffe. One man entered into a lease arrangement by contract and set up a business to hire video movies. He had been in business for one month when the unscrupulous landlord of the shops allowed a hairdresser, five doors down, to alter half of his shop so that he, too, could become involved in the video industry. It may be said by some people that that is healthy competition; in my opinion, it is not. People who invest money in businesses are entitled to some Government protection, but it is not available in the video industry. The entire industry should be looked at thoroughly. I call on the Government to make an investigation and to do something constructive.

Another company that is equally guilty of ripping people off and should be investigated by the police is Quality Kitchens Design and Installation Centre, which has its registered office at 101 Lutwyche Road, Windsor. Recently, I have received numerous complaints about that company. According to the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs—I have a photocopy of the business registration and the names of the principals involved—one of the principals is John Kelly, alias John Kellar, alias John Kaller. The name he uses when answering the telephone is dependent upon the seriousness of the problems one is having with the company and its product. His business partner is registered in the business as Peter Anderson, alias Dieter Wolfgang. He is another nice fellow!

In April of this year, the company was raided by the Commonwealth Police. Certain records were confiscated from the office. I feel quite comfortable in saying this, because at this stage I am not aware of any charges pending against the company. Of course, I am hoping that what I say today will inspire the Commonwealth Police to do the job that they are required to do. I am told that the records were confiscated by the Commonwealth Police on the basis of professional tax evasion and the possibility of future bankruptcy.

By all accounts, this company should be operating a trust account. When people call in the so-called professionals to design a kitchen for them, they are required to put money up front. Very often, it is in the vicinity of \$1,000 to \$1,500. That money has not been going into a trust account. The company has been using it on a day-to-day basis to keep itself afloat.

I shall tell honourable members what this company says in its advertisements. It says that the money goes into a trust account. There is a lovely ring about the advertisement. The company says that once people sign up for the particular item, the company puts them in the hands of what it calls its "good shepherds". A "good shepherd" comes round to the person's home and liaises with him. Good shepherds, or even bad

shepherds, usually carry crooks. I think that the word "crooks" can be adequately applied to these good shepherds. In its advertisement, the company says—

"Once this full deposit is paid the file is passed to your Quality Kitchens shepherd who will ring you within a few days to arrange an appointment with you to double check your measurements and details."

The money is put up but it does not go into a trust account. The good shepherd calls usually about six weeks after a person has paid his money. The advertisement goes on to state—

"This money is placed in the Security Permanent Building Society trust a/c until the kitchen is completed in your home and is released by your signature on your happy sheet."

I have checked this matter out thoroughly. The fact is that Quality Kitchens does not have a trust account with the Security Permanent Building Society. The company is a shyster and the operation is a rip-off. It has been involved with a product about which many people have complained.

Recently, I became aware that the television program "State Affair" was doing a story on the company. Unfortunately, because of legal problems, "State Affair" was not able to go into the full details. However, it was able to get no fewer than 30 people who have dealt with this company to talk about it. "State Affair" went into the homes of these people and looked at the quality of the workmanship. It was found that cupboards had broken, doors had fallen off and wooden louvres had fallen out. As I say, the company is a shyster and the product is third rate, to say the least. There is no existing trust account. I believe that the contract is illegal and not binding; yet people are still being ripped off. In this case, the Corporate Affairs Office stands condemned for not stepping into this matter some time ago and scrutinising the day-to-day arrangements of this company.

Previously in this Parliament I have said—and I repeat it today—that it is time that the kitchen industry was registered. Almost six years ago I raised this matter in the Parliament, and I am still prevented from appearing on television and talking about these bogus, shyster operators, because of a stopper writ that was issued at that time. That vexatious writ was served on me to stop me appearing on television and further exposing these bogus companies. Of course, I am doing it here today in Parliament by referring to this particular company.

I am also high critical of some of the shopping centres in Brisbane, such as Westfield's Shoppingtown at Indooroopilly, certain organisations in my own city of Ipswich, and also the Big W stores throughout the State that allow these crooks to enter their shopping centres and demonstrate their wares. During late-night shopping or on Saturday mornings these impressive units are set up in the shopping centres. There is always somebody to demonstrate the product and to give a price or to arrange for another person to call out and measure up. The management of those shopping centres and the management of show societies throughout the State, particularly the Royal National Association, have a responsibility to at least check out the bona fides of these companies before they are allowed to set up exhibitions in their centres. That should be done before the companies are allowed into the centres to rip off the public.

I make the definite statement today that this company, Quality Kitchens, is in serious financial trouble. It is operating illegally on people's money that should be in a trust account. If people are still dealing with Quality Kitchens, I ask them to not pay any further moneys and to demand back moneys already paid, because I believe that the company is on the verge of bankruptcy. I believe that the directors of the company are milking people and paying the money into their own private accounts. Tomorrow they could leave the whole box and dice, skim the cream off the top of the milk, as it were, and walk out, ripping off the public. The company should be investigated.

A lady in my electorate came to me with a particular problem with this company, so I began to check it out. I assure the House that on no fewer than six occasions I

tried to contact Mr John Kelly. It reached the stage at which I said to the receptionist on the telephone, "You may tell Mr Kelly that I am a member of Parliament. I intend to give his company a bagging in the House when it sits. If he does not come to see me, I will give him a serve." After two broken appointments, he finally came to Parliament House to see me. I do not usually judge people by appearance. If I did, the honourable member for Sherwood would get an appalling assessment from me. But just from talking to Mr Kelly and from the way in which he attempted to conduct his business dealings with me, I concluded that he was a con man and a shyster. The fact that he operates under four different names or aliases says a lot about the type of person that he is.

Mr INNES: I rise to a point of order. I confirm that the member for Wolston is an excellent judge of shysters, con men and disreputables.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That is the sort of intelligent interjection that one expects from members of the wiped-out, demised Liberal Party. I ask honourable members to look at them sitting in the back row. They are the slippery six. The four members who are sitting there now could be called the four stooges—Curly, Larry, Mo and Shemp. They also have one reject from the seven dwarfs, and the latest addition to the ranks is Queensland's version of Carlos the Jackal. What a motley crew they are.

I also make reference today to a recent case in the Victorian Supreme Court out of which one of Australia's most notorious and detestable citizens was gaoled. The non-parole period was set at 18 years. I am referring to Darryl Leigh Sorby, who was the Queensland and Victorian link for the Mr Asia drug syndicate. On 13 October 1981 I asked this question in the House of the then Minister for Police (Mr Hinze)—

"(3) Is he aware that Darryl Sorby, the Victorian distributor for the Terrence Clark Mr Asia Drug Syndicate, has recently moved to Queensland and is involved in land speculation and development on Bribie Island?"

"(4) What action will he take to ensure that Mr Sorby is prevented from carrying on his illegal activities?"

The Minister answered—

"I have been informed that a man named Darryl Sorby is residing in this State and is involved in land development on Bribie Island. The Commissioner of Police has indicated he has no evidence at this stage of Mr Sorby's being involved in any illegal activity, but should evidence of this nature be elicited, appropriate police action will be taken."

In this place last Tuesday I asked the present Minister for Police, who is sitting in the Chamber—

"With reference to the recent conviction in Victoria of Darryl Leigh Sorby, who was a part of the Mr Asia drug syndicate—

Was Sorby at any time under investigation or surveillance by the Queensland Police Force whilst involved in his role as a land developer on Bribie Island and, if so, to what extent were members of the Police Force involved?"

The highly intelligent answer from that Minister of the Crown was—

"Yes. But, in the interests of future successful police operations, it is not policy to reveal information regarding surveillance activities."

I did not intend to indulge in trying to cream people in the Queensland Police Force who do an excellent job, particularly those who face danger and drama in their positions as undercover police officers trying to infiltrate drug rings.

It was only as a result of the competence of the Victorian Police Force and its action that Sorby was apprehended. After Mr Asia, Terrence Clark, was put behind bars in Britain, Sorby resided in this State for at least three years. He still carries on his

illegal activities in this country. In October 1981 he was in Queensland. Approximately eight months ago, he was apprehended by the Queensland police when he was driving some sort of vehicle, churning up turf or something, at the international airport site. However, for 2½ years he was allowed to run unfettered in this State. God knows how many young lives he was responsible for destroying.

All the Minister said to me was that it is not in the interests of future successful police operations, or policy, to reveal information about surveillance activities. Obviously the Queensland press did not share the Minister's view. I have here a newspaper displaying a photograph of fish that were found in Sorby's boat. The fish are marlin and they had holes cut in their back so that drugs could be stuffed into them and brought ashore illegally. Sorby was running drugs by night. He used to go out in his cruiser and pick up drugs in Moreton Bay. And the Minister told me that Sorby was under surveillance! He was able to carry on that activity in this State for 2½ years, until the Victorian Police issued an extradition order and took him south to face charges for tax evasion. The Victorian police eventually got him, and he has now got his just deserts.

It is time that someone in this House told that moron of a sister of Sorby's, who has been making public statements to the effect that Sorby is a fine, upstanding fellow and, "He really is a nice fellow and he would not be involved in that sort of business", what he is. Not involved in that sort of business? Not much! He has been sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment without parole. He should be put away for 50 years.

That brings me to the point of asking: Where is this fantastic legislation that the Queensland Government told us it would introduce to combat dealers in drugs? Leading up to the last State election, the Premier made a policy statement to the effect that his Government would introduce Australia's toughest drug laws. I do not object to tough drug laws, because it is time that the Government came down heavily on the Mr Bigs in the drug business and particularly on those who are involved in dropping heroin all over the State.

Annual reports of the Police Department for any number of recent years—five, six or 10 years—indicate quite clearly that the Queensland Police Force has an abysmal record in apprehending major drug-dealers. Approximately 95 per cent of the convictions that have been recorded in this State for drug offences have concerned offences relating to marijuana. I do not enter into a debate on whether marijuana is a dangerous drug. However, the fact is that only 5 per cent of the convictions have related to major drugs such as heroin, cocaine and the less popular drug LSD.

Why is it that very few people have been convicted for drug offences? Only a couple of weeks ago, one Minister, in reference to the road that is being constructed through the Daintree rain forest, said, "The Government wants to put that road through to stop big drug dealers who are coming in huge ships which take a mile to pull up once their motors are stopped." If the ships take a mile to stop after their motors have been shut down, they must be carrying a hell of a lot of drugs. I like to think that the construction of the road will make some difference, but I suggest that it will not make a difference. I am sorry to say that I am firmly convinced that elements within the Queensland Police Force work in co-operation with some of the crime bosses and Mr Bigs in the drug industry in this State.

Today I make a personal call to the Prime Minister to release the third copy of the Costigan royal commission report, which has never been released for public consumption. I wonder why some of it was not released for public consumption. The Federal Liberal Party was in office and the statements being thrown around freely were that many people named in that third copy of the Costigan report had friends in very high places on the other side of the Chamber; that there was a very close association of persons named in that third copy with the National Party in Queensland. If it appears in that document, it is time that it was made available to the public.

The public wants to know the names of the persons in that document. Although I can hazard a guess as to the names of those persons, I will not refer to them in this

Chamber. I would like the document to be made public. The names of the persons have been on the nose round Brisbane for a long, long time. One does not commence as an ordinary businessman in our community and 10 years later have \$150m. Something smells! The Opposition knows who they are; the honest Government members—they are very hard to find—know who they are. I believe that there has been a cover-up and a smothering of some of the facts about activities of some members of the Queensland Police Force.

I turn now to another matter that deserves mention in this Chamber. Earlier this year Judge Given, a highly respected person on the District Court bench, was reported in the press as having asked why a serious charge against a publican, who received character references from senior politicians and police officers, was dropped. The judge is reported as having said that on the uncontested, unchallenged evidence the man was guilty of a burglary charge which was reduced to entering with intent.

That scathing comment was made by the judge about Mr Reginald Tegg, who was the publican of the Petrie Hotel. With two other persons, he was charged with breaking and entering with deliberate intent. Is it an accident when a person puts a piece of pipe inside a piece of hose and then bashes somebody over the head with it? Is it an accident when a person breaks and enters a person's property and points a .22 rifle at someone's head? It is a fantastic joke that there is no bullet in the breech or in the magazine. If the trigger is pulled, the victim could die from a heart attack. Those three clowns—Tegg and his two accomplices—were let off with a warning. Tegg, who was 53 and licensee of the Petrie Hotel, was fined a total of \$2,500. His other henchman, Mackay, a 38-year old man from Petrie, was fined \$750. Davis, also from Petrie, was fined \$500. The judge asked why those persons were not prosecuted on the more serious charges of burglary and assault.

I am disappointed that the Attorney-General is not in the Chamber at present. I would like to know who gave instructions to the Crown law office. The first recommendation from the Crown law office was that those persons should be prosecuted on the more serious charges. Suddenly the word went out that they had friends in high places. I agree with the member for Lytton who said in this Chamber recently that there is one law in this State for the rich and the powerful who have influential friends in high places and there is another law for the working-class person who does not have the right connections. Who made the telephone call to the Crown law office? Who gave the instruction that, as those people had connections with people in high places in the Queensland Police Force and in the National Party, they should be prosecuted on the lesser charge of breaking and entering?

What a crass use of character references it was for the Commissioner of Police to put his name on a character reference for Tegg, who was the main offender. What smells? A former Assistant Commissioner of Police (Tony Murphy)—what a charming character he is—wrote a reference for Tegg and allowed it to be used in the court case, as did the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. At the time, all that the Police Commissioner could say was: "I'm not embarrassed." He claimed that he wrote it out with the best of intent. He wrote it out with the best of intention, all right, because for years it has been well known that that particular north-side pub has been where the Commissioner of Police and a few of his cronies have gone for a drink. They were personal friends of Tegg. I very seriously suggest that this was a deliberate interference in the proper processes of the law in this State.

The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) ordered that the burglary charges against the three should be dropped and said that he had made the decision to enter a nolle prosequi after advice from the Solicitor-General and other Crown law officers. Why did he make that assessment? That assessment should be tabled in the Parliament. Why is it that no-one, the media included, was ever able to get from the court copies of the character references written by the Commissioner of Police, a former Deputy Commissioner of Police and a Minister of the Government? Something smells, and I do not have to say much more about what I believe smells. The Attorney-General

has an absolute responsibility to make a proper explanation in this Parliament as soon as he can of his role in this case.

In the minutes remaining to me I wish to mention a few local problems in my electorate. I will refer to the police again. By and large the police do an excellent job in my area, but they operate out of a building that is virtually a spa tub. That is the only way it can be described. That little shanty stuck on the hill is manned from 9 o'clock in the morning until 3 o'clock in the afternoon in an area where bashings, drug-related offences and breaking, entering and stealings are on the increase. In the last few months a fellow was bashed and knifed at the Goodna Railway Station. Someone went berserk in an army tank and finally committed suicide in front of half of the residents of a local street. With all of that happening, the police station operates from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. only. From 10 o'clock at night until 5 in the morning, the entire provincial city of Ipswich has one mobile patrol. If an offence is being committed at one end of the city, to get police there in a hurry is impossible.

I call for an emergency allocation in the forthcoming Budget for the upgrading of police facilities at Goodna. Quite frankly, the Redbank Police Station should be shut down and the two combined so that the expertise of all officers can be brought into one complex that is manned 24 hours a day. Today I make that call on the Minister for Police. recently I received a call from him to say that the matter was under investigation. I have been told that for the last five years. It is high time the government stopped playing its own little brand of politics. The Government plays games with kids' education.

Mr Booth: Rubbish!

Mr R. J. GIBBS: It is not rubbish at all and the honourable member knows that it is not rubbish. He should look at the condition of some of the schools in my electorate. Some still do not have carpet or carpet squares on the floors. Some demountables are nothing more than painted pipens.

Only a couple of years ago when this Government conducted a sham of an investigation into education in this State, I said to members of the committee, "Come down and have a look at a real smash of a school." Members of the honourable member for Warwick's party were appalled at the conditions in that school. The class-rooms were completely out of date and lacked ventilation, and children were being taught in demountables. A person involved in the greyhound industry who loved his dogs would not make them live in those buildings. The schoolgrounds were in a shocking condition and had virtually no facilities.

The same conditions exist elsewhere, particularly in Housing Commission areas, all caused by a lack of planning by this Government. It plays politics with people's lives. It singles out Labor electorates and ensures that the schools in them do not receive attention. It it said that if a member complains about that, he loses votes, but it does not concern me because I am telling the truth. Anyway, the National Party wastes its time fielding a candidate in the electorate of Wolston.

It was the honourable member for Warwick who said that I was speaking rubbish but, unfortunately, it is a fact of life, not rubbish. I suggest that he come into my electorate and have a look for himself. If he wants concrete proof of what I am saying, he has only to realise that there is no high school in my area. Each day, almost 1 400 children have to leave my electorate and the electorate of Mr Gunn—the Redbank Plains, Camira and Carole Park areas—to attend secondary school. They travel to Bundamba, Oxley, Corinda or even as far as the Brisbane State High School. A great deal of that exodus could be prevented if high school facilities were available in my electorate. It is said that no land is available, but the land is there and has been available for 20 years. In fact, Evan Marginson, my predecessor, asked a number of questions on the subject and was told that a high school for the area was on the priority list and would be built in 1981. It is now 1984 and a high school is no closer.

What really reeks about this whole situation is that the Federal Government is putting more money than ever into the State education system and into the private schools as well. More money should be put into the State school system, but the Federal Government has allocated money on a non-political basis. It has allocated money to this Government on a non-political basis but people such as the member for Flinders play politics in the handing out of that money. When the day finally comes—it is probably 1 000 years away so I will certainly not see it—that we are rid of this archaic institution, this State Parliament, and Federal Governments of any political persuasion are allowed to make direct grants to schools, the education system of this country will be a lot better off.

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (3.13 p.m.): It is just nine months since I first had the privilege of participating in an Address in Reply debate in this Parliament. Again I am pleased to speak in support of the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply so ably moved by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise and seconded by the honourable member for Fassifern.

As the duly elected member for Toowoomba North, I extend my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor of Queensland on his enlightened remarks in opening this second session of the Forty-fourth Parliament. I pledge my loyalty and the loyalty of my constituents to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Our Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II of Australia. Long may she reign!

Along with my Toowoomba North constituents, I share, too, the great concern that His Excellency expressed regarding recent trends within Australia to downgrade our traditional links with the monarchy, destroy our traditional parliamentary standards, denigrate the time-honoured provisions of our Constitution and even strike at the very heart of our family and religious ties. These trends have been identified in our community for some years now. Nowhere do they receive anywhere near majority support; yet at every opportunity the socialists of this country and in this State are steadily moving to force their unwanted and despicable standards upon the people of Australia.

Unfortunately, the majority of Australians are, by nature, fairly easy going in all areas except where they are actively involved. Too late they will turn their attention from their own local interests and discover that the socialists have moved with stealth and deceit to complete their takeover of this country. That would make it the 73rd country to fall within the communist/socialist sphere since World War II.

His Excellency referred to the change in Australia's national anthem which was proclaimed without reference to the people of Australia, and also to the removal of the reference to God and the Queen in the Australian oath of allegiance. He expressed concern, too, about apparent moves to change the national flag, and to attempts, successful in some instances, to put aside the provisions of the Australian Constitution.

All of this is being done by the Federal ALP Government, ably supported by its equally nefarious cohorts in a number of States, including the Opposition in this Parliament. Nowhere have these people acted within their mandate from the electors of Australia or made any move to honour their many election promises. Led by the puppet prima donna, Prime Minister Bob Hawke, the socialists in Canberra now have the effrontery to say to the people of Australia that an early election is necessary. Why should that be so? There is no earthly reason why the Federal Labor Government should not complete its full term in office unless it knows as well as we do—and as well as the majority of Australians will soon know—that the management, development and financing of this great country are becoming completely undone because of the inept policies, mismanagement and actions of the incompetent and faction-riddled Ministers.

One has only to look at the recent Federal Budget to see why His Excellency was so concerned and why those financial experts who have examined it in depth condemn it universally. What a litany of lies! How can any Budget give the wide-spread rebates lauded by Mr Keating when, at the same time, gross revenue from the Budget is increased

by about 17 per cent? Well may the two honourable members walk out! They are two of the worst examples of the people to whom I am referring on the Opposition benches.

The Brisbane "Telegraph" hit on one answer in its headline stating that over 1 000 000 tax-payers would be paying higher taxes because the Government's fiddling with the tax brackets placed them on a higher tax rate.

The Federal Budget provides \$30m for the America's Cup defence, but only a paltry \$3m for Expo 88. It contains nothing for aged care!

We all know what Mr John Stone thinks of the Budget and the Federal Government's policy on wages and financial management. Mr Stone resigned as Treasury head in disgust. This country has thus lost the services, at departmental level, of the last of the top, experienced Treasury officials. We have lost a man of infinite, practical knowledge and experience, whose expertise was ignored by the Labor know-alls in Canberra. They have increased Commonwealth borrowing during their term from 0.9 per cent to 4.7 per cent of the gross domestic product—a fivefold increase which must be serviced and repaid by the people of Australia.

The head-long rush to an unnecessary early election has been virtually ignored by the media, although it has been supported in some instances. It should be emphasised that, before the last Federal election, Mr Hawke stated publicly that he would serve his full term if elected to office. Last year he floated a referendum proposal for compulsory fixed terms for Parliament. However, for political expedience, he is prepared to call an early election. Honourable members can well imagine the uproar there would be in the press if our Premier did the same, yet the press has calmly condoned Mr Hawke's hypocrisy. This politically expedient move has been made solely to try to ensure survival for Mr Hawke and his socialist Government, because it would surely be doomed if it completed its full term in office. Before voting, the people in Australia will certainly consider the whole of the Hawke Government's record in office and the prospects for the future if it is returned in a premature election.

In addition to the items that I have mentioned, and which were highlighted by His Excellency in his Opening Speech, the Federal Labor Government in every possible way has done away with Imperial Honours and reference to the monarchy. To circumvent the provisions of the Australian Constitution, it has used communist-sponsored United Nations accords. It has introduced Aboriginal land rights and heritage legislation to divide the Australian community and eventually establish a separate State. Those are moves that have already turned black against white and black against black, and those moves significantly conflict with our own progressive Aboriginal and Islander Acts. It has screwed up our relations with the United States on defence, and with the Asian countries on regional matters. It has pandered to the communist regimes in Vietnam and Russia and it has blocked uranium-mining, with resultant losses in export earnings and jobs—except in Labor's favoured State—for its own political purposes.

Mr Katter: Only in Queensland is it dangerous to mine uranium.

Mr McPHIE: It would not be dangerous to mine uranium in Queensland if the Federal Government would give Queensland an export licence. If that were done, jobs would be created and money would be earned for this country.

The Federal Government has introduced the rotten word "consensus" into the country's industrial vocabulary. It is a word that ensures mediocrity by accepting the lowest common denominator in any situation instead of accepting responsibility for policies and providing the leadership that is so urgently needed in Canberra. The Federal Government has allowed the terrorist organisation SWAPO to establish an office in Australia. It has even introduced a sex discrimination Act to further divide the community.

Mr De Lacy: Did you see those South African policemen bashing demonstrators on TV the other night?

Mr McPHIE: I have seen on television South African policemen coping with terrorists and demonstrators who are going beyond the accepted levels of demonstration. I do not consider that it is bashing. I do not consider that laws should be made for one group of people so that they can fearlessly attack the police, while other laws are made to stop police carrying out their duties in a reasonable manner.

The Government in Canberra about which I am speaking has claimed credit for the improved economic circumstances prevailing in Australia at present without in any way acknowledging that those improved circumstances are directly—and even solely—due to improved conditions overseas, the excellent seasonal conditions in Australia over the past 12 months and the Fraser Government's wage pause and Community Employment Program initiatives. The Labor Government has not done anything to provide permanent long-term jobs. In fact, as the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs has said, it has even stopped the creation of permanent long-term jobs by blocking uranium mining in certain States.

Mr Davis: Who wrote that?

Mr McPHIE: I wrote it myself on Tuesday morning. I undertook a lot of background research, and the facts are all there.

As I said, the Labor Government in Canberra has not done anything to provide long-term jobs. In fact, as John Stone said, and quite correctly, the Labor Government is more interested in wage increases for those who are already employed than in providing jobs for those who are unemployed.

The Federal Labor Government has foisted Medicare on an unsuspecting public. It has not done anything to help Australia's primary industries with overseas sales or the provision of needed assistance when those industries are in trouble at home. Look at the beef negotiations with Japan and the complete lack of help for the sugar industry—although, before the last Federal election, sugar-growers were loudly assured that they would receive assistance. The Federal Government's allocation of \$4m for soil conservation in this vast nation is surely a mockery for a Government that claims to be concerned about the well-being of the primary-industry sector.

The Federal Government's record in other areas is equally lamentable and its Ministers are woefully inept. The Federal Attorney-General, the man responsible for upholding the laws of this country, even sent tactical military aircraft on operations against a sovereign State of this Commonwealth. I know from newspaper articles at that time that the SAS regiment personnel were based at East Sale in Victoria. Where the "O" boats were, I do not know, but they could well have been given the task by a man such as the Federal Attorney-General of steaming up the Franklin River. What a blatant misuse of Federal powers and responsibility!

The list goes on and on. To it must be added the Labor Government's continual debasing of the Christian ethic and of the traditional concepts of morality, its endorsement of homosexual and de facto relationships, and its deliberate white-washing of serious misdemeanours by Labor Ministers, senators, back-benchers and self-appointed justices. The names of Murphy and Young will always be synonymous in this country with deceit, intrigue and deception.

And the Labor Party does not stop there. Could anyone ever trust the Wran and Ferguson Government in New South Wales, with its record of never-ending inquiries into graft and corruption, or Cain's lot in Victoria? The New South Wales Government has even authorised an overseas trip, at public expense, for a committee to investigate brothels. What a misuse of power and money!

This blatant and deliberate dishonesty, which is found throughout all Labor Governments, along with their outright rejection of traditional religious and family standards, will surely reap its own reward at the ballot-box at this coming panic-initiated election of Mr Hawke. The future of Australia if the Hawke Government is returned to office at the forthcoming ill-conceived, premature and unwarranted election is equally bleak.

Mr Davis: They will win by at least another 40 seats.

Mr McPHIE: I remind the member for Brisbane Central that the Labor Government does not have 40 seats to win. One seat that it has very little hope of winning is the one for which the erstwhile Leader of the Opposition is seeking endorsement. I speak, of course, of the seat of Capricornia.

The Federal Government will have been in office for about 18 months when the election is held. Some of its pet legislation has been blocked. Other pieces it has considered far too dangerous to introduce. It is seeking re-endorsement and, if it is returned, it will be absolutely ruthless in the introduction of that legislation.

Capital gains and wealth taxes will be introduced to bring in more revenue. Medicare charges will be increased to prop up what is becoming a failing financial monster. Inflation and interest rates will increase and developmental and project funding will diminish as the nation's financial mismanagers battle to meet increased wage demands and unemployment and social security security payments.

I ask honourable members if they have considered the effect that the recent redundancy and superannuation provisions for industry will have on production costs.

Mr Vaughan: What are they?

Mr McPHIE: The member for Nudgee knows perfectly well. If he does not know, he has not been doing his homework as a fellow on the Opposition front bench should do.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr McPHIE: If the member for Nudgee does not know what I am talking about, he should not be sitting on the front bench and he should not be interjecting. He should sit on the back benches where he belongs.

Honourable members should remember what the Federal Minister for Science and Technology (Mr Jones) said about the Budget allocation for his department. When asked if he had any worries about the small allocation that his department had received, he said that he did not, because it would receive plenty of money after the election. He is a Minister in the Hawke Government, and he knows that costs and taxes will increase as soon as the Government is returned to power—if it is.

The prophecy by Mr John Stone that the Government will go down the plug hole financially will almost certainly come true. If the Federal Government is re-elected, it will take Australia with it down the path of destruction. Of course, it will be a republican Australia by then, headed for nowhere and lost amongst the mass of insignificant third-world socialist nations.

Mr Davis: Are you in favour of Australia's national anthem being "Advance Australia Fair"? Yes or no?

Mr McPHIE: I am in favour of the national anthem, and I consider it to be "God save the Queen"

The future of Australia if the Federal Government is re-elected is far bleaker than His Excellency the Governor dared to forecast. However, if Australians such as John Stone, Professor Geoffrey Blainey, the Honourable Charles Porter and his movement for a free Australia, and Queensland's Premier speak out, I am sure the electors of Australia will see that there is no alternative but to eject the socialist Federal Government from office. That must be done this year, because it will be difficult at the next election in 1988, in Australia's bicentennial year, to unseat the Government.

The actions of the former Leader of the Opposition will not help the Government in Canberra either. I question whether the honourable and divorced member for

Rockhampton will be able to win the seat of Capricornia. In any case, this House will be rid of him. He is certainly deserting a sinking ship. "The Courier-Mail" editorial today wished Mr Wright good luck. He will certainly need it when he takes on the Federal politicians.

The value of the new Leader of the Opposition and his deputy is also doubtful. The quiet and ineffectual union trouble-maker, the member for Sandgate, is the new leader. The tried and discarded member for Lytton is the deputy leader. Honourable members can be thankful that the self-proclaimed new Turk, the member for Salisbury, was not inflicted on them. As far as I can make out, in this Chamber he protects drug people and petty criminals and wages a non-stop vendetta against the police force, which is so ably responsible for law and order in the State. The honourable member for Wolston, that old warrior of no great note from the faction wars, was not elected, fortunately.

The new Leader and new Deputy Leader of the Opposition will make no significant difference to the weak performance of the Labor Opposition in this House. They will not be able to unite the many diverse factions that try so unsuccessfully to represent a united party here. They will not be able to correct the downward trend and poor performance of the ALP, which has been demonstrated so definitely by the disastrous results for Labor's poor candidate in the Stafford by-election. Certainly, though, in due course, Mr Warburton will be seen off, just as his five predecessors were, by our long-standing National Party Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

His Excellency's Opening Speech contains many encouraging points that are relevant almost exclusively to Queensland. I am proud to be part of this National Party Government team, which is responsible for the development and progress of this State. I am sure that that development and progress will continue under the fine leadership that this State has in the Premier and capable Ministers, many of whom have been able to visit my electorate of Toowoomba North in the past nine months. Their time and effort have been recognised and appreciated by the people of Toowoomba.

Reference has been made in the press to the pending retirement of His Excellency the Governor, Commodore Sir James Ramsay. In case his retirement occurs before His Excellency has the honour of performing his eighth opening of a session of this Parliament, I ask Mr Speaker to convey to him my thanks and those of the people of Toowoomba, as well as the thanks of the people of Queensland as a whole, for a job that has been done so very well with sensitivity and dignity throughout. I wish him and Lady Ramsay many years of happiness in their retirement, with, I am sure, the occasional return visit to Queensland.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (3.33 p.m.): Over recent weeks, much talk has occurred among the community and also in this House about the economy of Queensland. It is not very often that I agree with comments made by Queensland Government Ministers, but I do agree with comments made by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) to the effect that Queensland's economy is tied to the sugar industry. That is very true. The entire economy of this State revolves around the sugar industry, which is its major agricultural industry.

Many people do not readily accept that the sugar industry is also the major manufacturing industry in this State. The conversion of cane into sugar is a manufacturing process, and one that employs more people than any other industry.

Anyone who listens to the cries of National Party members would tend to come to the conclusion that the sugar industry is totally under the control of the Commonwealth Government. Let me set the record straight. The sugar industry in Queensland is totally under the control of the Queensland Government. The Government has taken over control of the industry through legislation that has passed through this Chamber. Every grain of sugar that is manufactured in Australia—including sugar that is manufactured outside Queensland—becomes the property of the Queensland Government. That has come about by statute and by an agreement reached between the Commonwealth and

the State of Queensland. That means that only one Government can be blamed for any problems that confront the sugar industry. If the finger is to be pointed at anyone, it is the Queensland National Party Government under Premier Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

What has this self-proclaimed great Government done for the sugar industry? While the Premier played around with the mining industry for many years, he totally ignored the warning signs that were starting to appear for the sugar industry. He ignored warnings that were given in this Chamber by me, the former member for Bundaberg (Mr Blake), the member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton), the present member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) and the Opposition spokesman on Primary Industries (Mr Kruger). The Premier can be likened to Nero—another great dictator—who fiddled while Rome burned. The Premier has fiddled while the sugar industry burned. The National Party in Queensland simply sat back on a ship in troubled waters. It hoped that something would happen.

Something did happen, and it happened for the worst. The National Party is now screaming and fearful that the boat will capsize. It is fearful that the great sugar industry that is the very prop of this State will collapse. However, does it accept any blame? Not on your nelly! The Government will blame the EEC—it is trendy to do so—or it will blame the drought. It still blames Whitlam. It tries to blame Hawke. The Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs blames the Weet-Bix advertisers for what is happening. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs blames children for not eating enough lollies. The members of the National Party will blame anyone except themselves. Most of the blame for the problems in the sugar industry lies fairly and squarely at the feet of the Bjelke-Petersen Government.

The sugar industry is controlled from plant to port by State legislation. The huge hike in State Government charges has affected the industry from the provision of water to the warehousing of sugar. Farmers, especially, have been lulled into a false sense of security by the State Government's promises and propaganda over the years. I intend to explain to this Assembly the way in which that has occurred. The sugar industry has commenced to go down the chute. No brakes are being applied by the Queensland Government.

I could refer to speeches that I have made in this Chamber since 1977, when it became obvious that negotiations for a new International Sugar Agreement would not be successful. There were two very good reasons for that. The EEC and the United States of America were not prepared to be signatories. After it was negotiated in 1980, the United States of America became a late signatory. However, by that time the die had been cast. The EEC never became a signatory. Consequently, in that period it grabbed the export sugar markets of the world. In 1983-84, when we went to negotiate another International Sugar Agreement, we found that the EEC was there dictating the terms. That did not happen suddenly; it had been happening since 1977.

On the eve of the 1977 State election, the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Sullivan), then the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Camm) and the Premier said to the sugar industry of this State, "You have been saved by our negotiating an International Sugar Agreement." From that time the industry started to go backwards. The industry was not saved; it had been placed in the lion's den. It would have been better had the Queensland sugar industry kept out of the agreement at that time. It should have held out and encouraged other countries to hold out until the EEC had been brought to heel. That did not happen. Things started to go down the drain.

In 1982 the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) introduced legislation in this Chamber to try to force growers to meet millers' costs on sugar quality. Things were going very bad with sugar quality. The legislation introduced by the Government was opposed vehemently and strongly by the Australian Labor Party. What the Government did has now been found to be illegal by none other than the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. The member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) and other persons within the sugar industry know that that is the best-kept secret in the industry today. I had strong words with the growers in the Mackay area. I said to them, "You must recognise that you look

after your industry or your political friends." They voted for their industry. They took their appeal to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. The decision has been tossed out and the mill-owners have had to scratch their heads again. As I have said, that is the best-kept secret in the sugar industry today.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr CASEY: I will call it "sugar quality"; never mind about those other fancy names. It is only a four-letter word because that is the spelling limit of members of the National Party. The problem with sugar quality was experienced not only in the Mackay area but also in other areas of Queensland.

In 1978 I claimed that the big three in the sugar industry were about to take complete control of the industry. They are Bundaberg Sugar, CSR and Pioneer. That has proven to be correct. The proprietary sugar-millers have the industry by the throat with the full consent, assistance and support of the Queensland National Party Government. Even Rocky Point, the smallest and only family-owned mill in the State, gets preference over the co-operatives. The Government has given that private company a million-dollar hand-out.

Mr Menzel: No, it was done by the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board.

Mr CASEY: No. The board had its usual hearings at the end of the year. Having been associated for a long time with the Babinda mill, through its struggles and adversities, the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) would well know that the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board made its determination, but a special hearing was set up for Rocky Point and it received special consideration while the co-operatives did not.

For years I warned growers not to let their party politics govern their sugar politics. But the National Party propaganda machine in the sugar areas of the State kept churning out this nonsense. Any time that any criticism appeared, the propaganda machine would go to work and, through a whispering campaign, would try to crush me and my warnings. The claim was that I did not know what I was talking about, but every word I have said in this Chamber has come true. I am still standing. It is my critics who have been proven to be the villains, the ones who did not know what they were talking about. They are the ones who have got this great industry into its present trouble.

Let us face the facts. The sugar industry is in deep, big trouble. What is worse is that there is no turn-round in sight. I would like to be able to say otherwise, but I cannot. The way out will be hard; it will be harmful and unhappy to many in the industry, but they must remember that the National Party Government got them into this mess.

If it is to get out of its problems, the industry requires massive capital investment and diversification from all sides—the growing, milling and refining sections. Unfortunately, the large profits of the 1970s have been frittered away by the many bad policy decisions of the Government. I am sure that the member for Mulgrave would not deny that, in the mid-1970s, people in the industry were running round telling growers to use more fertiliser and spend more money or it would only go to Whitlam in taxes. The industry should have been putting money away for a rainy day. It has come across a rainy day now and is like poor old Noah. It has been raining for 40 days and 40 nights and now it is floating round looking for the tip of Mount Ararat.

Much of the reason that the money was frittered away was the bad policy decisions of the Government, with the arch-ringleader being the Premier himself. In the same period he has feathered his own family's nest. He has been able to find money to build roads to the new family properties in central Queensland.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr CASEY: I will give the honourable member a bit more, too. He can just sit there and cop it.

Suddenly, the Premier found finances for a water resources investigation for the people who have taken over his property in central Queensland. That area has seen electricity extensions, a change in local government boundaries and many other things.

What has the Premier done for the sugar-cane family, for the family farmer? He has completely ignored the sugar industry. The Premier's only fall-back is the old, old story—blame Canberra. No matter what happens in Queensland, blame Canberra! That worked for the Premier in 1974 and he is hoping that it will work again, that it will fool the people again. However, once bitten twice shy, and the people in the sugar areas are wide awake to what happened in those days.

I will outline some of the direct ways in which the Government is penalising the industry, which is caught between its lowest prices in almost two decades and its highest costs in history. I will take the latter first—the costs. I am glad to see that the Premier has entered the Chamber. As soon as anybody speaks about costs, the Premier says, "It is the fault of the unions. It is the unions chasing greater wages." They are the Bjelke-Petersen targets of old. In that respect, the statistics show that the sugar industry, pro rata, has the lowest number of employees of any industry in Queensland. That is because it has the highest technical skills. Over a period, sugar-mills have improved their technology to the point where they are virtually electronically operated. The industry has gone over to bulk-handling, which was a Labor Government initiative.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Mulgrave does not know his history. The first bulk sugar terminal in Queensland was opened in Mackay in 1957 by Labor Premier, Mr Vince Gair. When the honourable member asks me for a lesson on the history of the industry, I will give it to him. That terminal was the blueprint for bulk sugar terminals throughout this State.

The industry has gone over completely to mechanical harvesting, the only country in the world to do so. That is how far ahead of the rest of the world the Queensland industry is, and the Government cannot blame the unions for cost increases.

But the sugar industry, like the mining industry, cannot stop charges, such as increased electricity tariffs and so on, being imposed by the Government. It is in those areas that the industry needs assistance. The Premier was recently presented with a document by the cane-growing industry, which stated—

"In its efforts to retard the rate of acceleration with which this margin is being squeezed the canegrowing industry sees the Queensland State Government having a major role to play."

The margin referred to is between revenue and costs. The industry suggested that there should be a reduction in the electricity tariff for irrigation.

Government Members interjected.

Mr CASEY: Because the Minister for Works and Housing represents a cane-growing electorate, he knows that there is a need to help the industry to lower its cost structure.

The cane-growers referred to the huge hike in registration fees that have been imposed on primary producers, and called for a reduction in water charges, particularly where water is being made available to farms and permits have to be obtained to pump water from a farmer's own underground source. In the last four years of the Bjelke-Petersen Government these charges have sky-rocketed. It is this Government that has imposed these costs on the sugar industry, so it cannot blame Canberra.

The industry also requested a reduction in excessive mortgage and other stamp duty charges. They affect growers who have taken out mortgages to keep their farms going. The Premier and Treasurer has not given them the relief they seek.

There is a need to extend to a lower load limit than the present 4 tonne limit the primary producer concessional registration to motor vehicles. There has been a fundamental change in handling procedures and the old 4-tonne load is out of kilter because most farmers use haul-out bins behind tractors to carry their cane. The chopped-up cane is carried in bins behind the tractor and although the unit weights less than 4 tonnes the farmers are receiving no help whatever. They are paying registration to haul cane only a very short distance to a bin dump. The Queensland Government could help by making the Rural Adjustment Scheme a revolving fund. That would help because as money comes back in it could be made available again.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr CASEY: It is the Queensland Government that sets the repayment figures and the honourable member knows that as well as I do. The repayment of the \$10m that has been lent to the co-operative mills could be included, and that would come back in the same way and make for a bigger revolving fund. In other words, it would form the State's own underwriting provision, which is the new term for what used to be stabilisation and a number of other things. So far as the National Party is concerned, that means a hand-out. The industry is not seeking a hand-out; it is seeking an opportunity to be able to help itself. Unfortunately it is not getting it from this Government. In fact, the opposite is the case.

The State Government should put its money where its mouth is. Why can it not make a greater contribution to the cost of operating the Rural Reconstruction Board, because the cost figures associated with the administration are paid for by the people who receive the funding? They therefore start behind the eight ball. Why not extend the Rural Adjustment Scheme to cover leasing, loan guarantees and insurance, especially leasing, which, because of the tax advantages, is the modern form of acquiring new equipment? Why should not the struggling cane-farmers be entitled to that benefit like those who are well off and do not have to seek RAS funds? Anyone who applies for funds cannot obtain them for leasing.

I repeat that the sugar industry is the State's biggest manufacturing industry. Why does it not get a share of the "Buy Queensland Made" and other promotional budgets? The Government spends money on virtually anything else. The Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs criticised the Weet-Bix advertisement, but the Government should match the advertising. Why should not some of the money spent on the promotion of Queensland be spent on the sugar industry, which is our biggest manufacturer? Why cannot the Government meet some of the cost of running the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board and the Sugar Board, the costs of which are now met entirely by the industry through subsidies and levies? Those two bodies are State owned and State run, but they are industry financed.

Why cannot the State meet the cost of earlier advanced payments? The sugar industry in Queensland is our industry.

Mr Menzel: Why can't Canberra?

Mr CASEY: Why Canberra? If the honourable member wanted to buy a new stove for his property, would he say, "Let Canberra help me pay for it?" He would not do that. He would pay for it himself. The Queensland Government should do the same for the sugar industry.

Rail freight increases are placing a heavy impost on the sugar industry. Most of the matters I have referred to have been raised by the Queensland Cane Growers Council with the Government, but the Government has turned a deaf ear to them.

The Government could assist in many other ways. For instance, the increased cost of registering business names which, although it may be a small imposition on the sugar and other industries in Queensland, nonetheless has an effect. The Government charges fees for machinery inspections and imposes charges under the Clean Air Act and the

Clean Waters Act so that inspectors may do their work. I think of the pay-roll tax and many other imposts.

On the calculations made by the Queensland Cane Growers Council and other bodies, if the Government were to implement the reforms suggested, on a conservative basis the sugar industry would save \$20m a year. This morning, when referring to MIM freight charges, the Premier spoke about each family in the State being affected by an amount of \$300-odd. If the sum of \$20m were spread over the 6 000 cane farmers in Queensland, each farmer would get about \$3,500. At the moment, many family sugar farms are not clearing an income of \$3,500 a year. Such a sum would help them considerably. If the Government were to implement my suggestions, it could help each family sugar farm in Queensland by \$3,500 a year, but it has turned a deaf ear to the sugar industry.

The Queensland Government should put its own house in order. What assistance has it given to young cane-farmers under the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme? I have here the figures tabled by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police on 16 December, which show that 51 approvals have been made throughout Queensland since the implementation of the scheme. Of that number, only two young cane-farmers qualified—two out of 51 in the biggest agricultural industry in the State. The Government is doing absolutely nothing for the sugar industry.

Mr Menzel: What is Canberra doing?

Mr CASEY: Canberra does not control the farmers' assistance schemes.

On 27 September 1982, the former Minister, Mr Ahern, announced that cane-growers qualified for rural assistance. An examination of the funds in this Government's books at 30 June 1983 showed that about \$30m was sitting in the three rural adjustment and reconstruction funds, all invested on the short-term money market earning interest for the Queensland Government. It was not until mid-September 1983—12 months after approval—that the Government released funds so that cane-growers could get rural assistance.

I notice nothing but silence from the Government benches. Government members know that that is true. Ironically, the money was released only a matter of weeks prior to the last election campaign. The money was kept under wraps, invested at a high rate of interest, in order to feather the Government's nest, and make the position look better for the Government at election-time. It is surprising that this Government, which is the greatest rigger of books, should talk about other people trying to rig the books. This year, when the same figures are available, I will make a similar analysis and let Parliament know what is happening.

The Rural Reconstruction Board, in its annual report for the year ended 30 June 1983, said—

“The board has sufficient funds in hand to meet anticipated needs in the aftermath of drought and flood for the coming year, but its ability to fund later requirements has been impaired by State Treasury's withdrawal of \$10 million from the Board's resources during the year under review, to fund other rural industry requirements.”

In other words, the Government has robbed Peter to pay Paul.

Let me look at another area in which the Government has failed to help the growers. Again, under State Government legislation, it has been traditional to divide cane payments on the basis of one-third to millers and two-thirds to growers. That formula has been in operation for a long time. I think that the member for Mulgrave, the member for Mirani and other members in this House who are sugar-growers have always adhered to that concept.

Mr Menzel: It has not changed.

Mr CASEY: The figure was adjusted slightly with the introduction of mechanisation in the industry, but, as the member for Mulgrave said, the concept has not changed. It is the basis of all awards of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. Also, I think the honourable member for Mulgrave would agree that payment is based on the mill average c.c.s. I have the figures here. If the honourable member wants to look at them afterwards, I will be happy to show them to him. I do not want to bore the House with them.

A grower should receive more money if he produces more c.c.s. If the coefficient of extraction of a mill improves, it should receive more money. Both sides benefit if they can achieve those aims.

Tighter controls exist in some areas in which growers own their own mills. Recently, I have seen the figures from a proprietary mill—in fact, it belongs to one of the big three—which indicate that the growers' return is only 61.75 per cent; in other words, that mill is diddling them of 4.25 per cent. When one goes further into the figures, one sees that a grower has to average almost 25 per cent over mill average before he can get a payment based on two-thirds. A full investigation is needed into those matters in the sugar industry.

Every mill has those returns. The Central Sugar Cane Prices Board has them. Instead of talk about structural adjustment, there should be a royal commission into the sugar industry. It would then be seen that the growers in this State are being diddled by millers under the cane-payments scheme. That must be investigated, and the only body that can do that is the Government.

I have touched on the happenings at Rocky Point. That was a hand-out by the Ministers. Even the Minister for Primary Industries, when he was speaking in this Chamber, referred to "mill"; he did not speak about the growers. He claimed it was because the mill had had a disastrous year last year, in which it reached only 64 per cent of peak. He said it was two-thirds, but it was actually 64 per cent. But two other small mills had lower figures. Last year, the Moreton mill reached only 55 per cent of peak and the Maryborough mill reached only 57 per cent of peak. Surely those mills must have been in positions similar to that of the Rocky Point mill. I stand by what I said previously: it is a hand-out to those organisations.

When I talk about organisations, I must remember that the growers throughout the State are struggling. Let us look at the mills. Are they struggling? The big three—CSR Limited, Bundaberg Sugar Co. Ltd and Pioneer Sugar Mills Ltd—are making big profits. In fact, Pioneer announced that its profit was up by 288 per cent this year. No grower in Queensland can talk about an increase of 288 per cent. Most growers had a 288 per cent loss. CSR reported a profit of \$25.7m, which was one of the best results in years. It was almost double the previous year's profit.

In fairness, I am the first to say that those three companies are well run. In the years when they had surplus funds, they wisely diversified. The lesson must be there for some of the co-operatives.

Mr De Lacy: Do you think that the owner of the Rocky Point sugar-mill is a member of the National Party?

Mr CASEY: I think that he might have a little bit to say in the party's affairs. Judging from the reaction of the Minister for Mines and Energy the other day, I think that the owner of the Rocky Point mill might be one of those blokes who are pretty good on the party's campaign committee. I know that, in the Albert electorate of the Minister for Mines and Energy, that family has sold a lot of land and made millions of dollars from its transfer. It is a pity that they did not try to use some of the land themselves.

The lesson of diversification is there for the co-operatives to learn. The directors of those mills must take some of the blame for complacency. I heard a former director bleating in the Chamber a moment ago. I am not sure what his position is now, because he has been on and off the board more times than he gets on and off the toilet.

New management techniques and new ideas have been introduced to the mills in recent years. I am proud to say that many of the new people are proteges of the Sugar Research Institute in Mackay, which has bred some good millers for the industry and for the economy.

I could go on and on. Let us look at the profits of the users of sugar. Cadbury Schweppes is the biggest user of sugar products in Australia, in its drink division and its confectionery division. This year, it recorded a 20.1 per cent rise in profit, and last year it recorded another major increase. Although companies such as Cadbury Schweppes complain to the IAC about the high domestic cost of sugar, they still make substantial profits, and the major ingredient in their product is sugar.

Companies such as Bundaberg Sugar and Pioneer Sugar are in danger of take-over by Elders IXL and Adelaide Steamship Company. Those two companies have already swallowed up some food companies. If they get their hands on the sugar industry, woe betide it, because they are tough operators. Elders IXL is run by that great champion of the Liberal Party, Mr John Elliott. He is well-known to Sir William Knox and other Liberals in this State. He is the type of person that Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen loves. In the Premier's opinion, Mr Elliott—not the grower or the producer—is one of the great people.

I turn now to what is happening in marketing in the sugar industry. Every State Government Minister cries about the European Economic Community; it is trendy to do that. Cabinet has suddenly discovered it, even though it has been established since 1960. The EEC had its greatest impact on Australia in 1974, when the Commonwealth agreement was renewed without Australia; Australia was just cut off. I ask the defendants of the Union Jack, especially people such as the member for Toowoomba North, who spoke immediately before me, to take note that it was the United Kingdom that tossed Australia aside. All the other countries of the Commonwealth were accepted, under the terms of the Lomé agreement, into the trading bloc or cartel with the EEC, but Australia was not. In spite of that, Government members want to keep the Union Jack in the Australian flag. That is all that they talk about. They want us to sing the United Kingdom's national anthem.

Although some people might think this strange, I say that Queen Elizabeth the Second is a lovely person. She has done a tremendous job in adjusting the monarchy to the modern age. The pity of it is that people such as the Premier, and those who write speeches for the Queen's representative in this State, do more harm than good for the monarchy because they cannot adjust to the times. They exhibit the staid, old thinking that existed years ago. Speeches such as the one the Governor delivered last week do the monarchy more harm than good. Her Majesty the Queen would not like it.

What happened to Queensland in 1974 when the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement finished? Virtually overnight, one-third of the market was lost. Because there was a big change in marketing structure throughout the world, Australia took over some of the Japanese market. Rex Patterson, a Labor Minister in Canberra, signed a long-term agreement with Japan. However, when it came time to renew that agreement, a different Government was in office in Canberra, and it was dictated to by the Queensland Government.

What did this Government do? It endeavoured to screw the Japanese to the wall, and the Japanese did not like it. They took out their revenge on Queensland by cutting back on their purchases from this State.

Queensland sugar-producers also found their way into the American market. Everything went along well until a bloke by the name of Reagan came along. He totally changed American policies. Government members not should kid themselves for one moment. If they want to stand up in this Chamber and wave "Old Glory", or whatever the United States flag is, that is OK by me. I do not mind the Yanks as people and I do not mind trading with them. However, Queensland should not let the Americans dominate this

State, because they would put the skids under us whenever they could in our trade with America.

While Queensland sugar-producers were looking towards the United States, the European Economic Community stepped in and grabbed all the new markets. All too often, we have seen what I term the old colonial squatter marketing ideals develop in Australia. We see this "old mother country" concept. All that Australian producers think they have to do is come out, like the Premier, in a pair of riding boots, a pair of tight strides and a big hat. They think that all they have to do is act like a great bwana and produce any product at all. They adopt the attitude that, no matter how good, bad or rotten their product is, the people over in England will buy it. No wonder England is such a deprived nation! Its people have been eating all the stuff that Australia has sent them.

Australia fell down when it came to producing quality. That occurred in the wool industry, the beef industry—that industry is only starting to wake up to the fact now—and the sugar industry. If we are not careful, it will happen in the wheat industry. If it does happen, it will create great problems in your area, Mr Speaker.

Australia's primary industries must remember that they produce for the consumers, not for the primary producers. Unless the primary industries produce quality products that the consumers want and will buy, the people engaged in primary industries might as well not plough their fields or tend their herds.

I said that I would come back to sugar quality, and I regret that the honourable member for Mulgrave has left the House. The problems arising in relation to the quality of sugar were discovered 15 years ago. At that stage Queensland still had a guaranteed market, but problems were beginning to appear. However, not one member of the National Party could see past the nose on his face.

It took five years for the sugar industry to think about the problem, it took five years for it to think of a way to get round the problem, and it took another five years for it to decide who would pay for overcoming the problem.

What else has Queensland done about capturing world markets? The world's biggest importer of sugar is Russia. Every year it imports in excess of 5 million tonnes. Yet, in spite of that, Queensland did not even consider Russia as a market. Why was that? Because Queensland regarded Russia as "those rotten coms". Now, however, Queensland is begging Russia to take its sugar. Fortunately, China helped save our sugar industry by taking quantities of sugar.

Queensland is ideally located to serve the eastern regions of Russia. This State could beat Cuba hands down in the supply of sugar to that part of the world. Certainly, Cuba has a special agreement with Russia, but Queensland would still be able to compete with it.

At the present time, Queensland is supplying sugar to Russia on a barter basis. In return for sugar, Queensland is obtaining fertiliser from Russia. And who is importing that fertiliser? The cane-growers themselves. They are doing that in order to try to obtain another market for their sugar.

To revert to the EEC—many honourable members do not realise that the EEC relies heavily on the importation of primary products. In fact, 75 percent of its raw materials are imported from outside the EEC. By comparison, the United States of America imports approximately 25 per cent of the raw materials that it uses. Australia is lucky, in that it imports an even lower quantity of the raw materials that it uses. Approximately 90 or 95 per cent of the raw materials that Australia uses are produced in this country.

The European Economic Community has to scour the world so that it can obtain raw materials for manufacture and resale. The EEC has been very smart; it has involved itself with developing countries in order to secure supplies. Australia, on the other hand, has done nothing like that in order to gain export markets.

The Africa-Caribbean-Pacific-European Community, a little known organisation, publishes a bulletin every two months. That organisation contains all the developing countries in Africa and the Pacific and the 10 nations in the European Economic Community. All of those countries, with the exception of Canada, New Zealand and Australia, are the old Commonwealth.

What is happening there? Those communities are involved in the marketing structure of the EEC. Canada, of course, is tied in with the United States of America. The New Zealand Government got out aggressively in 1974, as the beef industry is now finding out, and captured the quality markets for beef throughout the world. Ten years after the Lomé agreement set up the ACPE Community, Australia is still plodding along. The Sugar Board had to be aware of all of those changes. The Lomé Convention Treaty was established in 1972, 12 years ago. At that time sugar was one of the main negotiating items. Now Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Vanuatu, Western Samoa, Tonga—all close neighbours—are benefiting from it. Australia has been left behind. If we do not smarten ourselves up, Australia will very soon be one of the Third World countries. Europe is giving those countries trade, not aid. Those countries are purchasing manufactured goods from Europe rather than from Australia. At about this time last year I was in Papua New Guinea with some of my colleagues and saw the sugar industry that had been established at Ramu. The Ramu sugar industry was told by Australia that it would not be a goer, that it would not get off the ground, and that Papua New Guinea did not need a sugar industry as it could continue buying Australian sugar. However, Papua New Guinea said that it wanted its own sugar industry.

A consultant from the United Kingdom developed the industry. The mill was built by Kawasaki of Japan, not Walkers of Maryborough. The harvesters were manufactured by Klaus of Germany, not Toft of Bundaberg or Massey Ferguson. The only thing Queensland did to help was provide the assistance of the Queensland Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations with varieties. The Queensland Sugar Board put its head in the sand and the Queensland Government adopted the same attitude with the white sugar market.

I shall refer now to the sugar-refining industry. CSR will not miss a swipe from me. CSR went to the Industries Assistance Commission and tried to make out that everything was going great guns in the refining industry. It claimed that the effective rate of assistance for refining is about 6 per cent. In fact, it is 20 per cent!

Time expired.

Mr KAUS (Mansfield) (4.12 p.m.): It is a pleasure for me to participate in the Address in Reply debate. Recently I read the speech that I made in this Chamber in 1966.

Mr Prest: Is this the same one?

Mr KAUS: No.

In 1966 I seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech. I congratulate the mover, the member for Surfers Paradise, and the seconder, the member for Fassifern, on doing such a good job this year.

Mr Fouras: Are you going to talk about the Queen and the flag?

Mr KAUS: No, I will not refer to them. However, I remind the honourable member that I fought for our flag. I also remind him that I fought for the conditions that he enjoys today.

I congratulate the Governor on the excellent job that he has done during his term in office. I understand that he will retire soon. I have entertained him at different functions and wish him and Lady Ramsay well in their retirement.

I turn now to the guide-lines for the establishment of a Queensland sports institute. In the last couple of days, Sallyanne Atkinson, the Liberal Party leader in the Brisbane City Council, has received a great deal of radio publicity. On a talk-back radio program today she again mentioned the establishment of a sports institute.

Whilst it saddens all of us to see our young athletes travelling overseas for further training in university institutions, I do not agree with suggestions by the Liberal leader, Alderman Sallyanne Atkinson, that our universities and colleges should be asked to lower their academic entrance requirements for the benefit of talented young athletes. It is vital that universities retain their primary function of educating and it is no use pretending that, talented as some athletes may be, they are academically inclined.

However, this is by no means to be construed as meaning that either field of endeavour should take priority in our thinking and planning. I am immensely proud of the sporting achievements of our athletes in every sphere, but their encouragement should lie in a Queensland institute of sport, rather than a combination of training and university courses. To lower the entrance qualifications at universities and colleges would, I believe, do a great disservice to these hallowed institutions because, if anything, as educational standards improve, the entrance scores will be increased.

The Government owes it to young sports people to have an institute of sports or a sports development centre in Queensland, where enthusiasts could receive training and improve their performance. If this concentrated tuition were given by experts, the athletes could be nurtured at a very early age and receive dual benefits.

One of the reasons that Queensland's swimmers have done so well over the years is that a large number of schools have swimming-pools. I know that, within a square mile in my electorate, there are five or six swimming-pools at which, every Saturday morning, swimming clubs are run, sometimes by as many as 23 parents. That is marvellous. Of course, that is only one aspect of sport. Others are tennis, cricket, football and so on. This is one of the ways in which young people with natural ability can be picked out and encouraged.

Mr Fouras: There are a lot more pools in schools in your area than in mine. In your area the parents are richer.

Mr KAUS: That might be so, but it also shows good representation by me.

As I said, athletes nurtured at an early age receive dual benefits, such as the required guidance to reach the top of their active performance in their chosen sport and career training so that, once the days of sports participation are over—all must agree that athletes have to retire at a relatively early age—they can be assimilated into ancillary jobs in the sporting world as sports administrators, coaches, referees, managers, etc. That would be maximising their knowledge and ensuring that it was passed on to others.

Establishing such an institute would give the athletes an assurance that the Government and the State were behind them and also improve Queensland's position in the sporting world. Queensland has the athletes, the enthusiasm and many existing facilities upon which such an institute could be built. I believe that the Government, with the assistance of the business world, would provide financial backing. In fact, initial planning for such development has already been suggested. Unfortunately, it will be too late to prevent our losing some of our present Olympians, who are travelling abroad to further their training and studies. I believe that they have no option but to do so. However, it would not be too late to retain future sportsmen and women in this country.

I realise that we have a national Institute of Sport in Canberra, but it is not convenient for athletes to travel away from home. Most of them have to retain employment in their early stages of promoting themselves in the sporting world. Indeed, many would still be at school. I have visited the institute. It is absolutely magnificent. I recommend that all members visit it. Unfortunately, it cannot cater for everybody. A wide variety of sport is played in Queensland. Any facilities built would be used to the

full. With the excellent climate we enjoy and the skills at our disposal, we could lead the world. We certainly owe it to our youngsters to take the initiative.

On not one but two occasions I have made submissions to the Government on the establishment of a Queensland institute of sport, which would not only shape the immediate future of sports development in this State but also determine our position in 10 to 20 years' time. The first step must be well founded. It must be as near to the correct direction as possible and of the right magnitude, a balance between something too small and something too large.

Whatever the form of the institute, it must, emphatically, show value to the community, to the Government, to private enterprise and to the general public. It should serve the needs of the State just as the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra serves the nation's elitist sporting needs. I am referring, not to an elitist group in Queensland, but to the need to get our sportsmen to the level necessary for them to attend the Canberra institute.

Secondly, the institute should, wherever possible, use existing facilities—we have plenty at present—and human resources. We have both, and are improving in every area. Thirdly, the institute would ultimately have to seek some measure of financial independence. All the preceding concepts should permeate the initial plan and be maintained in perpetuity. Opposition members might rag me for saying this, but we have embodied those principles already in the shooting complex at Belmont. It will remain in perpetuity for the present shooters, their children and their children's children. It is the best shooting complex in Australia. The army even admits that by using it continuously.

Once the wheels are set in motion, the sports development machine must be steered by experts. A committee comprising representatives of sport bodies, Government, business and educational establishments should be carefully chosen for that onerous and time-consuming task. It should have at its disposal the services of a skilled, full-time sports administrator whose task would be to research available material, canvass concerned groups, prepare recommendations and, finally, establish future policy for the institute. The lines of communication from the administrator to the committee and then to the Government should be direct and independent of any departmental red tape. I do not advocate abolishing the present administration but gradually merging it with the new organisation.

With the best possible ground rules laid in terms of philosophy, objectives, underlying concepts and committee structures, the job of formulating the Queensland institute of sport should be approached more confidently. With any project of this magnitude and importance, information about the planning details of the institution must be obtained from relevant sources, which I envisage as follows—

Local sources—Sports body proposals, questionnaires, interviews, etc.

National sources—Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra, State institutes and tertiary bodies.

Overseas sources—Working visits to centres of other countries, library material, interviews of sports field experts.

With a collection of independent resource material, basic ideas could be formulated, such as—

- (1) A sports house and sports institute operating in parallel under the same roof but independently funded;
- (2) A sports house and sports institute not only being separate concepts but also being separate physically; and
- (3) A sports institute to be the main body, the sports house serving as the administration arm.

To achieve these ends, total use could be made of all existing facilities such as the Commonwealth Games facilities, educational facilities and Government facilities, with diversification round the State through existing national fitness centres and camps.

I propose utilising the existing Chandler facilities, with an expansion into the Belmont Rifle Range grounds, to create a total sports complex with permanent accommodation to cater for groups of athletes and sportsmen from a variety of sports disciplines. The accommodation and facilities could be utilised for sports camps and seminars throughout the year.

Because I am very interested in the concept, I intend to conduct a survey of every sport at the Chandler, Belmont and QEII complexes. A great deal of accommodation is available, in those areas. I will include Boondall when it is completed. Transport could be organised from area to area, depending on the sport. All of the complexes, and perhaps even the national fitness camps throughout Queensland, could be used in one year. National fitness camps along the coast and in the inland could well be used. I am not neglecting anyone in the training and development of our youth in sport.

A recent shoot held at the Belmont Rifle Range continued from one Wednesday to the next. The Australian universities shoot-out is taking place there at the moment. Over a period, 1 500 to 2 000 people passed through the gates. When the gun people hold their annual or national shoot, 1 000 people in the one discipline are in the complex. I emphasise that the swimming, cycling and weight-lifting facilities are next door. All that is required is co-ordination, but nothing can be done without finance.

A responsible and skilled committee advised by a sports administrator would sift and mix, producing the best possible formula, but a certain amount of flexibility within the plan is necessary. It must be subjected to constant review and evaluation. It is envisaged that funding would be drawn from the Federal and State Governments, as well as from local government, private enterprise, foundations and trusts.

There would be close liaison between the Queensland institute and the Australian Institute of Sport, since Australian sport is founded upon State clubs. That would continue to feed national teams. If those links were nurtured properly, the benefits to Australia as a whole would be inestimable.

I come to my conclusions. Firstly, a Queensland institute of sport is inevitable. Secondly, an institute must accept responsibility for all levels of athletes for sport development. Thirdly, to ensure that an institute would best serve the community, the concept would have to be correctly researched, meticulously planned and systematically evaluated.

Queensland has an opportunity to build upon the wealth of experience and the myriad of modern facilities in Brisbane. Sporting associations, clubs and people in Queensland and Australia are in need of guidance in their quest to improve administration, coaching and programs. Let us not bypass this golden opportunity.

The need for an institute is irrefutable, and the timing for one now is ideal. The Queensland Government should recognise that fact and initiate the development of a Queensland institute of sport. I hope that this concept is accepted in terms of stated philosophy and objectives.

I made four points in summary. Firstly, a committee drawn from Government, sport and business institutions should be established to bring the concept to a reality—to research and collate relevant information, to propose and determine objectives and guide-lines for the proper conduct of the institute and to initiate and implement a master plan of operation. Secondly, a full-time sports administrator should be employed to undertake those duties requested of him by the committee. He should display imagination, creativity and an ability to document ideas and research and be solely concerned with the formulation of the institute plan. Thirdly, the institute would, wherever possible, avail itself of existing facilities, human or physical—there are many of them, and they are first-class—and it would attempt to secure a degree of financial independence from the State Government. Detailed planning would show the value to the community by satisfying certain needs in the State. Fourthly, a specific relationship with other State sports institutes, and especially to the Australian Institute of Sport, should be incorporated

into the master plan. The next step would be to draw up the very definite course of action that is suggested in principle in this initial outline.

That plan was formulated a few years ago, and it has been resurrected. Prior to the Commonwealth Games, there was a lot of difficulty in getting finance from the Brisbane City Council. On that occasion, we won handsomely, but we did not crow about it. The sportsmen have benefited from it. We have to continue.

There will be Australian Games and University Games. We have to be prepared, and give our junior and senior sportsmen and sportswomen the opportunity to compete successfully in any games that are held. It is up to the Government to give encouragement, and the time to do so is now.

I turn now to trends in employment and unemployment. The social and political dimensions of these problems are most vividly reflected in employment trends. In the OECD area, unemployment is expected to reach 28.5 million—8 per cent of the total labour force—by the end of 1982, and no decline is as yet in sight. A substantial proportion of the unemployed are below 25 years of age. Only the other day, the outgoing secretary to the Treasury said that most of Australia's unemployed are between the ages of 15 and 25. In the developing countries, underemployment is an additional problem. In 1980, the total number underemployed and unemployed was 455 million. Governments talk about what they are doing, but those figures illustrate the enormity of the problem with which they are faced.

The world's total labour force, estimated at over 1.6 billion in 1975, is expected to exceed 2.5 billion by the year 2000. Most of the increase will occur in the developing countries, where the labour force is growing at the rate of 2.9 per cent per annum, as compared with 1 per cent in the developed countries.

I do not consider Australia to be a fully developed country. A couple of years ago, I went overseas and 90 per cent of the people to whom I spoke had never heard of Australia. While I was there, I tried to promote the tourist industry. I was given pamphlets, which I distributed in every city that I visited in Europe. They were written in German.

I will never forget the first night that I put them out. Everybody was dining. I left and came back 20 minutes later, and not one pamphlet was left. I thought that someone had seen me put the pamphlets out and had picked them up and thrown them in the rubbish bin. I even went down to the rubbish bin to see whether they had been thrown out. I did not know what had happened to them. However, on every other night after that when I put them out, I saw what happened to them. I sat in a corner and watched the people pick them up. Then I went over and spoke to them and promoted Queensland and Australia. They were interested in Queensland and asked many questions about this State.

I made a few friends at railway stations and on the ships and aircraft on which I travelled. Unfortunately, I did not have enough pamphlets to distribute; I had only a few hundred. However, it was a good method of approach to promote Queensland.

To absorb the backlog of unemployed and new additions to the labour force, the developing countries now need to create over 25 million new jobs a year, 37 million a year by 1990 and over 50 million a year by the year 2000. The challenge is enormous by any reckoning and is made more formidable by the prospect that the demand for labour will decline as new technologies are used.

Employment problems are becoming worse in both developed and developing countries. Economic recovery may arrest the increase in unemployment in developed countries, but the level of unemployment is likely to remain high, especially as the adoption of micro-electronics technology is likely to increase in pace with the recovery. The persistence of unemployment will increase pressure for protectionism, which has a strong bearing on growth and employment in the developing countries.

Although the overall prospects for employment seem poor, there are certain groups whose situation give cause for particular anxiety, namely, the young (under 25s) and women. In the OECD countries, young people account for about 20 per cent of the labour force and 40 per cent of the unemployed. In the developing countries, unemployment is higher and there is a greater proportion of young people because of the population age structure; in some of them, youth unemployment is estimated to be as high as 60 per cent, which is shocking. This raises such important policy questions as the relevance of education and training to employment prospects, the need for special efforts to accelerate youth employment, the choice between (or the mix of) labour and capital-intensive technologies, and wage differentials between professional, skilled and unskilled employees, between younger and older workers, and between rural and urban sectors.

In 1975, the number of women in the world's active labour force totalled 576 million. It is expected to reach 800 million by the year 2000. As the actual contributions of women to the economy are not fully reflected in employment statistics, these are conservative estimates and the actual numbers are considerably higher.

For a variety of reasons, female participation in the labour force tends to be concentrated in a narrow range of low-income, low-skilled and low-productivity jobs, usually in sections of industry that are extremely sensitive to the fluctuation in economic activity. This makes women particularly vulnerable at a time of falling export demand. They also often suffer more than men when modernation reduces jobs in agriculture. Further, when women become unemployed they tend to fade into the family circle, which in itself is not bad. They are not as visible a problem as unemployed males. Consequently, there are fewer programs to deal specifically with unemployed women or to create jobs for women. Therefore, special attention needs to be given to them.

A wide range of activities can be devised to give women better opportunities in the labour market. These include the increased provision of child care and early infant education, improved access to education and vocational training, and more vigorous equal employment policies.

As to direct measures to expand employment in the developed countries, besides macro-economic policies, Governments are adopting a variety of measures to accelerate job creation. These include public works, subsidised jobs, in-service training, selective employment promotion, financial support for training, and tax allowances, grants and subsidies for investment. Governments offer a guide to what can be done in this field. In Canada, for example, 75 000 jobs were created through community-based projects in 1977-78. In Britain, development areas receive selective grants for projects and preferential treatment in public sector contracts and development agencies encourage overseas investment by providing equity and loan capital and infrastructure for industrial projects. Priority is also given to the long-term unemployed and to projects in areas of high unemployment.

In recent years, small businesses have proved particularly successful in creating employment, and Governments, in recognition of this, have been giving them special assistance. Not so Mr Keating. He is not doing very much for small businesses.

A Government Member: He is killing them.

Mr KAUS: The other day he killed them when he said that the small business lobby is selling itself down the drain. He recently told a packed Institute of Directors luncheon at the Sheraton Hotel, "It is time you stopped asking for subsidies they are not going to get." He told the 500 guests to stop whinging. He said that the business sector was always asking for hand-outs from the Government and had asked the Government when the cold hand of bureaucracy was to be taken off the controls of small business.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr KAUS: He evidently does not have a good knowledge of business matters.

An interesting article states—

“The US economy with a comparatively low average annual growth of 2.5 percent during the 1970s (compared to Australia’s 3.5 percent) was able to create 20 million new jobs. This job creation performance was some 50 percent better than Australia’s (adjusted for population).

The Government appears mesmerised with macro-economic projections worked out by its departmental economists. The focus on rapid growth as the cure for unemployment may not only confuse cause and effect, it can also distract attention from a whole range of policies which create opportunities for enterprise and generate jobs.”

The article further states—

“Business enterprise is hamstrung by the huge dead-weight of taxation (State and Local as well as Federal), the ever-increasing multitude of Government regulation with which it has to contend, and by an overly-rigid centralised wage-fixing system which ignores market realities.

In a recent speech, Les Hollings, Editor of ‘The Australian’, pointed out that the success of the US in creating new jobs has come from small companies mainly in the service industries; ‘... the new jobs are created by those firms that go from five jobs to ten jobs—or even more, from no job to one, two or three. They create the jobs, not General Motors or similar giants.

‘The services sector in America is not strongly unionised, and it is not strongly regulated. Outlets can open and close pretty well when they want to and there is a fairly free market in wages.

‘So, without any planning at all, left largely to its own devices, this area has been the saving of America. In fact it has become its strength.

‘Compare this to Australia. Although we have had strong growth in services, we are too strongly regulated. The regulation on small business on wages, opening hours, taxation has sapped much of the vigour from our services sector growth’.

Its over-emphasis on macro-economics is leading the Government astray. What is needed is a strong dose of micro-economic thinking.”

Although the Federal Treasurer is in that position of power, he still calls himself a democratic socialist and he and his colleagues think that they can muddle through to Utopia. In their view, economic direction is enough; it is not necessary to restrict political freedom. However, then they learn differently. Alas, their initial plan does not produce results. In fact, quite the contrary is the case. As a result, they impose more economic controls, exchange controls, prices and wages controls, labour controls and rationing. None of these things do the trick, either. The shops gradually empty, so these democratic socialists get angry and turn on their press critics.

They become paranoid and pass a great deal of legislation to punish what they term the saboteurs of the economy. Under that legislation, they can lock up whole categories of people. They use the parliamentary guillotine more and more often, pass enabling legislation instead of detailed constitutional statutes, but still the economy gets worse. Some of their legislation is invalidated by judges and is called unconstitutional, so next they turn on the courts.

Judges are replaced with the nominees of these democratic socialists and newspapers are taken under what is called responsible control. Irresponsible members of Parliament are expelled and the next step, because of obstruction, is the abolition of the Upper House. Finally, in desperation, a state of emergency is declared and the life of Parliament is extended indefinitely. The democratic socialists rule by decree with special powers of search, arrest and detention without trial. Of course, the claim is that all of these moves are temporary, for the duration of the crisis only, but the crisis never comes to an end. In due course Parliament, as it is still called, adopts a new constitution that regularises everything so that people can once more vote, but there is only one party to vote for.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (4.52 p.m.): The Governor's Opening Speech was an embarrassment to any Australian, more so to any man or woman who had fought for the State and the country. The prepared address delivered by the representative of the Queen, who represents all people of all classes, all colours and all political persuasions, was colourless, in bad taste and totally unwarranted. His address has done him no good, and those responsible stand condemned.

For the last couple of days I have been in this Chamber and listened to the comments made by Government members who have claimed that the Government had done some wonderful things. That was in the past. In seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the member for Fassifern spoke of the new coal mines and the power houses, railway lines and wharves that have been constructed. I do not deny that those projects have been commenced and completed. However, they were in the past, and that is what is wrong with this Government.

Mr Littleproud: The port at Fisherman Islands is still being built.

Mr PREST: They are all in the past. I am talking about big projects, not little fish. I am speaking about projects on the coast of central Queensland that cater for ships of 150 000 tonnes.

The Government has nothing for the future—or very little. The Government lives in the past and has very few plans for the future. That is why Queensland is way behind other States in coming out of the current recession that Malcolm Fraser, the leader of the Liberal-National Party Federal Government prior to March 1983, got us into.

The only thing that is expanding rapidly in Queensland is crime—murders, armed hold-ups, fraudulent land deals that have had the support of people who have received Queen's Honours, drugs and prostitution. The only other growing industry is small businesses going to the wall.

During this session, when I have the opportunity to do so, I will speak on many important issues, including increased rates and charges for services provided by local authorities and the fire services levy introduced by the Government. Although local authorities have to bear the brunt of, and the blame for, these increases, they are the fault of the Government and are due to the actions of Ministers of the Government.

My first real concern today is a criminal act of fraud perpetrated at the Eagle Farm racecourse on 18 August. The member for Callide spoke at length on this issue, but I wish to take a different point of view—that of the ordinary, small punter, not that of a racehorse-owner, as the member for Callide (Mr Hartwig) is. I will be able to talk about the stewards and not fear reprisals.

The inquiry being conducted into this ring-in affair at Eagle Farm can clearly be seen as a cover-up for the inefficiency and lack of positive action by stewards on that occasion, and possibly on other occasions in the past five weeks or so. Once again we see Caesar investigating Caesar, with the appointment of four stewards headed by the chief steward (Mr Andy Tindall) to conduct the inquiry. The first person questioned should have been the chief steward, Mr Andy Tindall. The first question asked should have been: When were you first aware of the concern about a ring-in or a fix and when were you first aware that a mammoth plunge on a donkey in race 4—not race 5 as Mr Hartwig said—was taking place? The second question should have related to what action he took, particularly as it has been reported that the Warwick Farm betting steward said that he rang the betting steward at Eagle Farm and informed him of the mammoth plunge on Fine Cotton, a horse with no form at all. I would then ask what action was taken by that betting steward and whether he reported the telephone call to the chief steward on that day.

All stewards who were in charge at Eagle Farm that day should be questioned. Why were the papers, markings, brands, etc., of all horses racing at Eagle Farm not checked, particularly those of a horse with bad form that was backed in such a mammoth plunge?

It should be remembered that Fine Cotton was not backed late. At racecourses all round Australia people were queueing up two races early to get on Fine Cotton. In Darwin betting started as early as 10 a.m. The dogs were barking that there was a fix at Eagle Farm, but no action was taken by the stewards until after the race. I will have more to say about that in a moment.

Jockeys have been reported as saying that on each occasion Fine Cotton raced in Queensland—at Bundamba on 6 August, Doomben on 8 August and Eagle Farm on 18 August—it was a different horse. That statement was made on 24 August. Where have the stewards been? Why have they not been doing their job? Why have they not been checking papers, markings, brands, etc.? Their action, or lack of action, requires a lot of answers, but they will not be found at this inquiry headed by Andy Tindall.

An independent inquiry—a royal commission—is the only way to the bottom of this corrupt industry. Racing is known as the sport of kings, but I suggest that it should be known as the sport of crooks. A royal commission headed by a Supreme Court judge is the only way of sorting out and exposing this corrupt industry and showing why action was not taken by the stewards before the race.

Why was all money not refunded after the horse was disqualified? That would at least have enabled the ordinary punters, the little old ladies who followed the plunge, to get their money back. It would have allowed those people who invested big money, including the people who worked the commission, to come forward and claim the thousands they put on. But it would also have enabled those people to be questioned about whom they put the money on for or who was backing them. That would have revealed some of the names at the top who were involved in the greatest scandal in recent racing history. But, no, the stewards did not see it that way, or else they were not interested in catching and questioning the persons involved. Or was it a case of knowing that the plunge horse was going to be disqualified and getting on the ultimate winner, Harbour Gold? Harbour Gold was at very generous odds—because of the money that had been invested on Fine Cotton, or should I say Bold Personality—but it should be remembered that Harbour Gold beat the next-placed horse by many lengths.

Mr Lee: What were the odds on Harbour Gold?

Mr PREST: I believe they were 11 to 2. The horse paid \$6.80 on the TAB. But I remind members that Harbour Gold was beaten by Bold Personality in a photo finish by only a short half head. It should be remembered that Bold Personality is a good flying-handicap-class horse and it has won six races in open company. We should follow Harbour Gold through the divisions and into open company.

To get back to the fix—have stewards checked the betting sheets to find out about the late plunge and all the late bets on Harbour Gold? Newspaper reports say that at least one big bookmaker in Brisbane and one at Warwick Farm were aware of what was going on. Weren't they lucky!

It should not be forgotten that the trainer, Mr Haitana, said on the program "60 Minutes" that the dogs were barking it. Everyone at Eagle Farm, apart from the stewards, knew that the fix was on. How many others in addition to the stewards, the officials and the bookmakers knew that if the bets on Fine Cotton had been refunded there would have been a big reduction in the face value of the tickets on the ultimate winner, Harbour Gold? The lucky ones in the know—it could have been the bookmakers, the stewards or the officials—would not have been paid such lucrative odds. Who were the lucky ones? They were not the small punters. I believe that it was the stewards, the officials and the bookmakers—the ones in the know—as reported in the press.

Without a royal commission, we will never know where they got their information. People are scared. They fear for their lives and will not come forward to speak. The bookmakers will not identify the commissioners who placed the bets, and the commissioners will not identify for whom they were acting. No-one wants to discuss the matter. Who could blame them? Life is short, but death is everlasting.

I question the wisdom of the persons involved in this fix in buying Bold Personality at 2.45 p.m. on Friday and, within 24 hours, backing him off the map for hundreds of thousands of dollars. They were running quite a risk. If all that happened on Friday afternoon, that was a very foolish course of conduct. But it did not start on Friday and run into Saturday. It was very well planned and involved quite a number of people in the racing industry.

The ring-in was well-known. If Mr Haitana was a victim in this fix and feared for his life before the race if he did not agree to the ring-in, the situation remains unchanged. The gang has lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. He may have been a little safer if he had informed the stewards when he had the opportunity to do so, that is, when he paid the \$20 fine for the late notification of the jockey. At the time, the horse could have been withdrawn and no money lost. The crooks would not have been so desperate, and Mr Haitana would be clear in the racing industry and would have a future in it—that is, if he was not murdered.

I support the member for Wynnum, the Opposition spokesman on racing, in his call for a royal commission into racing in Queensland. Today, the Opposition was supported by a racing man, the honourable member for Callide. Such a royal commission should be headed by a Supreme Court judge. The stewards who are holding the present inquiry do not have the experience or the ability to conduct an inquiry into a criminal act of fraud.

Fancy the inquiry sitting for a few hours one day and adjourning until Friday, which is tomorrow. God knows how long the inquiry will drag on! It will probably drag on until members of the public become utterly tired of seeing that no positive action is to be taken. Today's "Telegraph" says that the Australian Jockeys Club appears to be dissatisfied with the lack of action on the part of the Queensland Turf Club and intends conducting its own inquiry into the ring-in at Brisbane.

Mr Innes: How can you be satisfied that Mr Haitana was purely a victim? Did you watch the "60 Minutes" program?

Mr PREST: I do not believe that he is. I believe that he was part of it.

When I spoke in the second-reading debate on the Racing and Betting Act, the Minister said that the amendments were designed to give better racing in the State. I thought that was a good thing. An improvement in Queensland racing was long overdue.

On 31 January this year, I saw a Channel 0 news/sports program in which a very well-known licensed trainer in Queensland, whose horse Get to the Point had run a shocking race on the previous Saturday, stated that very big money was to be made in the racing game, especially if one could arrange for a favourite to be beaten. On 7 February, I asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing what he intended to do about the statement made on that television program. I asked—

"(1) Who, from among jockeys, trainers, owners or other persons, is getting this big money to have a favourite beaten?

(2) As this statement has clouded the minds of punters as to the conduct of the racing game, who is paying this big money?

(3) Will he have an immediate investigation conducted into this statement made on that particular program?"

The Minister's answer was—

"I share the honourable member's concern."

That is all he did; he shared my concern but took no action.

Mr Goss: Isn't it the case, though, that the National Party has never believed in a first-past-the-post contest?

Mr PREST: That is true. The National Party believes that if one runs last, one can still be a winner. The Labor Party believes that, in racing, if one cannot win, one must not be able to lose.

In the debate on the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill, I said that the racing industry in Queensland should be improved. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing interjected on me and asked—

“Do you believe that I should direct the principal clubs to introduce pre-race swabbing?”

I am pleased to say that today, after six months, the Minister said that he will introduce random pre-race swabbing of horses. Once again, the Government has closed the gate after the horse has bolted.

The following article appeared in the press on the 28th of this month—

“Queensland Turf Club chairman Sir Edward Williams has called on critics of racing in the State to produce evidence of illegal acts which have gone undetected.”

I told the Minister about a particular incident in January, but nothing was done about it. Further on, the press article stated—

“He is happy with the way racing is being controlled in this State . . . ”

That is what Sir Edward Williams is reported to have said. Honourable members know what knights are like. We have heard about the land swindles on the Gold Coast involving Sir Wallace Rae and Sir Rupert Hamer.

On 21 August 1984, this article appeared in the press—

“Mr Hinze said he believed racing in Brisbane was ‘as clean as anywhere else in the world’.

‘You will never be able to take a certain criminal element out of anything that people bet on. There will always be someone who has a go.’ ”

That is a nice thing for the Minister to say! The Government is making large allocations of money to the racing industry while money is needed for schools, houses and other urgent matters.

Sir Edward Williams and the Minister have said that everything is above board in the racing industry in Queensland. An article in the “Daily Sun” of 21 August 1984, under the heading “Just one more sham”, states—

“Saturday’s horse switch was just one of many recent ‘shams’ in Queensland racing, a Sydney bookmaker claimed today.

‘Most people in racing have their own theories as to what’s going on in Brisbane, but everyone agrees it’s bad for racing in Australia,’ he said.

Another big Sydney interstate bookmaker said that in his view little had been done to arrest what he described as ‘rampant crookedness in the north.’

Former bookmaker Terry Page blasted Eagle Farm stewards for ordering all bets to stand on the ring-in race.

‘It was highway robbery,’ said Page.

‘I really can’t believe the stewards allowed bets to stand.

‘What about all the rank and file punters, little old ladies and people who have just the occasional flutter?’ ”

I could not agree more. That view is not shared by the racing officials or stewards in Queensland. Someone made a late plunge on Harbour Gold. From what I understand, it was someone in a position to know that the ultimate winner would be disqualified, that the money would not be refunded, and that, therefore, there would not be a face-value deduction on the second horse, Harbour Gold, which was declared the winner. It meant that those in the know obtained very lucrative odds.

Another gentleman involved in the racing industry, Jim Anderson—I believe that he has political affiliations—had this to say—

“The reputations of some southern critics of Queensland racing nosedived yesterday when the finger of blame for the Fine Cotton episode pointed in their direction.

Trainer Hayden Haitana’s inference that the ring-in was not organised in Queensland will shock the southern knockers. Since the ring-in exploded last Saturday week, they have blasted Brisbane racing with almost unrestrained vigor, so how will they take the news that the headquarters of ‘Mr Big’ are based south of the Queensland border?”

I believe that that is true. Fraud in the racing industry in Queensland could have its origins in the southern States. Because of the actions of the stewards and the tightness of security in Sydney and Melbourne, people know that they will not get away with it. However, in Queensland, a race can be fixed and the person responsible can get away with it. That is why so many interstate crooks come to Queensland. All the ring-ins in racing over the last 12 months have happened in Queensland.

Mr Lee: You are telling lies.

Mr PREST: I have never told a lie in my life. I am 58, and I am not going to start now.

It is also known that the stewards in Queensland do not do their jobs. It is claimed that the identification checks of horses at Bundamba and at other mid-week race meetings are not as stringent as the checks carried out at Saturday meetings. If people are game enough to pull a racket like this at Eagle Farm, which is Queensland’s major racecourse, I wonder what is happening in the provincial cities and country towns. Importantly, it is happening all the time. It is no wonder that racing in this State is at such a low ebb.

Racing commentator Jim Anderson reported—

“Fine Cotton’s registration papers had been checked at his previous three Queensland starts, but chief steward, Mr Andy Tindall said they had not been examined before yesterday’s race.”

The QTC has now set up an inquiry headed by Mr Andy Tindall. The stewards admitted that they did not check the brands and markings on the plunge horse on the Saturday of the ring-in because the horse had already raced three times in Queensland in the last month. Even though Mr Tindall said that Fine Cotton’s markings were checked at Bundamba on the Monday before the ring-in and at his other two starts, the jockeys claimed that Fine Cotton and Bold Personality were different-coloured horses. They were not black; one was a bay and the other brown.

The hunt is on for the trainer and for anyone else who may have any information; but no-one is game enough to come forward. A royal commission is the only way to satisfactorily resolve the matter.

It has also been revealed that Brisbane racing has been under scrutiny since January, when sources close to the industry alleged that a sophisticated Sydney gang might have master-minded the doping of several top fancies at a Doomben meeting. We know about the licensed trainer of Get To The Point, whose horse was alleged to have been nobbled. The Government claims that nothing is happening in Queensland; that it is all happening in New South Wales. It is happening in Queensland, all right.

Earlier today the honourable member for Callide referred to reversals of form. In Queensland, a horse can run last on one day and then win at its next start, without any questions being asked. Why? Because those people who are in the know are making a quid. The little old punter who makes plunges, however, can lose his money. He certainly lost his money at Eagle Farm on the 18th.

Mr De Lacy: “He or she”; my mother had \$5 on it.

Mr PREST: That is true; he or she. The Minister for Racing (Mr Hinze) said that he was a mug in that he did not back the horse. He was in the north. I do not know where his money was. Perhaps it was only in jest that he said that he was a mug. Perhaps he should have had more money on the horse that came second.

In Queensland, the stewards do not check the horses, they do not check the papers and they do not look at brands. No wonder the crooks are coming up to Queensland from the south. In Sydney, gallopers have to face up to three identification checks a day under a very strict AJC system. Up to four officials who are linked to the stewards' panel carry out an identification check on horses before a race. The chairman of the AJC stewards insists that complete registration papers for all horses are carried at all times. That is not done in Queensland.

After the race, when Fine Cotton was about to be disqualified, the stewards asked Mr Haitana for his papers, and he could not find them. As the honourable member for Callide said, no action was taken at the course that day to apprehend Mr Haitana. He went and had a few drinks, eventually picked up his belongings and went off. He is now in smoke. Does anyone really think that the police are looking for him? Of course not!

Opposition members put questions on this matter to the Minister for Racing, and, generally speaking, his answers indicate that he does not care. He simply said, "I do not care. I will leave the matter to Mr Tindall and the stewards and others who were in charge of racing at Eagle Farm on that day."

Mr Wharton: That is not true.

Mr PREST: It is all here in black and white. The Minister who interjected was once a racing man; I do not know whether he still is. I do not know whether punters at Gayndah or Thangool backed Fine Cotton or Harbour Gold. Perhaps the Minister was one of the lucky ones who were on Harbour Gold.

Yesterday, the honourable member for Brisbane Central asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

"With reference to the inquiry being conducted into the substitution of another horse for the horse known as Fine Cotton are betting ledgers from the following centres being investigated by stewards; Rockhampton, Townsville, Gold Coast, Toowoomba, Gladstone and Cairns?"

In answer, the Minister said—

"The questions are of a general nature relative to a matter at the Eagle Farm race-track that is now the subject of a stewards' inquiry. For the benefit of Parliament, I should say that I believe the inquiry should be allowed to take its course. It is being conducted subject to the laws of the State. Under the circumstances, it must be granted all the rights of a court.

I have no complaint with the activities of the principal club, the Queensland Turf Club, or the chief stipendiary steward, Mr Andy Tindall. I am concerned that there should be so much media input into this matter."

In other words, the Minister does not want the media to report what happened at Eagle Farm; nor does he want the media to report the fact that virtually no action will be taken.

Later, the honourable member for Brisbane Central asked the same Minister—

"(1) Is he aware of widespread claims that punters, including Queensland punters, prefer to bet on events held in southern States because they believe interstate races are better controlled and, therefore, more likely to be honest?"

(2) What action is being taken to restore punters' faith in racing in Queensland?"

In answer to the first question, the Minister said, "No." In other words, he did not know that punters in Queensland were putting more money on southern events than on Queensland events.

The following article recently appeared in the press—

“In 1982-83, for example, Queenslanders used the TAB to bet \$91.2 million on Queensland horses, or what they fondly believed to be Queensland horses—some of them with forgettable heads.

In the same year Queenslanders invested \$129.1 million on racing in Victoria and wagered \$102.1 million on the things running around NSW tracks. In other words a lot of people seem to feel that they are getting a better deal interstate.”

I table a comparison of Queensland TAB turnover figures for a spread of years, and I ask that it be incorporated in “Hansard”.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the following document—

Here is a comparison of Queensland TAB turnover figures for a spread of years:

	Gallops \$	Harness \$	Dogs \$
1983-84	393,703,190	39,129,816	27,379,957
Queensland races only	113,789,466	16,052,673	16,277,617
1982—83	323,703,150	38,391,203	26,878,818
Queensland races only	91,172,657	17,337,921	16,535,049
1980-81	229,574,980	36,274,259	19,536,680
Queensland races only	82,095,498	19,049,586	12,974,495
1976-77	155,517,788	35,277,651	13,263,787
Queensland races only	68,409,827	21,641,372	9,387,280

Mr PREST: People will not come forward to give evidence at the inquiry. However, if a royal commission were held, people could be subpoenaed to give evidence. A person in Melbourne by the name of Eric “Scotty” Good has already been bashed. A recent newspaper article states—

“A man who said he was beaten up because he knew too much about the Fine Cotton ring-in scandal last night claimed he knew the two men who organised the swindle.”

Another press article states that there is reliable information that the man responsible for the ring-in scandal also instigated a similar race fix in Brisbane two years ago. We know also that a trainer by the name of George Brown was found murdered in his burnt-out car outside Wollongong earlier this year. It is suggested that it originated in the racing industry in Queensland. A jockey who has ridden for Pat Haitana fears for his life, as do the wife and family of Mr Haitana. A former jackaroo bought the ring-in horse Bold Personality. He has refused to name the person from whom he bought the horse for fear of his life. The trainer, Mr Haitana, fears for his life. The bloodstock agent, who police feel could provide urgently needed information into the Brisbane race ring-in scandal, has gone into hiding. So he fears for his life.

The family of a New South Wales horse-trainer, Cyril Lavell of Moranbah in Queensland, who was found drowned with a blacksmith’s anvil tied around his neck, now believe that he was the victim of a gang of race-riggers. It has been said that everything in Queensland is well and that we should not be talking about that. However, people have been murdered or are missing. Other persons fear for their lives. At present an inquiry is being conducted by a group of stewards who have no previous experience in carrying out such a major inquiry. The Opposition believes that the inquiry should be conducted by a Supreme Court judge.

I believe that Mr McGregor-Lowndes had never set eyes on Fine Cotton. According to a press report, Miss Pearse appeared at the inquiry and adopted a devil-may-care attitude. It states that she was certainly at ease when she gave evidence and that when she answered questions from stewards she often stared at the ceiling, chewing gum and

tapping her feet on the plush carpet. That is the type of inquiry that is being conducted into such a mammoth swindle in Queensland.

In relation to this matter, I quote from the following press article—

“ . . . authorities should not underestimate its vital importance to the immediate future of the racing industry.

Put simply, last weekend's fiasco has set racing in this country back 20 years.

The big question around the tracks is how hard the authorities are prepared to push their investigation. If the matter is pursued vigorously, the names involved are such that it could become one of the biggest scandals in turf history.

Many experienced turf men are already dismissing the chances of investigators ever getting to the bottom of the caper. They say, at worst, middle-men will cop the rap and keep their mouths shut about the real details behind the affair.

It is an attitude racing administrators, police and parliamentarians cannot be allowed to adopt. Many of the details are common knowledge around the tracks—the dogs are barking some of the prominent names involved. It should therefore prove impossible for those who might otherwise feel inclined to reasonably consign the whole thing to the 'too hard' basket.

One of the biggest names in racing was a central figure in the 'ring-in' attempt. Several of racing's best-known faces—including a big-betting businessman, a man who has been a bookmaker and an older gent with a colourful background—led the charge to get set at any price.”

The problems are not only with racing; presently they are in the trotting industry. Many of the heads of the trotting industry have resigned. In fact, Barry Morton, a prominent owner in racing and trotting and one of the State's biggest gamblers, believes that Albion Park punters are getting a lousy deal. In his opinion, controversial speed racing requirements, inconsistent rulings by stewards and bad programming detract from the success of the multimillion dollar trotting complex. Mr Morton said—

“It's all very well saying a big percentage of the favourites are winning. But how many of them are at odds that the average punter can't get on?”

However, Peter Burge has said that the trots have never been so good. If one form of racing is to be investigated, the whole industry should be investigated.

Mr Davis: You called for a racing commission, didn't you?

Mr PREST: Yes, that is so. The industry has to be cleaned up. The problems have continued for far too long. Now the Government has the opportunity to do so, it should be done immediately.

As this is the Year of the Family, housing is of concern to all members. The Governor said what a wonderful place Queensland is and what a wonderful job the Government is doing. If that is so, why does the State have such record numbers of unemployed people? Why are record numbers of people waiting for adequate housing? The reason is the attitude of the Government. This year the Federal Government will assist first-home-owners with the staggering amount of \$265m, an increase of 85 per cent on last year.

I admit that the Minister for Works and Housing has a job to do. Recently, in an effort to get some publicity, he issued a press statement about the purchase of 11 units in the city of Gladstone for approximately \$450,000. However, before their purchase by the Government, those 11 luxury units were fully occupied. By his actions, the Minister put 11 families onto the street in order to put 11 families, who were waiting for Housing Commission accommodation, into those units.

Mr Wharton: No!

Mr PREST: That is true.

His actions did nothing for the economy. If that half a million dollars had been spent in another way, it would have created employment, created activity within the building industry and would have served some purpose. The Government bought this real estate from a person who, perhaps, had had his fingers burnt. Because the units were being rented at a cheap rate, perhaps the owner could not carry on. Certainly the luxury units were in demand. However, the Minister's actions put 11 families, who were on the books at the court house as waiting for housing accommodation, into the units and, at the same time, put another 11 families onto the street. Honourable members should not forget that 117 applicants are still on the books. In the course of these actions, the 11 luxury units were dismantled. The luxury items were removed.

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr PREST: If the Minister does not know, he should ask the Works Department.

Mr Wharton: They are still there.

Mr PREST: Are they being used?

Mr Wharton: We didn't put anybody out.

Mr PREST: Yes, the Minister did.

This Government should not be buying real estate. It should be putting money into the building industry in order to bring some benefit to the unemployed and to business people.

In the short time remaining to me, I want to draw the attention of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to the activities of the SGIO Building Society, and in particular to the case of a person who borrows money from the society to build a home which will be his principal place of residence. At present if that person is forced to leave his city of residence and travel to Callide or Stanwell to obtain a job, even though he leaves his wife and family in the house, he is forced to pay up to 3 per cent more on the money he borrowed. That is totally wrong. If a person is forced to travel to another area to obtain employment and leaves his family in the house, even though the loan is in his name, the rate of interest should not change.

Time expired.

Mrs CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers) (5.31 p.m.): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Now swear allegiance to the Queen.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I will do so on behalf of all those members who I have noticed have not done so.

At the outset of my address, through His Excellency the Governor, I pledge my continuing loyalty and affection, and that of my constituents, to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I assure His Excellency that I believe that support for the Crown, the Commonwealth and the flag has never been stronger in the electorate of Pine Rivers. I also acknowledge our returned soldiers, and those who did not return, who fought to keep out country free. They fought under our Australian flag.

I worry about the way the Federal Government is attempting to change our way of life, an attempt which will do nothing but tear our families apart. The Sex Discrimination Act, the removal of the word "God" from the oath of allegiance and the right of defacto of Federal parliamentarians to free overseas travel are innovations to be deplored, as they could result in the break-down of the family unit.

The Queensland Government may be frowned upon as not being quite with it, as the Opposition would have it, but it is strong, stable and firm in its policies, which are

opposed to the innovations I have mentioned and legislation that attempts to destroy our way of life. There are suggestions that a referendum might be held under section 128 of the Constitution. At the rate elections are being held, why should we not have a referendum as well? This suggestion is made by the same people who, when this Government attempts to do something with a building, scream "Heritage", although it is they who are destroying our heritage. Woe betide any of us who, if born in another country, should ever wish to lose that close connection gained at birth, as I felt was indicated by the member for Windsor——

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. Under Standing Order No. 120, which I have checked, the honourable member is casting aspersions upon me and I ask her to withdraw totally.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Menzel): Who was casting aspersions on whom?

Mr COMBEN: On me.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker, but in his speech the other day the honourable member said that he had no connection——

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

Mrs CHAPMAN: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thought I heard the honourable member correctly when he spoke the other day.

Industry and commerce in our State must flourish. Because of the way in which we are facing up to the unreasonable requests of unions, we are saying to business, "Queensland will be able to protect you." We, in Queensland, through our Government, want non-compulsory unionism. The accord set up by the Federal Government was favourable towards the unions. Can anyone tell me when Mr Hawke has made a decision without consensus entering into his reply? That allows him to go back and consult with his colleagues, especially Mr Dolan, who nearly always gets his own way. That is slowly, but surely destroying small business industry. One has only to read the comments made by the Federal Treasurer to know what he thinks about small business. They were printed in the local press today, and because everyone believes that the press is right, they must be correct.

The only way to eradicate unemployment is to ensure that enough profit is made by business to let it expand and employ more people. But how can profit be made in the light of such demands as a 38-hour week, a loading on the wage system, termination pay and redundancy pay, to name but a few?

The risks are taken by the employers but the rewards are very few. Taxation is a huge problem to all persons in business. Each of us should take a long, hard look at our electorates to see exactly what is happening to small business. If we do so, the answer will come back loud and clear—get rid of the unions and get everyone back to work. To those persons who have sweetheart agreements with unions, I say, "You do not deserve any pity from others who, through their struggles, have tried to do the right thing. You have set the precedent for even tougher times for the industry."

The shame of it all is that we have Federal and State unions. Thank God our State Government, through the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), has seen fit, with the backing of small business, to take a stand and start fighting back. I congratulate the Government on doing so.

No doubt the saying that a worker's next rise could cost his mate his job is certainly one to be heeded by the members of the general public who depend on small business for their living. It was proven in more ways than one during the wage pause.

Mr Davis: With what small business are you associated?

Mrs CHAPMAN: I am associated with every small business. I represent them here. I represent the people in all small businesses. Small business has been neglected totally by the Federal Government, as is evidenced by the statements made by Mr Keating.

Mr Innes: Did you note that, yesterday, the Federal Treasurer insulted all small businesses?

Mrs CHAPMAN: I certainly did.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: He was certainly not siding with the Opposition when he talked about small business.

Under the wages pause, industry started to pick up and get back on its feet. It had started to recover but, alas, the recovery fell by the wayside after the present Federal Labor Government entered into and enjoyed a de facto relationship with the unions.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Menzel): Order! I remind the honourable member for Wolston that I do not mind occasional interjections, but I think the House should be able to hear the member in reasonable silence.

Mrs CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have become accustomed to dumping garbage.

Compensation is always a heavy burden on small business. In Queensland, we have what is known as a single-insurer system. All persons in the State should fight vigorously against any move by the Commonwealth to nationalise workers' compensation.

Mr Comben: Claude wants you to wind up.

Mrs CHAPMAN: He has told me to ignore people such as the honourable member. I am trying to do that, but it is very hard.

If that were to happen, Queensland would eventually be subsidising the other States in which premiums paid by employers are up to 400 per cent higher than those in Queensland. In Queensland, employers pay a mere \$4.70 for every \$100 paid in wages. New South Wales employers pay \$29.54 and Victorian employers pay \$21.88 on high-rise sites and \$14.48 on low-rise projects. In Victoria, the employers of underground coal miners pay \$40.22. That is five times the rate paid in Queensland, which is \$8.20.

Confidence and incentive are what we have in Queensland, and we are lucky to have both. Provided that the weather does not affect our rural sector too much, we should have a very sound future.

What a pity it was that the sugar industry, which is in a desperate position at the moment, did not get the hand-outs that were offered by the Labor Party prior to the last Federal election. My heartfelt sympathy goes to all of those people who gave their all to the sugar industry and put Queensland on the map through their pioneering spirit.

Transport is of paramount importance. As areas expand, more and more specialised transport is needed. The introduction of electric trains, which provide clean and efficient travel, has greatly benefited the areas close to the city. It has brought suburbs even closer to the city. As people can now park and ride, there is less traffic in the inner city area.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Wolston will refer to the honourable member for Pine Rivers by her correct title.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is not her correct title. She is the honourable member for Pine Rivers.

Mrs CHAPMAN: However, I am very concerned about the transport facilities in Albany Creek and Bracken Ridge. I will present a petition from 690 residents of Bracken Ridge to the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) for his urgent attention. It contains proposals for relieving the problems in those areas.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Multiple interjections will not be tolerated.

Mrs CHAPMAN: Computerisation is being introduced into Government departments. That is a step forward for the 16 departments involved, and another step forward for Queensland.

No matter which Government is in power, it needs to take a long, hard look at the unemployment problem. It is not the easiest problem to overcome.

A Government's commitment to low levels of tax is of paramount importance, and I am pleased that the Queensland Government has taken some initiatives in that direction. Queensland is the lowest taxed mainland State in Australia.

Queensland is benefiting from a significant increase in birth rate, in addition to all those southerners, or, should I say, persons from south of the border who are flocking to our great State in large numbers each month.

The Commonwealth Games, which were held in Brisbane, were the forerunner of things to come. When Expo goes on show in 1988, Queensland will show its expertise to the world in no uncertain style. The bonus that Queensland will receive from Expo 88 will be the development of a major transport interchange at the Roma Street Station. Once Expo 88 is on display, Queensland's friendly way of life and friendly atmosphere will certainly be known world-wide.

I now look at some of the major projects being undertaken in Queensland. The Burdekin Falls Dam is nearing completion at a cost of \$42m, including associated works. This financial year, \$80m is being spent on hospital projects, including the new obstetrics facility at the Queen Elizabeth II Hospital.

Queensland will never be able to afford enough homes to house those people in need of housing. The question that should be asked is: Can the Government keep building homes for between \$40,000 and \$45,000 and renting them for approximately \$28 a week? It is of paramount importance that people should be able to buy their own homes from the Government which, with the help of the Federal Government, should be able to afford to build more welfare housing.

Of course, we all must understand that sooner or later the barrel must run dry. Only a certain percentage of the population is paying taxes, and once the number of people receiving welfare payments is greater than the number of people paying taxes, a real problem will arise. That day is not too far off. Any Government would be less than honest if it did not say, "Yes, welfare payments and costs are a real worry." The welfare payments made to people who definitely need them are not a worry; those that are made to people who do not need them are. How can that matter be policed? No-one can be certain that the money is being paid out where it is needed most.

Queensland has set the pace for Handihomes and in my area of Pine Rivers the first Handihome has been opened.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Chamber will come to order. The honourable member for Pine Rivers will be heard in silence. The interjections are adding nothing to the debate and the member for Pine Rivers is not accepting them.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murrumba will come to order.

Mr KRUGER: I rise to a point of order. The first Handihome in Queensland is being opened in the electorate of Murrumba.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I applaud the honourable member's good fortune, but there is no point of order.

Mrs CHAPMAN: In answer to the member for Murrumba, I point out that I said that the Handihome is to be opened in the area of Pine Rivers. I remind the House that I am also the deputy chairman of the Pine Rivers Shire Council.

Mr Comben: You have two jobs!

Mrs CHAPMAN: I would take up four jobs if I could help people. I have to do all the work that Labor Party people do not do.

It is wonderful that many barriers were torn down in the Year of the Disabled. In performing daily chores, or in everyday life, many benefits for handicapped persons can be seen. Doors open the correct way, ramps have been built where there used to be steps and car-parking has been set aside for the sole use of disabled persons.

Queensland's schools are better than ever and many facilities have been provided. Some students return to their homes of an evening that have nowhere near the facilities provided at school. I pay tribute to p. and c. associations, and they deserve more recognition. I am sure that every honourable member will agree that, without the money raised by p. and c. associations, Governments would face greater expenses.

However, the drug problem will continue as long as there are children, schools and meeting places. I do not know how anyone with any feeling for his fellow-man could ever suggest that drugs should be legalised in any way, shape or form. Queensland, in an attempt to protect our clean way of life, has taken a positive step to fight the illicit trade in hard drugs. However, I must say that no legislation could ever be strong enough to stop those who deal in this trade. I deplore any moves for the legalisation of drugs.

I hope that, through the strong, understanding and definite way that Queensland has gone ahead, the State and its people will prosper under the guide-lines set out by His Excellency the Governor in his Opening Speech.

Mr McLEAN (Bulimba) (5.48 p.m.): I welcome the opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply debate. Because of the sickening way in which the many Government speakers have patted one another on the back, a few things should be said before I turn to the main issues.

Mr Lee interjected.

Mr McLEAN: Just looking at the member for Yeronga makes me sick. I notice that he and his Liberal Party colleagues are in the Chamber today, but during the divisions last night they were conspicuous by their absence. The honourable member for Yeronga will have plenty of time to interject because I have plenty of say.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Bulimba will address the Chair.

Mr McLEAN: Government speakers have not mentioned the good things that the present Federal Government has done for Queensland and Australia.

Some reference should be made to the disastrous seven years that Australia suffered under the Liberal Party and Mr Fraser as its leader. Over that period, unemployment reached record levels, the highest since the Great Depression; interest rates sky-rocketed to an unbelievable height; taxes were higher than they had ever been before; schemes

such as bottom of the harbour schemes, which were costing the country approximately \$7,000m, were rife; and massive cuts were made in welfare services. Not a great deal can be said for Mr Fraser and the Liberal Party during its seven-year term of office before Mr Hawke came to power in Canberra.

As to the criticisms that have been levelled by National Party members—I have not heard any Liberal Party members participate in this debate—at the deal that Queensland is receiving from the Federal Government—after Tasmania, Queensland already receives the best relative deal from the Commonwealth. At the last Premiers Conference, Queensland received the highest percentage increases in Federal funds of any State.

Mr McPhie: I think you included what they owed us anyway.

Mr McLEAN: Little Sir Echo!

In anyone's terms, the Federal Government was being quite generous. I suggest that it is valid to claim that Queensland is being subsidised by other States. In 1983-84, Queensland received \$720 per head, compared with \$580 for New South Wales and \$561 for Victoria. In Commonwealth tax-sharing grants, every Queenslanders received \$166 more than every Victorian. That is not unreasonable by anyone's standards. If Queensland had been paid at the same per capita rate as Victoria, this financial year this State would have received \$417m less than it did receive.

As for the biggest myth of all, namely, that Queensland is a low-tax State—since the last State election, almost 3 000 Government taxes, fees and charges have been increased. Despite promises made by the Premier and Treasurer that Government charges would rise only in line with the rate of inflation, increases in Government charges have been as high as 10 times the inflation rate. Since 1975-76, Queensland has had the second highest increase in State taxes. Those facts are set out in the Reserve Bank bulletin of December 1983. So the myth that Queensland is a low-tax State can be dispelled quite easily.

Mr McPhie: That has not convinced me.

Mr McLEAN: Listen a bit longer.

The CPI State charges index shows that from 1981-82 to 1982-83 State charges and taxes increased by 43.6 per cent. Over the same period, the inflation rate for Brisbane was 19.5 per cent.

As to some of the services that this Government provides—despite the fact that Queensland obtains the best relativity deal from the Commonwealth, the level of services provided by the Queensland Government remains the lowest in Australia. Queensland spends 82.8 per cent of the national average on education, 74.4 per cent of the national average on health, 92.5 per cent of the national average on law, order and public safety, and 80.6 per cent of the national average on social services. Those figures come from the Commonwealth Grants Commission hearing in 1982.

Member after member on the Government side has claimed that the Queensland Government has managed its Budget very well. Queensland has a public sector debt amounting to \$1,741m, which is well above that of any other State. In 1983-84, Queenslanders will pay \$718m on the State's total debt.

As to the high charges that members of the public pay in Queensland—one of the first that comes to mind is electricity charges. Since 1975-76, the average Brisbane householder's quarterly electricity bill has increased by 165 per cent, from \$44 to \$118. The removal of the tariff concession for continuous hot-water heating will probably force substantial additional expense upon house-holders. After Western Australia, Queensland has the second highest electricity charges in Australia.

Brisbane has the highest milk prices of any capital city. Despite the fact that Queensland has no petrol tax, it still has the highest petrol price of any State. Motorists are obviously being ripped off. The Queensland Government is allowing that to happen.

As to motor vehicle registration fees—in 1978 in Queensland, it cost \$41 to register a four-cylinder vehicle and \$62 to register a six-cylinder vehicle; in 1984, it cost \$96 to register a four-cylinder vehicle and \$150 to register a six-cylinder vehicle. That represents an increase of 142 per cent. The lowest charge to register a six-cylinder vehicle is \$62 in South Australia. There is a great difference between the fee charged in South Australia and that charged in Queensland. The myth that Queensland is a low-tax State can be dispelled quite easily. If Government members are honest about that matter, they would agree with what I have said.

The member for Pine Rivers referred to unemployment in Queensland. The Queensland Government needs to explain why, according to the latest statistics, Queensland was the only State other than Tasmania not to register a record drop in unemployment. It is ironic that the two non-Labor States are going against the national trend of declining unemployment. The level of unemployment in Queensland remained static in July, with 104 300, or 9.2 per cent of the work-force, unemployed. All other States with the exception of Tasmania showed a drop in unemployment, with the national average falling to 8.4 per cent. Victoria had the lowest unemployment rate of 7.1 per cent—a significant difference when compared with the rate in Queensland; in fact the rate was more than 2 per cent lower.

In Queensland, the level of youth unemployment, which is a matter that worries many people, remained a disaster, with 22 200, or 21.3 per cent, of 15 to 19-year-olds unemployed in July. That was a substantial rise on the previous month's rate of 19.1 per cent. At the latest Grants Commission hearing in Brisbane, Queensland Treasury officials admitted that the Queensland economy was narrowly based and recovering more slowly than the economy in other States. That is obvious. It is also obvious that the major reason for that is the State Government's failure to encourage diversification of the Queensland economy, and that showed up in the high unemployment figures. I believe that the Government should realise that advertising campaigns do not broaden the State's economic base.

Mr Davis: Particularly when you see some of the Ministers' faces on the advertisements.

Mr McLEAN: I could not agree more.

A complete reappraisal of the State Government's policies is needed. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) should take the high unemployment figures as a warning. Queensland is failing to tackle the problem of adult and, especially, youth unemployment, and urgent growth and employment stimulation is required if Queensland, along with Tasmania, is not to be left further and further behind.

Mr Kruger: Do you think that Mr Lester really knows the problem?

Mr McLEAN: I am quite sure that he does not.

A number of issues that I wish to raise are related to industrial relations. I was interested to hear the very narrow-minded and uninformed comments made by the member for Pine Rivers.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr McLEAN: If the honourable member listens, he will find out.

The success of the Hawke Government is probably nowhere more obvious than in the field of industrial relations. I refer particularly to the prices and incomes accord. It was built round a consensus and involvement by people from the trade union movement, industry and Governments. When the Hawke Government entered office, it faced an

enormous deficit, double-digit unemployment and double-digit inflation, with no signs of recovery. To its credit, it has achieved some radical and innovative results.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr McLEAN: Before the dinner recess, I mentioned the efforts of the Fraser Government during the seven years it was in power before the Hawke Labor Government. I now turn to the success that the Hawke Government is having in industrial relations, the field in which the National Party Government is having its greatest failure. The membership of the National Party seems to have great difficulty in understanding the real problems involved in industrial relations. Because of that, Queensland is confronted with more industrial trouble than any other State.

The historic setting up of the prices and incomes accord showed that the Federal Government was prepared to face the problem of industrial relations. When the Hawke Government came to power, it faced all sorts of problems that I will not detail. However, I must offer my congratulations for the way in which it has handled these problems. Unless the problem of industrial relations is faced, Queensland, and, indeed, the whole of Australia, has no chance of extracting itself from the dire problems of unemployment that existed when the present Federal Government came to power. At that time, confrontation was everywhere.

Many people do not understand what the Labor Government has done in setting up the prices and incomes accord. The first basic tenet is that the Labor Government sees industrial relations as one of a number of interdependent policy areas. Industrial relations cannot be considered in a vacuum, just as other problems cannot be considered without having regard to the attaching industrial relations implications. The second tenet is that the Government is firmly committed to consultation and co-operation as a way of developing and implementing industrial relations policies.

It is probably worth remembering that the trade union movement is not an abstract mass. Because I have been involved in the trade union movement over many years, I say with all sincerity that although those on the Government side appear to be of the opinion that the trade union movement is controlled by a few officials, most certainly that is not so. Members opposite seem to forget that three million Australian men and women are involved in the trade union movement. Those people express their aspirations through trade unions. The great majority of Australian trade unionists are willing to play a constructive role in dealing with and overcoming the problems facing the country. Members opposite do not give them credit for that approach; they openly roast the trade union movement.

Particularly since the Hawke Labor Government has given the trade union movement an opportunity to express opinions, it has shown that it is very capable of making a positive contribution to an overall improvement in the nation's economic and industrial output. Any fair-minded person would agree with that. Largely as a result of union acceptance of and adherence to a new wage system, industrial conflict in Australia has reduced dramatically.

The level of industrial disputes in 1983 was 25 per cent lower than in 1982, and time lost through industrial disputes fell to the lowest level for 16 years. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for September 1983 showed that, compared with the same period in 1981-82, industrial disputation fell by more than half in the 12 months to September 1983, and it would be necessary to go back 15 years to find a lower September figure for working days lost. Those figures speak volumes for the success of the prices and incomes accord as a way of sustaining economic recovery through co-operation with trade unions.

I have other figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics that I feel should be cited. They are of great importance in determining the means of decreasing industrial conflict. They show that a high proportion of strikes result from managerial policies covering misunderstandings and disagreements on such matters as rosters,

overtime, pay calculations, terminations and promotions. For instance, in the three months ended September 1982, managerial policy caused 46 per cent of the total number of strikes and 15 per cent of the total number of working days lost.

Relations in the trade union movement have probably never been better, and will probably continue to improve. The benefits of the incomes accord are probably now clear to everyone. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and in a very short period the Federal Government has led a recovery from record unemployment, record inflation and record just about everything else that was detrimental to the average Australian.

Mr Davis: I haven't noticed any Government members complimenting the Labor Party on reducing inflation.

Mr McLEAN: Because they were so vocal when the Hawke Government took over and said how bad inflation would get, it is surprising. To their astonishment, it has dropped to about 5 per cent, yet not one Government member has mentioned that in the past two weeks.

Mrs Chapman: Wait till you look at the deficit.

Mr McLEAN: The honourable member should wait to see next year's deficit.

Mr Veivers: We inherited \$9.5 billion.

Mr McLEAN: Although the Hawke Government should be congratulated for so many achievements, not one Government member has said a word.

The Queensland Government shows its greatest weakness in the area of industrial relations. It has failed to understand the problems, and on all occasions has been a dismal failure. On just about every occasion when there is a problem we see confrontation and agitation by Ministers—we see it from the Premier on every occasion—and conflict—

Mr Davis: Their answer to everything is to bring back the old anthem.

Mr McLEAN: Government members would bring back the cat-o'-nine-tails if they had the chance.

This Government still persists with the old, backward attitude to industrial relations that has been tried and discarded in most other countries.

There has been a flow-through from the accord to the Queensland private sector. There has been a lessening of industrial disputation, although Queensland still lags behind the rest of Australia in public sector industrial relations. The Government is constantly spoiling for confrontation. One can pick up a newspaper on almost any day of the week and read about some sort of confrontation or conflict. Fortunately for a great many workers in Queensland the benefits of the accord are still coming through.

On the recent figures concerning stoppages, it is to be noted that the position in Queensland has improved slightly. It is also to be noted that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs said that the industrial relations policy of the Government is now flowing through.

I will deal with that statement now, because it is in this area that the big problems lie now and in the future. The Government's attitude to a number of issues leaves much to be desired, particularly in the light of the example set by the accord and the Federal Government's preparedness to sit down and talk to all people about the problems that confront Australia.

It is very unfortunate that Queensland is the problem State in getting the whole scheme working smoothly. Probably the best example I can cite relates to when the Premier was overseas having talks about getting Brisbane chosen as the site for Expo. After the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs had issued a press statement—apparently the Premier rang him up about it—an article was published on page 1 of

“The Courier-Mail” dated 30 April 1984. I will deal with the press article and the response to it by many people. It was headed, “State plans big fines to curb unions”, and read—

“Tough new industrial laws outlawing picketing and imposing \$1000 fines for unionists harassing non-union workers will be introduced by the Queensland Government in August.

Secondary boycotts—or sympathy strikes and boycotts by union members in related industries—also will be banned.

Outlining the new laws yesterday, the Employment and Industrial Relations Minister, Mr Lester, described the Australian Workers Union as the ‘Industrial cowboys of the union movement’ and accused the Federal Government of kowtowing to the unions’.”

Mr Tenni: They always do.

Mr McLEAN: If the Minister waits for a moment, I will deal with that remark. The article continues—

“The new measures were necessary if the State Government were to curb union misbehavior.

‘The Government has to be strong when unions are threatening jobs. The unions have forced us to bring in this new legislation. . .’ he said.

‘Joining a union should be like joining a club,’ he said.

‘People usually consider the club’s merits and whether the service is good enough.’”

Mr Tenni: That is right.

Mr McLEAN: That is about the limit of the Minister’s experience in industrial relations. That is the rock on which the Government will founder. The Minister’s comment demonstrates his understanding of the trade movement and industrial relations. The Minister does not understand. He has not listened to one word that I have said.

Mr Tenni: You are wrecking the country.

Mr McLEAN: The Minister should keep talking; he is getting in deeper.

Mr Tenni: You are like the union rep. who has all the money, and the little bloke who wants a job is being done out of it by people like you.

Mr McLEAN: That proves the narrow-mindedness of the Government. I repeat that the Government will founder on the rock which is the inability of all Government members to understand the real situation with trade unionism and industrial relations world-wide. The Minister does not understand. He does not know and he does not want to know. He will never know.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The Minister does not know. The Government wants confrontation.

Mrs Chapman: Where are the democratic rights in unionism?

Mr McLEAN: There are democratic rights under unionism.

The press article continues—

“ ‘The Hawke Government is going to have to wake up to its responsibilities,’ Mr Lester said.

Under the new legislation, arrest and a \$1,000 fine would apply to any union leader who harassed workers. The union also would face heavy penalties.

Mr Lester said penalties for breaking the bans on picketing and secondary boycotts would be 'heavy enough to stop them'."

Although there are no Liberals in the Chamber, that statement was backed by them.

Mr Miller: There is an Independent Liberal.

Mr McLEAN: Turn it up, Col!

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr McLEAN: He is not an Independent, either.

The press article also stated—

"In Canberra last night, the Deputy Opposition Leader, Mr Howard, said the Federal Government's repeal of section 45D of the Trade Practices Act governing secondary boycotts would be opposed 'every inch of the way'

He said the section was a 'precious safeguard against union intimidation', and the only effective sanction against 'irresponsible' union disruption."

Mr Tenni: Of course it is. They are irresponsible at all times. You know as well as I do.

Mr McLEAN: Do they at times not accept commission decisions?

Mr Tenni: My oath, they do!

Mr McLEAN: Do they? Do you agree that they should accept commission decisions?

Mr Tenni: They don't most of the time.

Mr McLEAN: Does the Minister believe that Governments should?

Mr Tenni: Of course Governments should, and we always do.

Mr McLEAN: Will he stay a little while?

Mr Tenni: I will stay here for ever. I was here before you, and I will be here after you are gone.

Mr McLEAN: We will see. I shall continue with my speech, and we can argue about that one later.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair occasionally, too.

Mr McLEAN: I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker, but the misconduct tonight is coming from the Government side of the Chamber.

Turning to some of the problems that exist in the industrial relations area—

Mr Tenni: A typical union-lover.

Mr McLEAN: Would the Minister shut up for a while? He does not even know his own portfolio.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Prest: He would be the greatest idiot on the other side.

Mr McLEAN: He is by far the greatest clown in the Ministry.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Chamber to come to order and the honourable member for Bulimba to continue his speech.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McLEAN: I would like to continue with my speech, if I could.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McLEAN: It is extremely difficult because of the behaviour of the——

Mr Prest: Minister.

Mr McLEAN: The Minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: And the member for Port Curtis.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Port Curtis to come to order, and I ask the Minister to refrain from making provocative remarks. I would like to hear the member for Bulimba.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Port Curtis under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr McLEAN: I refer to an article in the "Sunday Sun" of 12 August 1984. It is headed "Joh Ready to take on Court!", and it states—

"The Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, plans action to overturn a State Industrial Commission decision approving compulsory unionism in Queensland.

A commission full bench ruled on Friday that unionists should get job preference in the State Public Service.

Sir Joh said yesterday: 'We will not accept that. It is the clear policy of our Government that people should not be compelled to join unions'.

'I will carry that policy and attitude to the utmost'.

'The policy of the Government is firm and well known. The court ruling is in direct opposition to our policy.

'The point is, does a court have the right to determine Government policy? I say that it does not'."

I have referred to that article for one reason: the Minister and just about every other member on the Government side talk about the unruly behaviour of unions and say that they are not prepared to accept the umpire's decision. On the other hand, we read headlines such as the one to which I have just referred.

Statements from Ministers are different. I do not know what is happening in the Government. I refer in particular to a press statement by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. He said that the State Industrial Commission was well respected in the community and by employer and employee organisations for its quick decisions and prompt resolution of industrial disputes. Two-thirds of Queensland workers are covered by awards of the Queensland Commission and only one-quarter of employees are covered by Federal awards. The Minister also said that State commissioners were on the job within hours of a dispute erupting and that they also had their ears to the ground.

On the one hand, the Minister has given the State Industrial Commission of Queensland a wrap-up; on the other hand, the Premier, backed up by the same Minister in other statements—I do not know whether he has gone cross-eyed—has criticised the

commission. If it could be believed that the Government is not hypocritical, it could be said that a mistake has been made. My experience in this place leads me to believe that that is not the case.

I was touching on another matter before I was rudely interrupted by the incompetent Minister for whatever he is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! That is unparliamentary language. I ask the member for Bulimba to withdraw those remarks.

Mr McLEAN: Very well. I was referring to the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni).

Mr TENNI: I rise to a point of order. I feel that those words are completely out of order. They are distasteful to me, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! They have been withdrawn.

Mr McLEAN: I would like to read from a decision of the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission about preference to unionists. I do so because there has been much publicity about the decision setting a precedent, and questions have been asked as to whether the Industrial Commission had jurisdiction to bring down such a ruling. In part, the decision reads—

“The applicants before us have pointed to their records before this Commission in pursuit of the industrial interests of their membership. There was no effort by the respondent to mount any challenge in this regard—an attitude we are able to understand because, in our view, no effective challenge could have been made. Each of the applicants has actively represented its membership both before this Tribunal and elsewhere in negotiations and discussions. That the benefits so derived may also be applied to non-members in no way lessens the recognition to which the Union is entitled, nor should it detract from the validity of claims seeking some measure of preference as to its membership.

In the circumstances of an identifiable area of largely career Crown employment, this Commission would not want to adopt a policy which required a demonstrated level of industrial disputation arising from conflict between unionists and non-unionists as a pre-requisite to considering it advisable to grant preference to unionists. To do so would seem both counter productive and a contradiction of the inherent, if unstated, objects of the legislation to which we now respond by deciding that in the total circumstances of the matters before us we believe it is advisable to grant preference of employment in terms of the amended applications which are before us.

Variations will be issued to give effect to this decision and will operate from 20th August 1984.”

That decision was signed by the three commissioners involved.

It is time that Queensland fell into line with the other Australian States concerning the accord that has been reached by consensus with those involved in the decision-making process. By being out of step, Queensland will eventually fall into a trap. From the Premier's provocative statements in opposition to the decision of the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission, it is quite obvious that his performance is not very much better than that of leaders in fascist Germany at the time when union leaders were under attack.

Mr Tenni: You mean communist Russia. That is what you support.

Mr McLEAN: Is the Minister supporting fascist ideals?

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The Minister supports fascist ideals.

Any country that does not have freedom of trade-unionism and freedom for workers is under a dictatorship, whether it be right wing or left wing. I do not agree with either, but it is quite obvious that the Minister does.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! This continual exchange between the honourable member for Bulimba and the Minister will cease. I will have order in the Chamber. I have given the Minister the protection of the Chair, and I do not appreciate further incitement to disorder.

Mr McLEAN: In the few minutes remaining, I should like to outline some of the policies that were set out in the Statement of Accord reached by business, the Government and unions.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr McLEAN: I shall quote from the Statement of Accord, and I should then like the Minister to tell me whether or not he disagrees with what I read out. These policies were arrived at by a cross-section of business people who make decisions in the business area, trade unions and the Government. It is quite obvious that Government members do not agree; certainly the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services does not agree. He wants Nazism in this country. If he had his way, it would be here.

I quote as follows from the Statement of Accord—

“These (fundamental features of effective prices and incomes policies) are:

The policies should aim to ensure that living standards of wages and salary earners and non-income earning sectors of the population requiring protection are maintained and through time increased with movements in national productivity.”

Surely the Minister does not disagree with that? I quote further—

“Government policy should be applied to prices and all income groups, rather than, as has often been the case, to wages alone.”

Surely he does not disagree with that? And further—

“The policies should be designed to bring about an equitable and clearly discernible redistribution of income.”

Surely he does not disagree with that? Finally—

“There must be continuous consultation and co-operation between the parties involved.”

Does he disagree with that?

Mr Tenni: Yes.

Mr McLEAN: He does? He does not want to talk to people; is that what he is saying? That shows the limit of his brains.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McLEAN: I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker, but it is very difficult for me to contain myself in view of comments such as that from the Minister. I repeat—

“There must be continuous consultation and co-operation between the parties involved.”

Surely the Minister will not tell me that he does not agree with that. Even a Nazi-supporter such as he would agree with that.

I have one final point to make. The Statement of Accord also says—

“Government policy at all levels should be accommodating and supportive.”

Does the Minister agree with that? Even he, with his extreme right-wing attitudes and stupidity, must agree with that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bulimba will continue with his speech and address the Chair. He will not direct his attention to other members in the Chamber. I cannot have all honourable members talking at once.

Mr McLEAN: I have very little time left, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Time expired.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (7.44 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I participate in this debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I begin my contribution by affirming my allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I am certain that the electors of Mount Gravatt, and indeed, all Queenslanders, join me in my affirmation of loyalty.

I gather that His Excellency's speech may well have been his last to the Queensland Parliament, as he may well retire in early to mid 1985. If that is the case, may I wish His Excellency a very happy retirement.

At the same time, I congratulate the former Leader of the Opposition on his apparent elevation to the House of Representatives. I wish him well in the particular task that he has chosen.

I place on record my congratulations to the newly elected Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton), the newly elected Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns), the newly elected Whip for the Opposition (Mr Davis) and the newly elected Leader of Opposition Business in the House (Mr Prest). I am sure that those gentlemen will perform those tasks with great distinction.

The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, the Minister for Education, the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs, together with the honourable members for Aspley and Toowong, spoke extensively on the conference to be held at Queensland University this week-end to discuss lesbianism and homosexuality. Numerous comments have been made and some regrettable interjections have been tossed across this Chamber by a few honourable members who seem to feel that the whole issue is a massive joke. How sad it is to note that so many of those comments have come from the ALP, which prides itself on so-called sexual tolerance. The comments show considerable intolerance and tells us nothing about lesbianism and homosexuality but a great deal about the interjectors themselves.

In the midst of all the comments, not one word has been heard about the stand of the Christian church. In this Assembly, we hear from Marxists, feminists, socialists, pragmatists, capitalists, and so on; rarely do we hear the Christian voice in this political forum.

I am an active member of a very large Christian church, the Garden City Christian Church, at Mt Gravatt. I feel certain that I speak on behalf of all my brothers and sisters in Christ at Garden City Christian Church and the wider body of the church when I state that that conference is to be profoundly regretted. As Christians, we cannot break the specific injunctions in scripture that determine our stand on the whole issue. We, as Christians, believe that homosexuality and lesbianism are a personality aberration; they are not genetically based. As such, we in the church believe that the whole life of lesbians and homosexuals can be transformed by a life based on love of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Scripture is quite specific in its rejection of homosexuality as an acceptable way of life. In Leviticus, 18, verse 22 the Lord proclaims boldly and clearly to the children of Israel, "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination."

Again in Leviticus, 20, verse 13, scripture says, "If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination."

Perhaps the most frequently quoted scriptures are those passages from the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans. In Romans, 1, verses 21, 26 and 27, St Paul says of the Romans—

“For although they knew God they did not honour Him as God or give thanks to Him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened

For this reason God gave them up to dishonourable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and their men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passions for one another, men committing shameless acts with men”—

and so on.

In his first letter to the church at Corinth, St Paul says in chapter 6, verses 9 and 10—

“Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers, will inherit the kingdom of God.”

St Paul also says in Timothy, 1, 10, that immoral persons such as sodomites are not blessed of God. I suggest that all honourable members might also read Colossians, chapter 3.

As a Christian, I agree with those scriptures, hence I cannot condone the University of Queensland conference.

As a Christian, I do not want to stand on the outside and simply hurl abuse or ridicule, make slanderous comments, make insensitive jokes or make fighting statements, and so on. That resides in the realm of the intolerant and is unchristian. Rather, I join with tens of thousands of my brothers and sisters in Christ in praying that each of the participants in the conference will come to know the peace and joy of a life based on obedience to the word of God. That is my prayer; I am sure it is the hope and prayer of all honourable members of this House.

I wish now to raise the issue of handicapped people and the provisions that our society makes for such people. May I take this opportunity of congratulating the Queensland Government, especially the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz), for designating this week, in this the Queensland Year of the Family, Handicapped Persons Week. I notice that quite a number of valuable activities have been organised, all of which have been designed to focus attention on the quality of life of disabled people.

How fitting it is that such a week should occur so soon after the recent Olympics for disabled people at which Australian—especially, I might add, Queensland—handicapped sportsmen and sportswomen performed so marvellously well. There has been a quiet revolution in society in attitudes towards handicapped people. That revolution has resulted in a higher level of acceptance by the community of disabled persons; hence, disabled people are now more visible in our midst.

The revolution has occurred on many fronts. The whole area of mobility has been revolutionised by major advances in wheelchair design and function, lifting aids, transport by motor vehicle, and so on. All of this has been accompanied by marvellous improvements in home care support equipment and materials. I again invite you, Mr Deputy Speaker, all other honourable members and the public in general to visit the Independent Living Centre at Greenslopes so that they can see what is being achieved.

Mr Comben: What about some more Government funding?

Mr HENDERSON: I wonder how many people have noticed the quiet revolution that has occurred in town-planning to accommodate the needs of the disabled. I am

pleased the honourable member for Windsor and I share a common concern. Perhaps if we fought together and not against one another, we would achieve our ends.

Street corners now have the gutters levelled out to allow wheelchairs to move readily from street to street. Buildings have ramps and special facilities for the handicapped. If one visits a large suburban shopping centre, one sees a long list of aids for the disabled. A major area of improvement, one which I am sure all honourable members and decent people will applaud, is the area of personal hygiene and toilet needs. Until comparatively recently, little provision was made for the toileting of disabled people. Hence, just a few short years ago, a simple visit to a local shopping centre, to a park, to the beach, and so on, became almost impossible for hundreds of thousands of disabled people throughout the world, because suitable toilet facilities did not exist.

The whole world has now recognised that a massive improvement has been made through the simplest of innovations—toilet doors that open outwards. If one talks to any family that cares for disabled people, one will find out how grateful they are for this simple innovation. If one talks to emergency service personnel, they will state how important those toilet doors are in saving lives.

I can speak from personal experience. For many years, I have lived through all the trials and tribulations of caring for a severely incapacitated family member at home. One of my former near neighbours can relate the bitter frustration of having a family member die in a toilet while rescuers were frantically trying to break down the door. Because of that, thousands of decent, sensitive Australians are indebted to those who crusaded for the simple innovation. One such crusader to whom I personally am most profoundly thankful is the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Vince Lester).

I have said that nearly all Australians applaud the now universally applied safety standard that toilet doors, especially for the disabled, should open outwards. I do not say that all Australians respected this decision. It seems that there are, regrettably, among us some people who wish to score points at the expense of the disabled. One such person appears to be Mr Ric Allen, who writes the column "Exit Line" in the "The Sunday Mail". In last Sunday's edition, he saw fit to score points off the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs by deriding his campaign to have toilet doors open outwards. Tonight, I feel certain that I speak on behalf of the families, the friends and the supporters of the disabled, plus the disabled themselves and all honourable members, in expressing concern at Mr Allen's insensitivity.

I am sure that Mr Allen did not wish to cause so much distress to so many people with his insensitive comment. I do stress that I feel that Mr Allen may not have recognised the extreme sensitivity of this issue. I do not condemn him for his comments, for I feel that he is probably a decent, honest and honourable man, but I am most profoundly disappointed that he saw fit to make the comment at all. Should Mr Allen wish to discuss the matter personally with me, I would be delighted to have him do so.

I want now to turn my attention to the job-creation schemes of the Australian Government. I note with enormous interest that the Prime Minister has told us on numerous occasions of his Government's achievements in the area of job creation. I want to take some time tonight to look carefully at the programs in some detail. I shall make detailed reference to the Victorian experience, as I believe that it shows the very worst aspects of this initiative.

The Hawke program provides temporary jobs of from three to 12 months' duration under a scheme called the Community Employment Program. During 1983-84 the funds available to CEP included an estimated \$200m saved during the wages pause of 1983. I might add that, during the 1984-85 financial year, the Federal Government plans to spend \$1,200m on the CEP.

It seems that there is a fundamental economic issue at stake. When we evaluate CEP and similar programs we cannot escape the fact that CEP creates temporary

Government-subsidised jobs at the expense of possible permanent jobs in the private sector. I might add that the program also subsidises State Government bureaucracies, and this probably also works counter to permanent job-creation programs.

I need not remind the House that CEP and similar programs are examples of extreme welfareism. It is true that the State traditionally provides for those facing hardships and great need, but it is a fundamental mistake to believe that a non-wealth-creating entity such as a Federal or State Government is a primary creator of jobs. The concept of the State as provider for all community needs is based on a cargo-cult view of the economic system, in which the tax system is regarded as an unlimited source of funds for Government activities.

Initially CEP was funded by what the Government saved in public service wages as part of the wage pause. Now it is proposed, not unreasonably, to expect that public servants and other wage-earners should make some sacrifice for the unemployed. However, it is important to remember that such a scheme creates no wealth and no additional income is generated. All that happens is that money is transferred from public servants to the recipients of aid under CEP. I need not remind this House that under such a program there is, firstly, no overall increase in national income; secondly, no increase in economic growth as such; and, hence, thirdly, no long-term solution to unemployment.

In the long term, without a wages pause or similar action, CEP and other programs will have to be financed from general tax revenue, by Government borrowings or by printing more money, all of which are areas of some specialty under Labor Governments. The paradox of such claims was summed up very well by Milton Friedman in his book "There's No Such Thing as a Free Lunch" In it he said—

"If job creation schemes are financed from taxes the taxpayer would have less to spend, which would reduce the number of persons employed in the private sector. New government employees would simply replace persons employed in the private sector.

If the funds come from borrowing from the public, less credit would be available to send to others. New government employees would simply replace persons employed in building houses or factories or machines that would have been financed by savings now absorbed by the public employment program. 'Make work' would replace employment devoted to adding to our productive wealth."

An examination of the Victorian Government's activities in job creation is very illuminating.

Mr Borbidge: They have had to increase taxes by 40 per cent to pay for them, too.

Mr HENDERSON: I quite recognise that.

Some 50 projects were reviewed in depth by the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research at Melbourne University. The institute found that the cost of creating one job was \$20,685. One wag correctly pointed out that the Victorian Government could have saved half the funds by simply handing everyone \$10,342.50 and letting them spend it in the community.

Other Governments, in the same way as Victoria, have used Federal Government hand-outs to pay for temporary staff, thus helping to disguise their real Budget deficits. The Victorian Government received \$72m between June 1983 and April 1984. Approximately 47 per cent went directly into State Government departments and instrumentalities, 31 per cent went to local government and 22 per cent went to various community groups.

It is interesting to note that the Cain Government received \$1,124,000 to set up a Community Employment Program data base to help administer the program. About \$163,000 was earmarked by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to provide a women's affairs office, with an information officer for \$10,000, a data-entry officer for

\$33,000, a personal assistant for \$12,000 for special projects, and so on. All of those were temporary jobs financed by CEP funds.

Federal funds of \$1,634,000 were allocated to various groups, such as the Movement Against Uranium Mining and Friends of the Earth. It is interesting to note that many of the groups are left-wing dominated groups that are now campaigning vigorously against uranium-mining, the Daintree forest road and so on. Seven major uranium-mining developments have been stopped by the activities of these groups. I believe that Friends of the Earth has employed a full-time organiser, paid out of CEP funds, to coordinate the Roxby Downs campaign.

Roxby Downs provides a classic case of the misuse of CEP funds. The ALP Premier of South Australia, Mr John Bannon, indicated that the Roxby Downs mine is worth about \$5.5 billion, with the potential to create up to 18 000 new jobs in a State that is desperately short of new job opportunities. The money to fight the ALP Government in South Australia over Roxby Downs is provided by ALP Governments in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia through CEP. That is yet another example of splits in the ALP. I could argue that CEP funds are really being used to destroy 18 000 potential jobs. What an economic absurdity that is!

It is sad to note that the Victorian ALP Government is generously subsidising an array of anti-USA, anti-ANZUS and anti-defence base groups. The so-called peace groups have received \$314,000. Various feminist groups have attracted \$2m. Unions and trades and labor councils have received \$1,445,000. Community and FM radio stations have received almost \$1m. The list is endless. It includes a number of communist groups, including FILEF, the Italian communist organisation, to which \$24,000 was granted.

Everything I have outlined is a blatant misuse of tax-payers' money. Groups such as the ones financed in Victoria have received nothing in Queensland. That is pleasing to note.

In the same way as the infamous Regional Employment Development Scheme of the Whitlam Government, the CEP program of the Hawke Government is doomed to failure unless massive amounts of tax-payers' money are poured into the scheme and thus lost in an array of useless projects. Unless vast amounts are borrowed or money is printed to finance the scheme, the whole CEP program will collapse like a pack of cards and, as happened to the RED scheme, it will leave in its wake little visible evidence of the enormous amounts of money involved. The scheme does not solve unemployment in the long term. Perhaps if the Government were to look at giving tax cuts to industry and providing positive incentives to promote free enterprise, long-term permanent jobs could be created. After all, what will happen to the tens of thousands of temporary employees once the money runs out? They will be right back where they started from, and CEP will simply stand as a monument to economic absurdity—an expensive substitute for unemployment benefits.

So, when Mr Hawke says that his Government has created 400 000 jobs, we need to ask ourselves the simple question: For how long? Sadly, the answer will be: Not long; possibly only until after the next Federal election.

In my criticism of CEP, I do admit that the program has brought economic welfare; it has also brought temporary jobs to a number of people. But what I am saying is that it is no solution to long-term and chronic unemployment and, as such, it needs to be reviewed very, very carefully.

May I finally make a comment on the recent creation science versus science debate. I would like to point out, first of all, my own involvement in this debate, and it stems from my period as a school administrator. In one school in which I was teaching, a science teacher set a compulsory assignment, which simply said, "Account for the evolution of the phylum Chordata." Basically, what happened in that situation was that one student who presented an assignment presented a creation science point of view. As a result of that, he received zero. His parents happened to be members of a

fundamentalist Christian sect that believed that the creation science point of view was the correct point of view. The parents, rightly, came to the school and protested to me, because at the time I was the acting principal of the school, that their child had in fact been denied the right to express a fundamental Christian belief by being given zero for that assignment.

When I spoke to the teacher concerned, we resolved that the student had been simply asked to account for something and that any legitimate accounting for had to be regarded as a worthwhile contribution to the debate. Therefore, it was decided to remark the assignment, and the student was given a mark other than zero.

What is happening in this debate is that a large number of people are insisting on misrepresenting the Government's position. A number of people are under the impression that creation science must be taught in secondary schools. That is not the position at all. The position is simply this: in a situation in which an individual's Christian beliefs are such that he or she could not reasonably be expected to present an evolutionary point of view, that individual shall not be penalised for presenting an alternative point of view. That does not mean to say that everyone has to present a creation science point of view; rather, it simply says that the individual shall have the freedom to present that point of view, should that point of view be his fundamental Christian beliefs.

The Government believes that that is an expression of the basic democratic and religious freedoms granted to individuals under our Constitution. There is a fundamental and inherent principle of religious freedom in this nation and, as such, individuals should not be penalised because of their particular religious views.

It has been argued that the Government is attempting to force particular religious points of view on people. That is usually the catchcry of people faced with such a dilemma. The Government is not attempting to push a point of view on anyone. What the Government says is that if an individual has an alternative point of view, and if the question is phrased in such a way that that alternative point of view can legitimately be argued to be a valid and acceptable answer to the question, the individual should not be penalised for presenting that point of view. That seems to be an eminently reasonable stand, and the Queensland Government embraces it.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Mr Row): Order! Interjections may be directed only to the member on his feet. I will not tolerate multiple interjections or exchanges between members.

Mr HENDERSON: The Government has not——

Mr Davis: He made a statement in the House that schools had to teach creation.

Mr HENDERSON: I suggest that the member for Brisbane Central read the Minister's press statement carefully.

It is an eminently democratic point of view to adopt. I do not see why an individual should be penalised if his fundamental beliefs are such that he could not present an evolutionary point of view.

I congratulate the Queensland Government yet again on what I consider to be a very good performance over the last 10 months or so. I look forward to witnessing the Government continuing in its fine example of leadership, and to being a part of that Government. I am sure that Queenslanders can look forward to a prosperous economic future.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (8.13 p.m.): I welcome the opportunity to speak in reply to the Governor's Opening Speech. I will correct a few misstatements that have been made during the Address in Reply debate, particularly in relation to the attacks on the national Government.

A progression of Government members have made speeches that were obviously prepared by the Government's propaganda machine. They have launched into a tirade that is typical of the manner in which the Queensland Government acts. The Government has chosen to divide the State by attacking Canberra, irrespective of the colour of the Government in the national seat of power. It also divides country people from city people in Queensland.

The most significant point emphasised by members on the other side of the House was the statement in the Governor's Opening Speech that the national anthem had been changed without reference to the people. Nothing could be further from the truth. In 1974, a referendum was conducted by the Whitlam Labor Government in which the people were asked to choose between "Advance Australia Fair", "God save the Queen" and "Waltzing Matilda". The people overwhelmingly chose "Advance Australia Fair". It was adopted as the national anthem until 1976, when the Fraser Government reinstated "God save the Queen". What is important is that "Advance Australia Fair" was chosen by referendum.

Government speakers have said that the people should have been given the opportunity to make a choice. In 1974, they were given that choice, and it was a good one. "Advance Australia Fair" was played for Australia's successful Olympic athletes as they stood on the podium to receive their medals. Their nationality stood out when that tune was played rather than "God save the Queen".

We in this Chamber are supposed to believe in the democratic process. The Canberra Government was elected by the people by an overwhelming majority, and it has declared that "Advance Australia Fair" is the national anthem. It has also declared that green and gold are the national colours. Whether or not members on the other side of the House agree with that, that is the state of the nation.

I turn now to other matters that were raised earlier today.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is trying to mislead the House. The referendum in 1974 concerned a national song, not the national anthem. The anthem was not even in dispute; it was still "God save the Queen".

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There no valid point of order.

Mr VAUGHAN: Of course there is no point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The fact is that the Australian people chose "Advance Australia Fair", and the Australian Government, which was elected democratically, has declared that "Advance Australia Fair" will be our national anthem. Whether Government members like it or not, that is the way it will be.

Earlier today, Government members referred to the oath of allegiance, and the Governor's Opening Speech referred to the proposed alteration to the Australian Citizenship Act to remove any reference to the monarchy. I should like to place in "Hansard" what the position is.

I am concerned at the continual emphasis that is placed by Government members on trying to implant in the minds of the people of Queensland a feeling of anti-national Government. That is a very dangerous practice for Government members to follow. If it is not stopped, a very dangerous situation will arise in this State.

Australia is a multicultural society. Whether Government members want to accept it or not, in this country there are people from many lands. Certainly not all of them have the same faith, nor all of them supporters of the monarchy. However, they chose to come to Australia because they like this country.

After their arrival in Australia, they are asked to swear an oath of allegiance to this country. The democratically elected Australian Government has changed the oath of allegiance. I shall read to the House what is proposed, as set out in the speech of the Honourable Stewart West in the second-reading debate on the Australian Citizenship

Amendment Bill 1983. I wish to place this in "Hansard" because I believe that Government members, by way of their vicious propaganda machine, are trying to twist the minds of people in this State. Again I say that that is a very dangerous exercise.

The Honourable Stewart West said—

"We propose to adopt a new pledge of Australian citizenship to be made by all new citizens in either of two forms. The proposed wording for the first form is—

'I renounce any current citizenship and allegiance to any State other than Australia. I pledge that I will faithfully uphold the Constitution, obey the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen.'

The second alternative pledge is—

'I renounce any current citizenship and allegiance to any State other than Australia. I swear by Almighty God'—

Government members have claimed that any reference to God was obliterated, but that is not true—

"that I will faithfully uphold the Constitution, obey the laws of Australia and fulfil my duties as an Australian citizen."

What is wrong with that? What is wrong with swearing allegiance to this nation?

Mr West went on to say—

"The present renunciation of allegiance is ambiguous and does not make it clear whether people are being asked to renounce their previous nationality, their previous language and culture, or all three. I believe it is important that the future wording of the renunciation makes it clear that it is only allegiance as a citizen to one's former state or country that is being renounced."

What is wrong with that? Government members do not understand what is going on. In the interests of their own twisted, political beliefs, they choose not to understand what is going on.

Mr Goss: Is it part of their purpose to distract attention from the real problems facing Queensland?

Mr VAUGHAN: That is exactly what the Government is about. The brain-washing machine in this State is the largest in the world. Government members are part and parcel of a complete brain-washing machine that has set out to twist the minds of the people in this State. The Government wants not only to divide the people in this State but also to divide the people in this State from the people in the rest of Australia. The Government thrives on division. The Queensland Government is on a very dangerous course. It will not be satisfied until it has the people of the State virtually fighting against one another. I have said previously that it will continue to do that until the situation in this State is comparable with that in Northern Ireland.

Mr West further stated—

"As a result of recent statements I have made in this House and elsewhere about the desirability of having a more Australian form of allegiance, some members of the Opposition have sought to make this a divisive public issue."

That is exactly what Government members are trying to do. They are trying to make this a divisive issue for their own political purposes. Mr West further stated—

"They have been supported by a minority in the community which does not appear to accept the reality that Australia is now a multicultural community and an independent nation."

Australia is a multicultural society and an independent nation. Mr West continued—

"People will simply be asked to swear allegiance to Australia and its laws and Constitution."

The two forms of pledge that I have proposed will I believe allow all people, whatever their views on religion, to make a full commitment of allegiance in Australia. Neither form differentiates between Australians on the basis of their attitudes to the monarchy. While there may be legitimate differences of view on this issue, they should not, in the Government's view, be invoked in a citizenship ceremony."

I appeal to Government members to note what Mr West said and to accept what he said.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: Government members are so twisted in their attitude and so biased in their thinking. In all sincerity, I think that they are doomed to failure, and that will happen by one means or another. They choose to seize upon any action or attitude expressed by the Federal Government.

Mr Simpson: Can we have a look at your multicultural flag?

Mr VAUGHAN: I will deal with the flag in a moment. I want to place on record what is proposed with the citizenship ceremony, but I will turn now to the Australian flag.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! If members do not come to order, I will delay the debate until they do. I will accept only one interjection at a time. Multiple interjections or shouting across the Chamber between members not involved in the debate will not be tolerated.

Mr VAUGHAN: During the prepared speeches delivered by Government members, reference was made to the proposed change to the Australian flag. The Government went so far as to use the Governor of this State—perhaps I should say that it abused his position—by having him state in his Opening Speech—

"Many Queenslanders are justifiably apprehensive about moves to change our National Flag and, rightfully, question the reasons for these moves."

Let me refer to the proposals to change the Australian flag. I am aware that statements have been made in the press about this matter. The Premier issued a news release that appeared in my local newspaper, and I took the opportunity to answer him. It was headed "Keep hands off our flag, says Joh". I would say that that type of propaganda would have appeared not only in my local newspaper but also in other local newspapers throughout the State. Why would it have appeared in local newspapers throughout the State? Because the propaganda machine of the Premier and the National Party in this State is trying to infiltrate the minds of the people in the community and sow in their minds the thought that the Federal Government is setting out to change the Australian flag.

The propaganda, when mentioning the "Hawke Labor Socialists", puts emphasis on the word "Socialists". I do not mind being called a socialist, but the fact of life is that members of the Government are socialists; they are agrarian socialists. As a matter of fact, members opposite are more socialist than I am. In his propaganda, the Premier said—

"The Hawke Labor Socialists should keep their hands off the Australian flag. They have no mandate to tamper with our flag, our institutions or our long-standing loyalties."

The fact of the matter is that it is not the Hawke Labor Government that has set out to change the Australian flag or to canvass the matter in the Australian community. As the Australian bicentenary is 1988, those who have set out to pose the question are in fact a group of very distinguished Australians. My information is that Ausflag 1988 Ltd

was incorporated in January 1983 by a group of influential Australian figures and businessmen, initially headed by none other than Sir James Hardy, who would hardly be regarded as a hot-shot supporter of the Australian Labor Party. However, because of a boycott of Hardy wines by the RSL, Sir James Hardy has subsequently been forced to resign.

The acting chairman of Ausflag 1988 Ltd is Ron Saw, a noted Australian journalist. The vice-president is Chris Hurford, who happens to be a Minister in the Federal Labor Government. Senator Kathy Martin was a vice-president and is an esteemed member of the Liberal Party. She resigned, probably through political pressure. The executive director was Harold Scruby. The directors were Edwina Dusseldorp, Bani McSpedden and Robert Nestdale. Prominent members of Ausflag other than Sir James Hardy—I emphasise that he is a knight of the realm—were Sir Rupert Myers, Sir Richard Kirby and Professor Geoffrey Blainey.

In their prepared speeches the gentlemen of the other side of the House made reference—

Mr Comben: There are no gentlemen on that side of the House.

Mr VAUGHAN: I will call them gentlemen because I am hopeful that one day they will see the light and will act like gentlemen. They should be prepared to accept the democratic process and act like gentlemen. They should accept the fact that Australia has a democratically elected national Government.

Mr Bailey: But you shouldn't talk rubbish. You are not allowed to talk rubbish.

Mr VAUGHAN: The honourable member for Toowong had better go back to Gold Lotto, because he is not making a very great impression on this House.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: Ausflag has a number of stated objectives. However, part of the Premier's propaganda in the local press was that there should be a referendum before any change is made to the national flag.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I suggest to honourable members on both sides of the House that interjections that are not acknowledged by the member on his feet do not contribute anything to the debate. Unnecessarily loud interjections only drown out the member on his feet. I ask the Chamber to come to order.

Mr VAUGHAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, one of the points being made by Government members is that, before there is any change in the flag, there should be a referendum; that the people of Australia should be consulted. One of the stated objectives of Ausflag 1988 Ltd is—

“... to conduct or to promote the conducting of such national surveys and referenda as thought desirable to ascertain the wishes of the Australian people in respect of the implementation of any part of the program including, without limiting the generality of this provision the adoption or design (or both) of a distinctively Australian flag.”

Nothing could be fairer than that.

For purely political reasons, however, the gentlemen on the Government benches have set out to hang the tag of trying to change the Australian flag on the Australian Labor Party, and particularly the Labor Government in Canberra, which is doing a magnificent job. They have chosen to ignore the existence of Ausflag 1988 Ltd. They have also chosen to ignore the composition of that organisation. It is comprised of influential Australians, a number of whom are associated with the monarchy. It is deliberate deceit, a deliberate misleading not only of this Parliament but also of the people of Queensland, and, if they had their way, of the people of Australia.

Before I leave that topic completely, I want to refer to the RSL. I have the greatest respect for returned servicemen and the RSL, but the RSL has been an arch critic of the Ausflag organisation and has imposed what could be called an industrial ban on Hardy's wines. Recently I was in Blackwater—in Mr Vince Lester's territory—and I drove past the RSL, which is situated opposite the Capricornia Hotel. I saw the RSL flag flying outside the building.

Mr Cahill: The Australian flag.

Mr VAUGHAN: I saw the RSL flag flying. One of the main arguments put forward by the RSL for resisting any move to change our flag is that it would mean the removal of the symbol of the monarchy—mother England—the Union Jack. But what did I discover? On the RSL flag the Union Jack, which forms part of the Australian flag, has been removed and replaced by the RSL badge.

Having cleared up that point about the monarchy and Ausflag, I will now deal with another matter raised in this Chamber by Government members, and I refer to the Governor's Opening Speech. First of all, I express my dislike of the manner in which the Governor has been used and abused by the Government of this State. The position of the Governor has been abused by his having to make statements such as he did in his Opening Speech.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: Yes, the position of the Governor has been politicised.

The Governor said—

“It is indeed heartening that my Government's commitment to low levels of taxation has maintained its status as the lowest taxed mainland State.”

Queensland used to be the lowest-taxed State in Australia, but now it is the lowest-taxed mainland State. Let us look at some of the low taxes in this State from the viewpoint of the ordinary man in the street. I begin by referring to the State Budget that was announced in September last year. I have here a newspaper clipping in which the Premier refers to fuel indexation. He said that the Federal Government had indexed the tax on fuel and that that was a ploy; that it should not happen. It is a fact of life that any percentage tax is an indexed tax. For example, the stamp duty tax on the ordinary householder's insurance policy used to be levied at the rate of .05 per cent of the sum insured. The Premier of Queensland, who said that it was shocking for the national Government to index the fuel tax, chose to change the .05 per cent to .07 per cent, thus increasing the tax on the ordinary householder's fire and general insurance.

I have here an extract from the Insurance Council of Australia bulletin of May 1984, in which the Government is criticised for imposing that extra levy. At the time, the Government said that because there was to be a change in the application of the fire brigade levy, which was formerly included in a householder's insurance policy, the insurance companies should not increase their insurance premiums. The companies were asked to exercise restraint because the Government intended to change the method of calculating the fire insurance levy.

When the Government was urging the insurance companies not to increase their insurance premiums, it increased the amount of stamp duty paid on the ordinary householder's insurance policy. The Government had an indexed method of taxation, but that was not good enough for this supposedly low-tax Government. It chose to increase the rate from .05 per cent to .07 per cent. That meant \$10 was taken from every householder in the State.

The Government cannot say truthfully that it does not believe in increasing taxes, or that Queensland is a low-tax State. Spokesmen for the Government who have stressed that there should be no increases in taxes—and even that taxes should be cut—have approached Canberra and asked for more. They are continually asking for more; they

never get enough. At the same time as they advocate reduced taxation they ask Canberra for more.

The prime example of Queensland's not being a low-tax State is to be found in what the Government is doing to electricity tariffs. Since the reorganisation of the power industry in 1977, the Government has ripped off the electricity consumers of Queensland. The Government takes 22 per cent of the ordinary householder's electricity account in taxation.

Mr Katter: That is equalisation.

Mr VAUGHAN: I am not talking about equalisation. I do not disagree with equalisation; in fact, it is a pity that the Government does not practise equalisation in other areas—for example, rail freights on coal.

The Government takes 22 per cent of every householder's electricity account in taxation. In addition, since the reorganisation of the power industry in 1977, the Government has increased its take as follows—

Percentage	Year
9.17	1977-78
17.5	1978-79
20.0	1979-80
25.0	1981-82

Mr Katter: We don't take any of that for Consolidated Revenue.

Mr VAUGHAN: That is the Government's capital works levy. I point out that it applies only to retail consumers, not to wholesale consumers.

When the Government reorganised the power industry in 1977, it raked 9.17 per cent off the top, and the rake-off increased to 25 per cent in 1981-82. The Government has not increased the rake-off beyond 25 per cent only because it realises that it has reached the limit, that it has squeezed the ordinary householder so hard that people are finding it difficult to pay their electricity accounts. What is the Government doing about that? It is doing absolutely nothing about it.

At the last State election, the Labor Party put to the people that there should be a different form of electricity tariff structures. The Government has maintained the same type of tariff structures. As a matter of fact, it is actually encouraging people to use more electricity. Under our existing tariff structures, the more electricity people use, the cheaper it gets. An ordinary pensioner couple living in a house and using a small amount of electricity pay much more per unit for that electricity than does a person who has a big house and every electrical appliance that opens and shuts.

Reference has been made to inverted tariffs. Some Government members might say, "We don't want inverted tariffs in this State." The fact of life is that inverted tariffs are already applied in this State. They are applied to the people just over the border at Dirranbandi who are supplied with electricity by the Electricity Commission of New South Wales. Inverted tariffs are applied to those Queensland consumers.

It is time that the existing tariff structures were changed. That would assist those ordinary people in the community who are battling to pay their electricity accounts. I venture to suggest that all members receive complaints about the ever-increasing electricity charges.

Let us look at the taxation that the Government has been applying. It applies this form of taxation to retail consumers. As I said, it does not apply the taxation to wholesale consumers. The Government takes from each of the seven distribution boards in Queensland 25 per cent of their gross retail sales as a form of tax. It does not impose any form of capital works levy on wholesale consumers who are supplied with electricity directly by the Queensland Electricity Generating Board.

Mr Katter: Do we take it from MIM?

Mr VAUGHAN: As the Minister would know, MIM generates its own electricity in Mount Isa and sells it to the North Queensland Electricity Board in Mount Isa.

What has this capital works levy meant? I am sweating on the annual report for the electricity industry this year, but in 1982-83 the Government raked \$153.7m off electricity consumers in this State. In regard to the South East Queensland Electricity Board, the Government took \$90.7m. It just went in and raked it off the top of the cake.

The Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs referred to tariff equalisation. As I said earlier, I support tariff equalisation; but what the Government is doing is salting money away. For instance, after taking \$10m from consumers in certain electricity authorities and transferring it to other consumers, the Government salted away \$14.7 in 1982-83. That is double the amount that it salted away the year before.

When electricity tariffs were increased earlier this year, the Labor Party took the Government to task and asked, "Why should there be a 13.3 per cent increase in south-east Queensland and a 9.7 per cent increase throughout the rest of the State?" The Minister gave a number of reasons why those increases in tariffs should be made. Under no circumstances should there have been such a huge increase in electricity tariffs. It was far in excess of the average rate of inflation.

An analysis of the financial report on the electricity industry reveals some very startling facts. The Government said that an increase in electricity tariffs was needed to keep up with the cost of living and other inflationary factors. The average daily amount of money that the State Electricity Commission invested on the short-term money market in 1982-83 was \$366m. It was invested at 15.25 per cent. At the same time as the State Electricity Commission, on behalf of the Government, had that money invested on the short-term money market, electricity charges were increased.

The balance in the loan collections expense account as at June 1983 was \$200.4m compared with \$38.3m the year before. The Government has been salting money away. The story does not stop there. The balance in the tariff equalisation reserve fund was \$41.4m compared with \$9.3m for the previous year.

I could keep going on and on, but I turn now to the Queensland Electricity Generating Board. It earned \$25.5m in interest on investments compared with \$7m the year before. The surplus for 1982-83 was \$24.4m compared with \$2.8m in the previous year. Its list of assets included \$49.3m cash at bank compared with \$3.4m the previous year. Short-term investments totalled \$70.7m compared with \$30.8m the year before. The QEGB had \$61.5m in fuel stocks as opposed to \$29.7m the year before.

Why would the Government want to increase electricity charges? I will tell the House why. When the Government reorganised the power industry in 1977, it had two aims. One was the equalisation of tariffs and the other was to get access to a large group of consumers in south-east Queensland—38 per cent of the State's consumers—who at that time were paying on average \$44.34 quarterly. The Government set out to get its hands on that group of consumers and progressively increase the tariffs so that the money gained from them could be used for a greater degree of self-financing in the industry. In 1982-83, the Government took \$150m in tariffs, and taxation on electricity consumers has been progressively increased, through the capital works levy, from 9.17 per cent in 1977 to the current figure of 25 per cent. The electricity consumers of this State are being ripped off.

The Government has become dependent on sources of revenue other than those that create an adverse attitude in the community. It espouses that it is a low-tax State and that it does not believe in taxation. It does not believe in open taxes. If I had time, I would talk about the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program Fund. The Government has said that Queensland does not have a petrol levy, but it was instrumental

in persuading the former Federal Government to introduce that program. The Queensland Government advocated that, initially, a 1c levy be imposed on petrol, and subsequently, it became a 2c levy. The Queensland Government asks other people to do its dirty work—to do what it does not have the courage or intestinal fortitude to do. It stands back and says that it would be a good idea to impose a tax on fuel but, in this place, Government members stand up and say that the National Party does not believe in fuel tax. The Government does not believe in coming out openly and telling the people of the State that it believes in a Federal tax on fuel. Instead, it has told the Federal Government to impose a tax on fuel so that it, the Queensland Government, can reap the rewards. That is exactly what has happened.

The same has happened with the Government's abuse and mishandling of the electricity consumers in Queensland. It has reached the stage now that ordinary family people cannot find the money to pay their electricity accounts. People complain to me about the increases in their accounts. The increase was 13.3 per cent this year, 15.8 per cent a couple of years ago and 11.14 per cent the year before that—a total increase of 165 per cent since 1977. That is much more than the increase in inflation. However, Government members try to justify it by saying that it needs the money to keep up with the electricity development that is occurring.

There is no way in the world that the electricity consumers of Queensland have received any benefit from the supply of cheap coal to the Gladstone Power Station. What the Government has done is pocket the money and tell the people of Queensland that this is a low-tax State. That is taxation by stealth. The Government says "We do not believe in taxes." It continually tries to white-wash the people of Queensland by saying, "It is not us. We do not believe in taxes. Those terrible Federal people are the ones to blame." The Government says to the people through the media, "There should be a reduction in taxes." However, what do the Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing do? They ask the Federal Government for more money. In answer to a question this morning, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing said that he will be making representations to obtain more money for road development in Queensland.

This year, Queensland will be spending \$440m on roads. The Governor made that point in his Opening Speech. What he did not say was that the Queensland Government will be getting \$258.8m from the Federal Government. A substantial proportion of that sum will flow to this State under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program.

With monotonous regularity, the Government increases the charges that it imposes on the people of this State. Electricity tariffs have risen and premiums on household insurance have increased. No matter which way the people of Queensland turn, they are faced with increased taxation by stealth on the part of this Government.

In conclusion, I wish to comment on the tirade that the Premier and Treasurer launched this morning on rail freights paid by MIM. The Government relies so heavily on rail freights that it cannot afford to forgo them as a source of income. At the last election campaign I was asked what I, as Opposition spokesman on Mines and Energy, would do.

Time expired.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (8.53 p.m.): It is my intention to speak on the performance of the Federal Government, to defend the actions of the Queensland Government and to discuss some matters that concern my electorate. Before I do that, however, and as it seems to be accepted that this is the last occasion on which the Governor, Sir James Ramsay, will officially open a session of the Queensland Parliament, I wish him well for the future. I hope that he and Lady Ramsay, both of whom are very pleasant people who have made a great contribution to this State, enjoy their retirement.

I have listened with interest to the previous speakers in this debate. Usually the honourable member who has just resumed his seat makes fairly good contributions to

debates. Tonight he spoke to matters that concern the people of Queensland, and for that I pay him a tribute.

One comment made by the honourable member for Nudgee, however, I cannot let pass. He referred to the RSL. I have been a member of the RSL for 40 years, and I suppose that I am biased. I know that the RSL is not always perfect. I do not intend to dwell on this matter, but I would say one thing to the honourable member for Nudgee, and also to the honourable member for Windsor, who interjected a great deal. If it had not been for the members of the RSL, those honourable members would not have any say in what they did with the flag. Let them remember that before they pull the RSL down.

Perhaps members of the RSL are somewhat like me—a bit old and cranky. Nevertheless, they were prepared to go and fight for this land. And they did not fight for money. When I enlisted, I was placed in a tent with seven other men. At that time, my bank account had £3.17.6 in it, which in today's currency is \$7.75. I was horribly ashamed of my bank account, until a few weeks later when I learned that it was the best of those eight in the tent. So Opposition members can rest assured that the people who defended this country did not defend it for money.

Some honourable members suggested that this country is not worth defending now. If the various standards of living that we built up in this land are not worth defending now, I would hate to think what would have happened to this land in my time.

Mr Randell: If the RSL had not defended this land, those members over there would not have had the right to free speech.

Mr BOOTH: They certainly would not. They should remember that.

I do not care what the Federal Government says about the flag and I do not care what propaganda it uses to change it. I do not think that it will succeed. Whatever it does, the last group that it should attack is the RSL.

Having listened to the speeches made by Opposition members, I think that they have overdone the issue of knocking Queensland. On every occasion possible they knock Queensland. They knock primary industry and secondary industry.

Mr Menzel: They praise Canberra, though.

Mr BOOTH: They do. I will come to that later.

By knocking Queensland they are acting very foolishly. The Opposition has had a bad week. The Leader of the Opposition decided to pack his bags and run. Not much worse could happen to it than that. The backwash from the Stafford by-election was just too much. He decided to draw stumps and depart. He saw the writing on the wall. He knew something had to be done about it. The Opposition has had a bad week and it has tried to cover that up by knocking Queensland. One member went so far as to say that the work-force in Queensland was unskilled and uneducated. That is certainly not correct. In the work-force or anywhere else, I will back Queenslanders against anyone. It is foolish for the Opposition to make such statements.

It is true that a serious downturn has occurred in the sugar industry.

Mr Menzel: And the Labor party won't do a thing to help.

Mr BOOTH: Worse than that, it appears to be enjoying it. The downturn in the sugar industry is probably the worst thing that has happened to Queensland. It has affected all of the towns along the coast. The effects of the downturn will be felt in the towns that are not associated with the sugar industry. Many reasons can be advanced for that downturn. Some of the problems in the sugar industry have been experienced in other primary industries. Before I conclude my speech, I shall have something to say about that.

If the ALP is ever to succeed, it should lift its sights and boost Queensland rather than knock it. Earlier, the member for Bulimba made an interesting comment. He said, "Surely no-one would believe in anything other than the redistribution of income." I do not agree with him. The great income redistributor whom I remember was Robin Hood. There was another by the name of Ned Kelly. Neither of them went down well. There is no merit in the redistribution of income. If a man works hard, saves his income and gives his best on all occasions, he is entitled to the fruits of his labour. He is entitled to the fruits of his labour whether he is a primary producer, works in secondary industry or works for small business.

If the report in this morning's press was correct, the Treasurer (Mr Keating) said that small business could expect very little from him. Those in small business do not expect a great deal from any Government. However, I believe that they would expect encouragement. A little bit of encouragement might have gone a long way. Because of the comments that were made by Mr Keating, many people in small business will decide to give up. Many small-businessmen are battling at the moment. Primary producers and small businesses which employ only a few employees—perhaps one or two—are experiencing a hard time. Shortly I will tell honourable members why that is so. The statements made by Mr Keating could do nothing but cause a downturn in the economy.

Throughout the debate we have heard Opposition members sing the praises of the Federal Government, even though it discriminates against Queensland. That is a very foolish tactic. By all means, Opposition members should be Australians, but they should be Queenslanders first.

I wish to discuss the Federal Government's suggestion of an early election. Surely when a Government is elected for a three-year term, that is just what it should serve. I know that members of the Labor Party will try to pull the National Party down and call it a "Joh Government" and all that sort of thing. However, the Premier always goes his three years. He does not try to hide behind a smoke-screen and call an early election. There is nothing more democratic than a Government that remains in office for its full term.

Mr Fouras: What about Fraser?

Mr BOOTH: Mr Fraser made a great mistake when he went to the polls too early. The Australian people rejected him, just as they will reject Mr Hawke when he calls an early election. The people of Australia will not be fooled. They will know that the Prime Minister has a reason for calling an early election, and it is that he can see an economic downturn coming. The writing is on the wall and the people will not be fooled, even by the so-called reductions in personal taxation. In real terms, personal taxation has been increased terrifically. If honourable members look at the amounts they have to pay in tax, they will see that in real terms their taxation has increased.

Mr Menzel: How long do you think the old guard will last?

Mr BOOTH: I was not about to discuss it at this stage. On face value, I think that the member for Sandgate (Mr Warburton) will be an improvement, but I will wait and see.

The word "consensus" is a nice one that has been used by people who cannot make a decision. Instead of assessing a situation and making a firm decision, they reach a consensus, which means they can rock around and do almost anything. There has been no consensus on defence spending.

Mr Borbidge: A Federal Government Minister advocates passive resistance if the country is invaded.

Mr BOOTH: I am only too pleased to comment on the term "passive resistance" Anyone who has served in one of the services, even for a short time, knows that every soldier is trained to kill or be killed. If enemy soldiers ever land on the shores of this

country and if that Minister goes down to meet them, shake hands and talk passive resistance to them, I know what will happen to him. It will not be because his passive resistance program is not any good, but because the invading army has not been trained to accept passive resistance.

I will return to the word "consensus", which is simply another way of saying that the Government is not prepared to accept its responsibilities.

Although I do not wish to dwell on the resignation of Mr Stone, I am concerned at press reports this morning that suggest that, if anyone else talks out of turn, he will be without a job. Surely in this society there must be some rights for people to be able to give some leadership. Surely it is in the nation's best interests for those people to speak out. Whether or not Mr Stone is correct, his courage in resigning and saying why will earn him a place in history as one of the great Australians.

I wish to comment on the effects of the Federal Government's policies on society in general. My colleagues have spoken about the national flag and the national anthem, so I will not spend time on them. The member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) spoke about the conference that is to be held at the university on the week-end. The university has reacted very quickly. All honourable members have had delivered to them a communication marked "urgent" The only point of defence from the University of Queensland is freedom of speech. If freedom of speech drags society down into the dregs, something is wrong. I am not prepared to blame the ALP Government for this conference but it might be a body under its control.

The antics of the ABC should be questioned. Those board members who said, "We had to agree with it; it is a board decision", should have the courage to resign if it goes against their ideas of Christianity, and even their ideas of humanity.

The ABC decision is such that one would oppose it not only on the grounds of Christianity but also on the grounds of humanism. It should not be taken lightly. I am surprised that the responsible Minister has not taken action and said that it should not be implemented. Probably only a few people are affected by it, or at least I hope it is only a few, but I think——

Mr Comben: You do not think it is a gay BC?

Mr BOOTH: No, I am not prepared to concede that.

I have been saddened by the silence of the responsible Minister and the Prime Minister. It is difficult to understand. The decision could have a real effect on young people who will say, "The ABC board is a reputable body, and it made the decision. It wasn't opposed by the responsible Minister or the Prime Minister. If that is the case, it must be OK." That does not make it right.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr BOOTH: If funding is made available in that fashion it would be of no benefit to the University of Queensland, and something should be done about it.

The Minister for Education (Mr Powell) has made a considerable impact. He is a sincere man who is trying to make some big changes and he may find their achievement somewhat difficult. The Governor said—

"My Government has embarked upon a far-reaching review of the State education system which will ensure that the education structure for the youth of Queensland fits the changing needs of society and the workplace as we move towards the year 2000."

I was pleased to hear that because it is important that any necessary changes to the education system be made, and made all round the State. It is no good making changes only in the capital city.

In my electorate of Warwick, negotiations for the acquisition of land for the erection of a TAFE college are almost complete. It should be erected as speedily as possible. It will be a joint college with one annex in Stanthorpe and another in Warwick, and I see nothing wrong with that.

Earlier today a member said, "If children are to stay at school in Years 11 and 12, we need TAFE facilities because a line of education will be needed for those children who cannot handle the academic grades." I agree. The Government will have to accept its responsibilities in regard to technical education. Children who acquire the necessary skills will become worthwhile members of society but, if the right to acquire those skills is removed, there will be problems. I urge the Government to construct TAFE colleges in the smaller cities and towns as quickly as possible. Warwick was selected as the site for the first of these colleges because it had a large population and was surrounded by small towns within a reasonable distance. Tonight I make an impassioned plea that every effort be made to begin construction by 1986 at the latest, which was the year first suggested.

I have some comments to make about the provision of sewerage in small towns. Because of the hilly nature of the town of Killarney, many septic systems fail there, or do not work as well as expected. The Glengallan Shire Council estimated that, on the basis of the present subsidy, it could cost up to \$800 to provide sewerage for each home in Killarney. The council cannot undertake the work at that cost, and has considered trying to do the job under the Community Employment Program. I am a little worried about the council obtaining approval. The Government must consider making sewerage works special projects in some of the smaller towns that have left the installation a little late. Towns of the size of Killarney cannot be left unsewered, or health problems will be experienced.

Although the Glengallan Shire Council is anxious to move, it is not prepared to do so because of the high cost. I appeal to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to consider helping to get the Killarney sewerage scheme under way.

The Warwick Hospital has a new development scheme under way. It is envisaged that the first stage will cost about \$4m. I have not been able to obtain accurate plans of what is envisaged, but I think that it will be what Warwick needs. People in Warwick with hospital insurance have very little chance of realising on that insurance because there are very few private hospital beds. When the new hospital is developed, I hope that sufficient beds will be available so that the needs of people with hospital insurance can be met.

Warwick was fortunate that The Oaks, a new 40-bed nursing home, was erected 18 months ago. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth Government refused to accept its responsibility to fund the nursing home. It is fair to say that, during the last Federal election campaign, not one Federal candidate said that the Government would not fund another hospital bed in a nursing home. All of them were strangely silent. They virtually said, "We will accept the responsibilities." Indeed, some of them said that they would improve the nursing homes situation.

Mr Mackenroth: How many nursing home beds in Queensland have been paid for by the Hawke Government?

Mr BOOTH: I do not know.

Mr Mackenroth: If the honourable member wants to tell the truth, he should tell it. How many of them were there?

Mr BOOTH: I do not know, but there has not been one additional bed.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I am speaking about the one in Warwick. The Oaks nursing home is not funded. It was built by the State Government but it was not funded by the

Commonwealth Government. I will not accept any further interjections, because that is the way it is. I will not continue with the matter.

Mr Mackenroth: Because you know that you are wrong.

Mr BOOTH: I do not, I challenge the honourable member. The Oaks nursing home has not been funded.

Mr Mackenroth: Why not?

Mr BOOTH: I will tell the honourable member why. It was claimed that a technical fault developed in asking for permission to erect it.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I will be quite happy to debate the matter with the honourable member in Warwick, because the Warwick people are very upset about it.

Mr Mackenroth: You do not know your facts.

Mr BOOTH: I know the facts on the nursing home that I am talking about.

The sporting subsidy has been very helpful to people living in outback areas. My electorate has many new clubhouses and the standard of the facilities available for sport has been lifted tremendously.

My area is very good for horse-breeding, and my electors are very interested in what happened in the racing industry in the last few weeks. In my opinion, no great merit can be claimed for latching onto the ring-in episode and trying to knock the industry and stopping the people from going to the races. That was exceedingly foolish, and ALP members will regret what they have done. I simply urge the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing to act wisely. If the stewards are not able to sort out the present ring-in scandal, perhaps a royal commission is warranted. The Minister has kept his options open, and I think that that is sufficient.

The best way in which the racing industry can be kept clean is for the stewards to be on the ball and stop these practices before they start. There has been some talk about branding horses. I am not prepared to go along with the suggestion that incorrect branding was responsible for this scandal. Photographs that appeared in the newspaper showed that both horses were correctly branded.

Mr Goss: How long should we wait for the royal commission?

Mr BOOTH: That is not a bad question. I do not know. If we had rushed in a week ago and appointed a royal commission, we might have made one awful mess. It may well be that the stewards will sort the matter out.

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! If the member for Salisbury wants to pursue his point, he should do so from his usual place.

Mr Davis: If the stewards knew five minutes before the race, why didn't they pull the horse out then?

Mr BOOTH: If the honourable member knows that to be a fact, I suggest that he should go outside and make that statement. It will cause some fun. The honourable member does not know that to be the fact. He is just pulling it out of the air.

I am grateful for the things that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing has done for racing in Warwick and throughout Queensland. Given time, he will tighten up the security in Queensland's racing industry. Extra security will be provided for the breeders in areas such as mine and for those owners who want to have their horses trained.

Mr Goss: How long do you think they should wait before appointing a royal commission?

Mr BOOTH: If the stewards' inquiry breaks down without being able to pin-point what happened, the Minister should then consider appointing a royal commission.

Mr Goss: How long would you allow?

Mr BOOTH: I do not think that time is important if the stewards are succeeding in their inquiry.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you think that the stewards will find themselves innocent?

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member is saying that the stewards are guilty. He is doing the same as the honourable member for Brisbane Central, who said that the stewards knew about it. If that is so, they are bad people; but I do not think that that is right.

My time is running out, and I wish to talk about road maintenance. Many roads lead into Warwick, and road maintenance is very important to the district. Some of the people who are entrusted with the maintenance of our main roads do not realise what the wet weather has done to some roads in south-east Queensland. In my area we have just experienced two of the wettest winters in memory. The engineer for the Glengallan shire, which is a black-soil area, asked for \$97,000 for local roads and was given \$50,000. He asked for \$239,000 for rural arterial roads and he received \$90,000.

Mr Davis: They are tracks.

Mr BOOTH: It is foolish to say that they are tracks.

Mr Fouras: Yet the Hawke Labor Government has increased road funds by 44 per cent.

Mr BOOTH: We hear about percentages. I am always suspicious with people who talk in percentages. When I was in business, a salesman often said, "I have increased sales by 300 per cent." However, when one looked at his previous sales one found that he had sold nothing. 300 per cent of nothing was still nothing. The honourable member should talk in money terms, not percentages.

I wish to say something about agriculture in general because I think there are some problems there.

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr BOOTH: If I did not change subjects, I would be like Opposition members, who speak for their full time and say nothing. Earlier, the member for Port Curtis spoke for 40 minutes, and I do not think that he mentioned anything other than the racing ring-in. I wish to raise many matters in the Address in Reply debate because members do not get many opportunities to do so. The member for Salisbury will find that if he ties himself to one subject he will not make much of a contribution.

I wish to make a few general comments about agriculture.

Mr Goss: Talk about soil erosion.

Mr BOOTH: I will, if I want to; I have some expertise in that field.

The plight of the sugar-producers has been mentioned by the knockers on the other side of the Chamber and by Government members who are trying to do something to help them. In fact, the sugar industry has been mentioned at length in this debate. I have great sympathy for the sugar-producers. The Government did not expect the downturn in the sugar industry to be so severe; but it has happened.

Mr Goss: Is that bad planning?

Mr BOOTH: I do not think that it had anything to do with planning.

Mr Goss: That is the whole problem; you didn't do any planning.

Mr BOOTH: I will take that interjection and tell the member for Salisbury what has happened to the sugar industry.

One of its major problems has been the great increase in sugar production from subsidised producers in the European Economic Community. The member for Salisbury would not know anything about it, but he tries to big-note himself. He has proved his ignorance by coming into the Chamber and talking about something he knows nothing about. I will not be side-tracked, because I want to say something about agriculture in my area.

Many of the problems that are plaguing sugar-producers and causing the downturn in their incomes are also severely affecting grain-producers, dairy-farmers and vegetable-producers. The greatest problem is the increase in costs. Costs have gone sky-high. I will give honourable members some idea of them.

Mr Price: What about the mining industry?

Mr BOOTH: I am not here to knock the mining industry, either.

Mr Price: The Premier did.

Mr BOOTH: No, I do not think that he did. He tried to give the facts. Perhaps the member for Mount Isa might be able to accept the facts, because he has a fair bit of skill and expertise, but it is difficult to get the facts across to his front-bench colleagues.

The increase in the cost of fuel was the first factor to hit primary producers. That was followed with the increase in the cost of spare parts, which happened nearly as quickly. However, the greatest problem for primary producers is the rapid increase in capital costs. Take the case of a farmer who wants to buy a tractor. If he trades in his five-year-old tractor, he finds that he will receive almost the same amount that he paid for it originally. That seems to be all right. However, the purchase price of a new tractor is 300 per cent more than the price of the tractor that he is trading in. The farmer gets a good trade-in. He does not get much depreciation at that stage, but he will on the new tractor. However, he cannot find the capital to keep on replacing his equipment, and that is why farmers are forced into leasing arrangements. The member for Mackay, who made the best contribution on agriculture from the Opposition, said in his speech that the new way of financing is leasing.

Mr Katter: He didn't have much competition.

Mr BOOTH: No, he did not have much competition, but he did try.

It is only because farmers have been forced into leasing that it has become the new way of financing. They do not want the benefits of additional taxation. If they could finance their affairs in the way they used to, they would be happy.

Mr Mackenroth: Show me a farmer who pays tax, and I will show you a fool.

Mr BOOTH: The member for Chatsworth is delighted that farmers are not in a position to pay tax. If a person does not pay tax, he does not make an income. It is as simple and straight-forward as that.

I turn now to the dairy industry. I will not back the Government all the way in what I say about that industry, but I want to say it while I have the opportunity.

I am extremely disappointed in the Milk Entitlements Committee. I do not believe that it has been able to balance out the milk entitlements of people in Queensland to

the extent that it should. I am disappointed with its performance, in that it has achieved very little. I urge the Minister for Primary Industries to have a close look at the cut-up of the entitlements of milk-producers. The traditional idea is that because milk for domestic consumption was produced in certain areas 50 years ago, it should continue to be produced in those areas for another hundred years. I do not go along with that. The Government should face up to the situation that exists today.

During World War II, when milk was first drawn from the Darling Downs and areas farther away, such as Gympie, it may well have been that milk was produced on land that was much cheaper than other land and at a cost that was much lower than that in other areas. However, costs have increased and gone sky-high. I see no reason for differentiating between areas in which milk is produced. Every producer should be given a fair share of the domestic market.

I turn now to housing. For many years, approximately two or three houses were made available in my electorate annually for rental purposes. It was thought that two or three houses were enough, and perhaps that number was enough till now. I urge the Minister for Works and Housing to try to provide more housing in that area. People are distressed because they are not able to obtain adequate housing. The towns of Warwick and Killarney have begun to grow, and people who are not able to obtain adequate housing are very unhappy.

Mr Mackenroth: How long do they have to wait?

Mr BOOTH: They do not have to wait very long. Last year, eight houses were constructed, so the position was not all that bad.

Mr Mackenroth: How long in terms of months?

Mr BOOTH: I could not tell the honourable member off-hand; I do not have the figures. If I had, I would be only too delighted to give him the figures.

The town of Killarney urgently needs three or four houses for workers who are stationed there permanently. The town of Warwick requires at least 10 or 12 houses. Problems have arisen over the area of land that is available, because the land that was available has been used up.

Mr Mackenroth: They are putting 460 in my electorate.

Mr BOOTH: And the honourable member jumps up in this House and says that he does not get a fair go! He stands condemned by his own words. Why is not the honourable member for Chatsworth grateful for what he is given? Why does he not give the Government the credit that is due to it? In trying to take from the Government the credit that is due to it, he is making himself look very foolish. The honourable member's remark has indeed made him look very foolish.

A Government Member: Do you think he is leadership material?

Mr BOOTH: I do not think he is. Opposition members acted very wisely when they decided to elect Tom Burns as their deputy leader. The honourable member for Chatsworth is not leadership material, and he is not a quick thinker.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! If the honourable member for Chatsworth wants to ask a question, he can ask it tomorrow, not tonight.

Mr BOOTH: I turn now to the matter of valuation, which is something of a bugbear. Earlier today, the Minister for Valuation was in the Chamber, but he is no longer here. I wish he was still in the Chamber.

Over the past few days, new valuations have been carried out in the Glengallan shire. They have risen on the average by 659 per cent. I realise that the Valuer-General's

Department can find some sales that would suggest that such an increase in valuation is in order. Many young valuers look at a few sales and go right to the top. In doing so, they leave themselves in a very vulnerable position. If anything happens to reduce the price of land—Lord knows what might happen under the Hawke Government to put land values on the skids—those valuers will be looking very foolish. It is not wise valuation practice to go right to the top area. Fairer results would be achieved if the valuers stayed a little further down.

Last April, the draft Family and Community Development Bill was tabled. It has attracted considerable public comment, which the Government will consider in the final drafting of the Bill. This legislation, which will be brought forward this session, is aimed at strengthening the family unit. It will contain provisions covering child protection, juvenile offenders and the development and licensing of community services.

I would be the last one to try to stop the Government bringing in such a Bill. I know that the Minister who will be bringing the Bill forward will do his homework and do the best he can. However, the Government should not go overboard in the matter of child protection. I would not like to see the stage reached at which someone is frightened to take his or her child to the hospital because of the fear that someone at the hospital will question that parent as to whether he or she broke the child's arm or caused some similar injury.

Mr Casey: You cannot remove parental control.

Mr BOOTH: That is right. That is the point that I am trying to make.

By and large, parents do an excellent job for their children. I know that some parents do let their children down. For every parent who lets a child down, 10 go too much the other way and give children too much. I urge the Minister to be very careful with what he does with the new Bill. He has postponed the Bill, so I think that he is moving carefully.

Mr Fouras: Is that why it is not in this session? It will be next year now?

Mr BOOTH: Tonight I am urging the Minister to move carefully and to be tolerant in his attitude. If there were more tolerance by Opposition members, I would not be arguing with them now.

Because of the lack of tolerance and some of the foolish ideas that Opposition members put forward, I found it necessary to try to reason with them and to do the best that I could. I have put forward some reasonable propositions. Perhaps I have been a little intolerant on some occasions. I listened with interest to the speeches that were made. Therefore, I was able to make a contribution that at least was based on some of the other speeches.

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (9.31 p.m.): It is my great pleasure to reaffirm my loyalty and that of the people of the Greenslopes electorate to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. We join His Excellency, Sir James Ramsay, in denouncing the efforts of those who would deny us of the right to our spiritual beliefs and would rob us of our traditions and heritage by attacking our commitment to God, Queen and flag. It is nine months since my maiden speech in this House. At that time I made a statement on my personal philosophy, which is integrally bound up with the philosophy of the Queensland National Party Government and places great emphasis on the care for human life and happiness. I believe that the key word in that philosophy is "care", a slightly old-fashioned word by today's standards that one does not hear as often these days as the more trendy words, "interpersonal relationships", "relating", "communicating", and so on, that merely cloud and complicate a simple concept that basically means "being genuinely interested".

The Government has come from country origins where people do care for each other. It has succeeded in injecting that same spirit into the city. All Queenslanders

recognise that the Queensland Government cares. It has cared about its sick and elderly to the extent that it was the only State Government to provide a free hospital system. It cares for each and every Queenslanders by protecting the security of private ownership and by promoting free enterprise. I have endeavoured to follow the good example of my Government on the broad Queensland scale and apply that same genuine interest in the Greenslopes electorate by ascertaining the needs of the people in my electorate and proving by achievement, not words, and as I have always believed that actions speak louder than words, that I truly care about the Greenslopes electorate and its people.

My maiden speech of nine months past was in part an explanation of the needs of the Greenslopes electorate.

Mr Davis: What have you done about that?

Mrs HARVEY: I am coming to that.

I was, in fact, calling those needs to the attention of all—the Premier, the Cabinet, the community leaders and the citizens of the Greenslopes electorate. I will refer to the points that I raised then and relate the action that I have put into progress since then. I outlined the need for the extension of involvement of traders in my electorate. The Coorparoo Junction Shopping Centre consists of a group of shops, each separately battling in the particularly tough trading times of our present economic climate. I formed the Coorparoo Traders Association, which is steadily growing in membership and which can now help to promote the shopping area. The Small Business Development Corporation was of great assistance in the setting-up stages of this venture.

Nine months ago I spoke of the need to deal with the irregularities of retail leases. Since then the Retail Shop Leases Act has come into force and has proven to be of considerable benefit to small business. Other than the Myer complex, the business in the Greenslopes electorate is primarily small business, which is assured of my support at all times both as a member of this House and as a member of the committee of the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology. I am acutely aware of the efforts made, the risks taken, the employment created—which amounts to over 50 per cent of the work-force—and the contribution that small business makes to the total Queensland economy.

In my maiden speech I said—

“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.”

Given the concerns that have arisen in my electorate since then, I add that, while Governments can build schools and libraries, train teachers and pass laws about attendance rates, it is really in the family environment that children learn to develop an interest in reading, to search for information and to heighten their awareness of a depth and variety of subjects. In many ways, for children the family is the most important class-room of all, because it is there that they receive their basic training.

The proof of the genuine concern of society at large to the threat to family stability is the incredible response of the people of the Greenslopes electorate to my call for a visible, loud affirmation through action that they do care for the family. In the small, 9 sq. km electorate of Greenslopes, over 40 local church, charity and community organisations came out onto the streets for Greenslopes Neighbourhood Family Week from 29 July to 4 August. A great deal of thanks is due to the Minister for Education for encouraging this worthwhile venture through the schools. I also sincerely thank the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs for his active support in supplying expert staff and resources to make the event a success.

The community of the Greenslopes electorate was given an invitation to participate to show people openly, and as publicly as possible, that they refuted the types of things that were happening in our society and that were disparaging towards mothers in homes,

towards mothers who felt that they needed to raise their children themselves, towards parents who were battling to look after their families as best they could and still maintain it as a family and towards the elderly people who had no family. The people came out in strength. Over 3 000 people showed their support for a concept that the Government initiated and has seen take action in the community.

The week engendered a spirit of belonging and co-operation, of caring. It encouraged membership inquiries for different organisations, such as Meals on Wheels and Civilian Widows. The activities of the week did not end there. As a result of it, the Blue Nursing Service and I have taken up the challenge and instituted action to form a day activity centre. Local and church people are now acting on that idea.

Sole parent families were also mentioned in my maiden speech. More than anyone else in our community, sole parents need the support and encouragement of the Government and the wider community as there is no more difficult and lonely task than to have sole financial, physical and emotional responsibility for the well-being of one's children. From personal experience, I well know the difficulties of this position.

I have previously referred to the problems of the aged, particularly the need for suitable low-cost accommodation in the Greenslopes area. The Minister for Works and Housing is to be complimented for the efforts of the Housing Commission in supplying in my electorate pensioner units which are specifically designed for the needs of elderly people. These smallish blocks with connecting walkways and a central landscaped courtyard facilitate interaction between the inhabitants and provide a pleasant living environment for the residents. The pensioner occupants are proud of the Clare Villa Housing Commission units and asked me to express their thanks to the Minister.

In company with Senator Lady Florence Bjelke-Petersen, I recently attended the launching of a retirement village project in which the Lutheran Church and a free enterprise building and marketing firm were involved. I have suggested to the church and the builders that such a project would be very welcome in Greenslopes and that the area, with its high proportion of elderly people wishing to escape over-large houses and lawns but wanting to remain in their own area, could be considered for future projects. I hope to pursue that idea further. I urge the Government to actively encourage such developers, as the need for such units is great and the service provided matches the requirements of elderly people.

The culmination of Greenslopes Neighbourhood Family Week was the holding of a large Mardi Gras, which necessitated the closure of the main roads in Coorparoo junction because there was no other central, public, easily accessible venue in which to hold such an event. I might add that over 3 000 people attended, which highlights the need for a central community area, something to which I referred in my maiden speech. I have proven the need, and it now remains for such a site to be made available.

I urge the Government to consider that the near-city electorate of Greenslopes has in the past been overlooked while major development has been carried out in the inner-city area. It is now time to provide the Greenslopes electorate with much-needed community facilities. The people of Greenslopes and I have proven, through the events of Greenslopes Neighbourhood Family Week, that we are a close community prepared to work together for the well-being of the community as a whole, and now need an area in which to foster the closeness and goodwill that has been engendered by these efforts.

Debate, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

LIQUID FUEL SUPPLY 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 provide for the production, supply, distribution, sale, use and conservation of liquid fuel in the event of a shortage of liquid fuel occurring in the State 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) (9.45 p.m.): I move—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

As a result of the uncertainties of the future supply of liquid fuels which emerged in mid-1979 following the Middle East crisis, Commonwealth and State Ministers in the Australian Minerals and Energy Council agreed to the formation of the National Petroleum Advisory Committee. The committee was set up to advise Governments on the appropriate arrangements and priorities for the allocation of liquid fuels during any period of national supply shortage.

It is clear that a liquid fuel supply shortfall could have a serious impact on national and State economies and on society generally. To minimise these adverse impacts, the committee concluded that contingency plans to deal with a serious liquid fuels shortfall should be available for prompt implementation when Governments decide that action is required.

The committee also concluded that the fundamental objective of any plan for a major liquid fuel shortage should be to ensure that supplies are made available to users so as to minimise the total impact on the community, in terms of both maintaining essential services and minimising economic dislocation and, at the same time, achieving the greatest degree of equity. The recommendations made by the committee, which included State and Commonwealth Governments, industry groups (including the oil industry) and union representation, related to this objective. The committee recommended that all State Governments prepare appropriate legislation to manage liquid fuel shortfalls.

The Queensland Energy Advisory Council subsequently reviewed the recommendations of the National Petroleum Advisory Committee with respect to their applicability to Queensland. Inter alia, this council concurred with the committee's major recommendations and endorsed the need for enactment of complementary legislation. This Liquid Fuel Supply Bill embodies that complementary legislation. It will provide a legislative basis for the management of liquid fuel shortfalls which may occur in Queensland. It will provide the basis for an equitable distribution of liquid fuel between essential, high priority and ordinary users within the State during any sustained period of liquid fuel shortfall, irrespective of whether the cause of the shortfall has international or domestic origins. As a result, the economic and social activity of the State should be able to be maintained as close to normal as possible.

Until the time of the reviews of the requirements for liquid fuel shortfall management conducted by the National Petroleum Advisory Committee and by the Queensland Energy Advisory Council, reliance had been placed on the State Transport Act 1938-81 as the general legislative vehicle for managing emergency situations that might occur. Those two reviews indicated that because of the singular importance of liquid fuels, and because of the unique circumstances surrounding liquid fuel shortfalls or emergencies, a separate legislative approach was required. All other State and Territory Governments share this view. They have all progressively introduced such legislation since 1974.

The State Transport Act 1938-81 has typically been used to deal with emergencies which are spontaneous, requiring decisive action to be taken according to the particular circumstances that arise in each case. The provisions of the Act cannot be implemented without the prior declaration of a state of emergency by the Governor in Council.

Both reviews of liquid fuel shortfall management to which I have previously referred highlighted the need for Governments to have the power to act to redress demand and supply imbalances long before emergencies or crises were reached. Indeed, the reviews

highlighted a number of aspects of liquid fuel shortfall management wherein a declaration of a state of emergency would be particularly inappropriate.

There is normally a lead time between the occurrence of an event or series of events which will give rise to a shortage of liquid fuels and the actual shortage. The appropriate response on the part of the Government in such circumstances should be a gradual one, that is, a response which allows the Government to apply a progressive series of measures to deal with the situation should it worsen. The responses envisaged do not need the declaration of a state of emergency until a situation is reached where market forces and low-key Government measures can no longer allocate supplies in a rational and equitable manner. Only through a graduated response can orderly and equitable distribution of liquid fuels be accomplished during a period of shortfall. Any other type of response is likely to encourage panic buying which will exacerbate the shortage.

A further factor which is critical to the orderly and equitable distribution of liquid fuels during a period of shortfall is effective contingency planning. It is important that both users and suppliers of liquid fuels who are likely to be significantly affected during any period of shortfall should participate with the Government in the development of the contingency plan. In order to achieve this objective, a number of ongoing powers are required. Following the requirements for liquid fuels shortfall management, three major legislative principles emerge: contingency planning, shortfall management and enforcement action. The Liquid Fuels Supply Bill has been structured to take account of these principles.

Part I of the Bill deals with preliminaries, which are essentially definitions.

Part II deals with administration, the principal aspects of which are the nomination of the responsible Minister with the power of delegation.

Part III addresses contingency planning.

Part IV provides for powers in the event of a shortage or anticipated shortage of liquid fuel.

Part V deals with powers to be utilised during an emergency situation.

Part VI deals with enforcement provisions.

Part VII incorporates miscellaneous, legal and sundry procedural provisions.

The requirement for the authority for shortfall management and enforcement action is clear. The requirement for contingency planning authority is equally important. It is important that in any period of sustained shortfall of liquid fuels, effective procedures which are understood by users and suppliers are in place so that the shortfall can be managed in an orderly manner and free from panic or other influences which might exacerbate the shortfall. In order to develop a plan providing for such procedures, it is necessary for the Government to possess ongoing powers such as the power to acquire information, the power to develop guide-lines for action in the event of a sustained shortfall and the power to take precautionary action in the event of an anticipated shortage of liquid fuel—for example, the pre-positioning of stocks at appropriate locations throughout the State.

A power is proposed to acquire, from any person who is in a position to supply it, information relative to liquid fuel contingency planning. A specific power requiring information in respect of prescribed businesses is also proposed. Prescribed businesses are envisaged as being wholesalers and retailers of liquid fuel. Information required from them will be related to location and ownership of the business, output or offtake of products and storage facilities at the location of the business.

A significant feature of the Bill is a requirement for the development of guide-lines in respect of—

- the identification of essential and high priority users of liquid fuels;
- the identification of bulk customers of liquid fuels suppliers;
- the calculation of allocations of liquid fuels to bulk customers;
- procedures for the bulk allocation of liquid fuels; and

the regulation or prohibition of the supply of liquid fuels.

The guide-lines will indicate the manner in which critical aspects of liquid fuel supply will be managed in any protracted period of shortfall. In the process of their development, it is envisaged that an understanding of the proposed management on the part of suppliers and users of liquid fuels will be realised, resulting in both an orderly and equitable manner of distribution and a greater sense of logistical independence and responsibility on their part.

The concept of essential and high-priority users is central to the principles and practices of the management of a liquid fuels shortfall. Certain users of liquid fuels have a greater need for those fuels than do other users. The supply of liquid fuels to those users needs to be guaranteed as best as possible, given the circumstances prevailing at the time.

The bulk customers of oil companies include both essential and non-essential users of liquid fuels. They need to be identified and classified. Procedures for the allocation of liquid fuels similar to those that will prevail for issues from service stations need to be developed to ensure an equitable distribution between bulk and retail customers.

Guide-lines need to be developed with respect to the regulation or prohibition of the supply of liquid fuel. Those guide-lines will indicate the restrictive measures that will be applied during a shortfall; for example, the odd and even number-plate system, maximum/minimum purchase amounts, etc., and the manner in which they will be applied. They will also indicate the triggers for allocation by permit and the manner in which such practice will be applied.

Consistent with the principle of declaring a state of emergency only as a last resort during any period of liquid fuel shortfall, it is considered that the proper pre-positioning of liquid fuel stocks at appropriate locations throughout the State is an essential feature of liquid fuel contingency planning. The Bill provides powers to give effect to this principle should a liquid fuel shortfall be imminent. Specific powers in this regard relate to—

- the power to direct oil companies to release sufficient quantities of liquid fuels of a particular type to meet the anticipated shortfall;
- the power to direct refineries to vary their output of refined products in order to meet the type of liquid fuels shortfall which is anticipated; and
- the power to transfer liquid fuels from one place in the State to another in order to meet regional shortfalls.

Should the shortfall worsen and reach grave proportions, or should the shortfall have its origins in a crisis—for example, a severe cut-back in domestic supplies of crude oil from Bass Strait or from the Middle East—the proposed graduated governmental response may be insufficient to equitably allocate available supplies to essential and high priority users. In that event, the Government will require emergency powers to deal with this eventuality. It is at this point that the declaration of a state of emergency is envisaged, for which the Bill provides the following powers—

- the power to proclaim a state of emergency;
- the powers of the Minister during a liquid fuels emergency;
- the power to allocate liquid fuels by permit;
- the power to give directions regarding allocations of liquid fuels to bulk customers;
- the power to regulate the supply of liquid fuels generally;
- the power to fix a maximum price for liquid fuels for the duration of the state of emergency only, in order to prevent profiteering, to recompense service station proprietors for loss of income and as a possible fuel conservation measure; and
- the power to control liquid fuels imported into the State during an emergency.

It is clear that, during a period of shortfall, particularly during an emergency period, both suppliers and users of liquid fuels will look to the Government to implement its powers in a firm but fair manner. For this reason, significant enforcement provisions have been included in the Bill. Put concisely, these provisions will give authorised persons the power to inspect premises, vehicles, vessels, aircraft and receptacles contained thereon. These provisions will have their major impact in the prevention of black-marketeering. It should be noted that an authorised officer will not have the power to enter a dwelling-house unless he has either the prior permission of the occupier or a search warrant authorising him to do so. Penalties for non-compliance with the provisions of the Bill include fines on corporations and individuals, the power of seizure and the requirement to comply with written and oral requisitions of authorised persons.

As indicated earlier, Part VII of the Bill includes a number of miscellaneous provisions. These are—

- the protection of oil company trade secrets;
- the authority to seek injunctions but not against the Minister;
- penalties for use of false documents;
- provision for limited compensation in the event of the acquisition of property or for damages as a consequence of complying with directions given;
- exemption from an action for breach of contract as a consequence of complying with directions given;
- exemptions from the operation of the Act;
- evidentiary provisions;
- a provision relating to averment;
- provisions relating to the service of documents; and
- the head of power for making regulations.

Whilst providing for extensive and appropriate powers for the Government to manage a liquid fuels shortfall of any magnitude, the Bill takes account of the protection of individual rights. The Bill contains provisions relating to—

- confidentiality of information obtained;
- appeals against the decisions of the Minister and his delegates;
- requirements for warrants to enter property;
- protection of trade secrets; and
- compensation for the acquisition of property and for the compliance with directions.

Of particular importance is the Bill's complementarity with the Commonwealth Government's Liquid Fuel Emergency Act 1984. That legislation contains a number of powers which most State Energy Ministers believe are appropriately powers of State Governments. The Commonwealth Government believes that such powers should be uniformly applied throughout the country and has included them in its legislation to achieve that objective. The Commonwealth Government has, however, included a sunset clause in its legislation, the effect of which is to provide a period of three years for State Governments to develop complementary legislation. A consequence of not enacting the Liquid Fuel Supply Bill will be to transfer the power for liquid fuels contingency planning in Queensland to Canberra.

Enactment of this Liquid Fuel Supply Bill will not jeopardise the operation of any other legislation but will provide the Government with the means of managing a shortfall which is confined to Queensland, or a national shortfall wherein Queensland is operating in concert with the Commonwealth Government and not subservient to it. I commend the Bill to the honourable members.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Forestry Act 1959-1982 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Glasson, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.4 p.m.): I move—

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

The Bill is aimed primarily at correcting anomalies or covering changes which legal opinion and experience have indicated are necessary for the proper implementation of the Act. The most significant amendments are the introduction of specialised management areas within State forests and provisions to enable the Timber Research and Development Advisory Councils to manage and control funds collected by the Department of Forestry for the purpose of establishing and maintaining such councils, and specifying managerial and accounting procedures to be followed by councils.

Honourable members will be aware of the increased use being made of State forests for recreational purposes. The cardinal principle of management of State forests requires that the Conservator of Forests have, as well as the purpose of producing timber and associated products in perpetuity, due regard to, among other things, the application of State forests for recreational purposes. Numerous recreational facilities and scenic drives have been provided and are being maintained on State forests.

In the administration and management of parts of State forests for these and other specialised purposes, it has become apparent that the existing legislation is deficient in some respects. Provisions of the Bill seek to remedy these deficiencies. The amendments provide for the declaration of

- (i) feature protection areas,
- (ii) State forest parks,
- (iii) scientific areas, and
- (iv) forest drives,

and provide powers for the Conservator of Forests to effectively manage and control these areas. Specific powers are included to control the use of vehicles within these areas and to regulate the use of State forests for camping.

These provisions formalise the concept of making appropriate areas of State forest available for the use and enjoyment of the general public for forest-based recreation or to competent scientists for research purposes. The Conservator of Forests may continue to manage these special management areas in accordance with the cardinal principle of the Act, including timber production in perpetuity, provided his management is not inconsistent with the specialised provisions set down for a particular area.

To provide some means of summarily dealing with persons attempting to commit or suspected of committing an offence on a State forest or timber reserve, including the misuse or abuse of facilities provided by the Conservator of Forests or behaving in a manner likely to endanger or cause annoyance to other users, clause 26 of the Bill empowers a forest officer to direct such persons to leave the reserves. A person who fails to comply with such a direction or who, after complying, then re-enters a State forest or timber reserve on the same day, commits an offence. That provision is essential for security and good management.

The increased public use of State forests, however, is not without problems. In recent times, the unauthorised use of State forests by off-road vehicles, and more particularly trail bikes, has increased.

In addition to the nuisance caused, and the real danger occasioned to legitimate users of the State forest by that unauthorised use, significant damage is being caused to forestry fire-breaks and access tracks, and to the forest environment generally, by disturbance of soil, often leading to accelerated erosion.

It has become obvious that unauthorised users riding or driving unregistered vehicles are often able to escape prosecution by means of refusing to answer, or refusing to answer truthfully, questions legitimately put to them by a forest officer. The limitations this places on the department's effectiveness in controlling this type of nuisance gives cause for concern and has been the subject of some adverse public criticism.

It is therefore considered vital to provide forest officers with an effective method of control, and, to this end, proposed amendments included in the Bill provide forest officers with the power to seize motor vehicles and motor cycles that are on a State forest or timber reserve without lawful permission or, in those situations where no permit is required, are being used in contravention of the Act.

To provide adequate safeguards for the interests of the owners of any vehicles so seized, provision is made for an application to be made to a Magistrates Court for an order to have the vehicle returned. The court, after a hearing, may confirm or disallow the seizure.

Thus, the intention of this provisions is not to permanently deprive a vehicle-owner of his vehicle but to ensure that my Department of Forestry can obtain sufficient and correct evidence on which to base a prosecution. It is further expected that all vehicles will, in any case, be returned to the owners upon completion of prosecution action. The provisions are so constructed as to facilitate this. The provisions have also been extended to formalise the dealing with vehicles otherwise seized under powers already contained in section 18 (1) (vii) of the Act.

This Bill also incorporates amendments to Part II A—Timber Research and Development Advisory Councils of the Act. The Timber Research and Development Advisory Council of South and Central Queensland and the Timber Research and Development Advisory Council of North Queensland were established in 1970 to advise the Minister with respect to matters affecting the timber industry, particularly the areas of promotion, education and research. To assist the councils during their formative years, the Department of Forestry carried out all accounting functions relating to the councils.

To enable the councils now to manage their own funds, provisions is made in the Bill for amounts of the additional Crown log stumpages collected by the Conservator of Forests for the purpose of defraying costs and expenses incurred by the councils in carrying out their charter to be paid to the councils on a monthly basis. The Bill also sets out the managerial and accounting procedures to be implemented by the councils. The proposed provisions have been drafted in accordance with recommendations made by the Auditor-General.

Adequate controls will continue to be maintained, as specific provisions of the Bill require the councils to submit their budgets to the Minister for approval and to append annual statements of account as certified by the Auditor-General to their annual reports, which are required to be tabled in this Parliament.

Section 22P of the Act, which provides for employees of councils to have the benefit of a superannuation scheme, has also been amended to bring it into compliance with Cabinet directives in relation to superannuation schemes for statutory authorities.

It is also proposed to clarify the powers vested in the incumbent for the time being of the position of Conservator of Forests, and the Conservator of Forests, the corporation

sole. Legal advice received by my Department of Forestry is to the effect that existing delegatory provisions in the Act provide only for personal delegation of powers by the incumbent for the time being of the office of the Conservator of Forests. A fresh delegation is thus required each time a person is appointed to hold that position. Provisions of the Bill seek to overcome these difficulties by vesting in the Conservator of Forests, the corporation sole, the right to exercise all or any of the powers, functions and duties inferred or placed upon the Conservator, the incumbent, by the provisions of the Act.

Furthermore, while the Conservator has power under the Act to delegate to the holder of the offices of deputy conservator and secretary, delegations to all other officers and employees of the department and other officers of the Crown are made to a named person, and thus need to be reissued whenever there is a change of staff in the delegated position.

Clause 6 of the Bill provides for the extension of the delegatory powers of the Conservator of Forests to include the additional power to delegate to the holder of an office specifying its title but not the name of the holder for the time being. This will facilitate the department's administrative procedures.

Clause 22 of the Bill is a machinery provision and amends section 47 of the Act, since the proviso in paragraph (ii) (b) of subsection 1 of this section does not fully exempt, as was intended at the time of its insertion, the Conservator of Forests from the provisions of this section to secure the consent of certain other departments when selling material to the Department of Main Roads for road purposes. To correct this, the proviso is deleted and included in subsection 6 of section 47.

The Bill also provides for the amendment of the subject matter for regulations as a consequence of amendments proposed by this Bill.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on the motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

DENTAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Dental Act 1971-1973 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Austin, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (10.13 p.m.): I move—

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

The Dental Act was last amended in December 1973, and since that time there have been a number of significant changes in dentistry which necessitate some changes in the principal Act.

The first change provided for in the Bill relates to the qualifications for registration as a dentist. Over recent years, there has been a steady increase in the number of applications for dental registration by overseas dentists who, under the provisions of the present Act, must be accepted.

The proliferation of university dental schools in some of the prescribed countries and Britain's entry into the European Economic Community could have made the

existing registration provisions within the Act too broad and could undermine the intention of the Dental Act to maintain existing high standards in dentistry in this State.

Restricting the registration of overseas-trained dentists will have an immediate effect that can be readily adjusted by the formulation of acceptable qualifications. Also, the viability of the Dental School of the University of Queensland is protected and, in addition, quotas will not require drastic reduction.

In an effort to fully outline the situation, the overall question of qualifications and registration has been broken up into three broad categories, namely, standards of registration, manpower and administration of the Act.

Firstly, I will deal with the standards of registration. The standards of dental education and the quality of graduates from Australian dental schools is kept under constant review. Conventions such as meetings of dental deans and meetings of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Dental Teachers ensure that curriculums, teaching techniques and standards are maintained. There are regular meetings of presidents of Australian dental boards and Australian vice-chancellors and, in the graduate field, specialist societies monitor training curricula. Most of these meetings include representation from New Zealand.

It has proved very difficult to assess curriculums and graduate standards of foreign dental schools and to equilibrate them to the standard of the Queensland graduate. This exercise has been attempted by the Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications using visits by senior dentists and academics to overseas dental schools. The results have been inconclusive and the expenditure considerable, thus resulting in the exercise being replaced initially by the COPQ examination and now the examination conducted by the Australian Dental Examining Council.

In recent years a number of new dental schools have been established which have not been assessed. Although most of them have been in Third World countries in Africa and South America, new schools have been established in Hong Kong and South Africa. Stellenbosch in the latter country has Afrikaans as the language of instruction.

The Dental Board considers that it is preferable to assess the competency of individual immigrant dentists by examination and clinical testing than try to judge the standards of the total output from a foreign dental school. That is standard practice in most of the other developed countries in the world, for example, national and State board examinations in the United States and the royal college examinations in Canada.

The advent of the European Common Market agreement governing the movement of professionals within that community gives concern for the future status of the General Dental Council of Great Britain with regard to Australia, since Britain is required generally to comply with the provisions of the ECM agreement. Also reciprocity is unlikely to be affected adversely from the Australian dentist's viewpoint as work permits must be obtained by non-British passport-holders to practice in Britain in any case.

The second category I wish to address is manpower. Like medicine, dentistry has a developing manpower problem and an over-supply of graduates to service community needs. The situation that is developing rapidly at present is likely to deteriorate further in the next five to 10 years as the dentist-to-population ratio is increasing. This is an Australia-wide problem, and Queensland is no exception.

Unlike medicine, there has been a change in the pattern of dental disease over the last 10 years. This change has caused a considerable reduction in the need for operative treatment of dental caries with a consequent reduction in the demand for this service. This is especially so in the younger age groups and has led to a reduced demand for dental care.

Therefore, in common with the policy in other developing countries, the Dental Board policy is that preference should be given to local graduates, both present and future, for registration as dentists in Queensland.

The final category with which I wish to deal concerns the administration of the Act, particularly with regard to applicants who are not immediately registrable. Administration of the Dental Act will be facilitated, as direct registration is clearly stated in clause 6 of the Bill.

The acceptance of the COPQ or its equivalent examination in dentistry will also facilitate procedures. This examination, for instance, closely follows the procedure of the Australian Medical Examining Council and consists of the following—

A written test in English for all applicants whose national language is not English. This test may be taken in Australia or at overseas embassies twice yearly.

A screening examination in dentistry consisting of four papers of multiple choice questions. This examination is held twice yearly in Australia and at overseas embassies on request.

Candidates who pass these two examinations successfully may sit for the clinical examination which is held at one of the dental teaching hospitals in November each year. Examiners are appointed from the profession in that State and the academic staff of the particular dental school, together with external examiners in each subject who are appointed from other Australian states. A certificate is awarded following the successful passing of these examinations.

In relation to residential provisions, it is undesirable that foreign dentists should be registered in Queensland when they have no immediate intention of practising in this State. Immigration to Australia is controlled by the Commonwealth Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department; hence the ability of foreign dentists to emigrate will involve criteria other than the acceptance of their dental qualifications.

Provision exists elsewhere for visiting lecturers and clinicians so that there is no acceptable reason for so registering.

Honourable members will note that the foregoing needs have been addressed in the amending Bill. For example, section 18 (1) will require a person to be residing in Queensland prior to registration. This will eliminate the need to register a dentist from another State or country when he has no immediate intention of practising in Queensland.

The involvement of the head of the Department of Dentistry, University of Queensland, in conducting oral and practical examinations has been eliminated. This will allow the Dental Board to accept the certificate issued by the COPQ or other bodies recognised by the board.

Subsection (2) of section 18 provides for the granting of overseas conditional registration by the board. The maximum period allowable for such registration is one year and is not renewable. This amendment also enables the board to cancel overseas conditional registration at any time. If a dentist who has received such registration proves to the board that he is practising dentistry in Queensland prior to the expiration of the one year period, the board is empowered to confirm his registration from the date that he was granted the overseas conditional registration.

The requirements for specialist registration as a dentist have also been tidied up. These amendments require a dentist to be registered in Queensland before being entitled to registration as a specialist. An applicant is required to satisfy the Dental Board that he holds a prescribed qualification and any other special condition in the specialty for which he has applied and, in addition, that he has gained special skills in the specialty for a period of not less than three years.

The Act does not cover the registration limited to post-graduate study or research within or under the auspices of the University of Queensland of persons from overseas holding dental qualifications not necessarily entitling them to full registration. In view thereof, a new section has been incorporated which will provide measures to allow the qualified registration for these study and research purposes of dentists from overseas countries and, in particular, the South East Asian countries which come within the Australian sphere of influence.

This new section contains suitable provisions to cover the granting of a certificate of registration, renewal and cancellation thereof, the period for which it may be issued and certain other requirements. A number of amendments have been included in the disciplinary section of the Act. A new subsection has been included which will allow the Dental Board to recover costs associated with any action it might take against a dentist under the section. It will ensure that pecuniary penalties or costs ordered by the board are remitted forthwith or immediately upon expiration of the time allowed for payment.

Because the business aspects of dentistry are now being carried on through various forms of partnerships, companies, etc., the Dental Board feels that the existing provisions of the Act, particularly in regard to discipline, are unsatisfactory in that they do not extend to cover such partnerships, etc. To overcome this situation, a new section has been included in the Bill to enable the Dental Board to exercise control over the dentistry practised by such associations, whether incorporated or unincorporated. The board may also hold inquiries into any matter relating to this section.

It will be noted that various penalties have been amended in the Bill to bring them into line with similar Acts and in accordance with current day values.

A new Part has been included in the Bill which will provide for the formation of dental companies. As previously stated earlier in my address, the business aspects of dentistry are being carried on through a variety of partnerships, companies and other associations. The Dental Board therefore considers that the Act should be amended to allow it to exercise control over such partnerships, etc.

Honourable members will be aware that in other professional groups, such as medicine, architecture, accounting, engineering and surveying, the members of those professions have the facility for incorporation. This progression is an Australia-wide movement and has followed trends already established in other countries. For example, in 1981, in this House, a Bill was passed which allowed medical practitioners to set up medical companies. The general guide-lines included in that Bill have been incorporated in the amendment to this Act.

It was never the intention of the Dental Act to include provision to cover corporate bodies. However, because of the changing practices, it has been necessary for the Dental Board to move with the changing times and to provide provisions in the Act for the purpose of clarifying the legal position in so far as dental companies are concerned and, in addition, to provide for the recognition of the existence of such companies. A somewhat similar situation existed at the time when the Medical Act was amended.

I assure honourable members that, in the process of the preparation of this Bill, care has been taken to keep the substantive provisions concerning dental companies distinct and apart from those applicable to the individual dental practitioner. The reason for this distinction is that only an individual person can be registered as a dentist. A dental company is seen to be a business or employing agency and, in this context, it has no need for registration under the Dental Act.

I point out that the provisions of this Bill are not intended to control and regulate dental companies in their functioning as corporate bodies. That is clearly a matter for other authorities.

The function of the Dental Board, in my view, is to maintain the relationship between the dentists in their professional role and their patients and, at the same time, to ensure that the responsibility for patient care rests with the individual dentist.

Basically, Part V specifically relates to the provision of dental companies and is distinct and apart from the other provisions of the Act. Adequate provision has been included to cover the establishment of dental companies and for such companies to recover fees.

Advertising provisions have been covered in the amending Bill. Clause 40 is appropriate in this instance.

A provision has been included which will allow the Dental Board to oversee the naming of dental companies. In this regard a company will be required to take action to alter its name to one approved by the board and any other authority empowered by another statute to approve a name. It also allows the board to obtain and select one or more names acceptable to it.

So as not to affect the legal liability of dental practitioners in a company practice, clause 42 has the effect of extending to one or more dentists a direct involvement in the agreement made between a person and that company for dental care and advice consequently given to that person.

Finally, I point out that a number of minor machinery amendments have also been included in the Bill.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Hospitals Act 1936-1983 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Austin, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (10.26 p.m.): I move—

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

The main purpose of the proposed amendment to the Hospitals Act is to extend the legislative power of the Chief Nursing Officer and to provide a number of other minor amendments.

Honourable members will be aware that in 1981 a decision was made to establish within my department a Division of Nursing Services. This division was established for the purpose of supervising nursing services conducted under the direct or indirect control of the Department of Health and, to this time, continues to expand in a gradual process of development.

On 25 November 1982, a Bill was introduced to this House which, inter alia, established under legislative provision, the position of Chief Nursing Officer. It also set out the duties of this officer in so far as nursing services in hospitals controlled by hospitals boards were concerned. The Bill was assented to on 3 December 1982.

In recognition of the further development of this division, it is considered that the legislative powers of the Chief Nursing Officer should be extended to include nursing services provided under the direct control of the Department of Health. These additional powers were originally considered at the time of the introduction of the previous amendment. However, it was felt that the division was not sufficiently established to cope with the extra work-load.

Since that time extra staff have been appointed, and it is now recognised that these additional duties should be passed on to the Chief Nursing Officer to allow her to effectively supervise and control nursing services. To this time these extra duties have been principally carried out by administrative arrangement, but it is now considered that such duties should be conferred on the Chief Nursing Officer by way of legislative provision.

The amendment to the Hospitals Act included in clause 2 of this Bill therefore extends the authority of the Chief Nursing Officer to include nursing services conducted by hospitals, institutions, sections and branches under the direct control of the Department of Health—for example, psychiatric hospitals, “Eventides”, maternal and child health and a number of other areas.

It should be noted that care has been taken to ensure that this amendment does not impinge upon the autonomy of hospitals boards as already provided for in the current legislation.

The other amendments provided for in this Bill relate to amendments of a machinery nature and, in addition, to the increase of certain penalties to bring them in line with current-day values.

Section 44 of the Act has also been amended to provide a specified period of 14 days for an employee to submit a reply in cases where he has been charged. This amended provision has been included following representations received from an industrial union and is in accordance with a similar provision included in the Public Service Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

NURSING STUDIES ACT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Nursing Studies Act 1976-1978 the Chiropodists Act 1969-1975 the Chiropractic Manipulative Therapists Act 1979 the Dental Act 1971-1973 the Hospitals Act 1936-1983 the Medical Act 1939-1984 the Nursing Act 1976-1979 the Occupational Therapists Act 1979 the Optometrists Act 1974 the Pharmacy Act 1976-1981 the Physiotherapists Act 1964-1981 the Psychologists Act 1977 the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945-1981 and the Speech Therapists Act 1979 each in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Austin, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (10.31 p.m.): I move—

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

Honourable members will note that the Bill provides for amendments not only to the Nursing Studies Act but also to a number of other Acts including—

- the Chiropodists Act,
- the Chiropractic Manipulative Therapists Act,
- the Dental Act,
- the Hospitals Act,
- the Medical Act,
- the Nursing Act,
- the Occupational Therapists Act,
- the Optometrists Act,
- the Pharmacy Act,
- the Physiotherapists Act,
- the Psychologists Act,

the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act, and the Speech Therapists Act.

Firstly, I will deal with the Nursing Studies Act. One amendment proposed to the Act deals with the appointment of a deputy chairman to the Board of Nursing Studies. There are two other minor amendments. The Act currently provides for the adviser in nursing, Department of Health, to be deputy chairman of the Board of Nursing Studies. The head of the Nursing Services Division is now the Chief Nursing Officer and it is fitting that this officer should hold the position of deputy chairman of the board in an ex officio capacity. It is proposed to delete subsection 8 of section 7 from the Act. This subsection refers to the appointment of members of the board, when it was first constituted, and following the passing of the Act, and, as such, the subsection is no longer necessary.

Section 24 of the Act also requires minor modification because the wording "in the prescribed form" presently stated in the Act is no longer applicable. Nursing education is carried out not only in hospitals but also in tertiary education institutions. It is therefore not feasible to apply this terminology to a tertiary institution, and appropriate amended wording has been included.

The amendment of the various other Acts is required for the purpose of bringing such Acts into kilter with Government requirements in the payment of fees and allowances to members of boards. Currently, the Acts provide for the prescription of fees and allowances by way of regulation or by-law. It has been the practice to amend a particular regulation or by-law in line with a scale of fees approved by the Public Service Board.

Legal advice indicates that this practice, unless closely monitored, could lead to disparities in the payment of fees, etc., to members of boards and committees. To ensure that a rigid system for the payment of fees and allowances is adopted, and to bring the provisions of the Acts in accordance with Government policies, the amendment will require the payment of fees and allowances as approved by the Governor in Council. This revised provision will mean that approval will be sought for the payment of such fees and allowances by way of an Executive Council minute in accordance with the scale of fees approved by the Public Service Board. Therefore, there will be no need to amend any other instrument.

Honourable members will note that, in addition to the foregoing amendments, an amendment to the financial provisions of the Nursing Act has also been included in the Bill. The provision will allow the Nurses Board to expend some of its funds not required for specific purposes towards meeting the costs involved in conducting nursing research. It is felt that this provision will benefit the nursing profession generally.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (AMENDMENT OF SUPERANNUATION PROVISIONS) 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 Grammar Schools Act 1975, the Rural Training Schools Act of 1965, the University of Queensland Act 1965-1983, the Griffith University Act 1971-1983 and the James Cook University of North Queensland Act 1970-1983 each 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) (10.36 p.m.): I move—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Bill implements Government policy requiring statutory authorities to obtain the approval of the Governor in Council for their staff superannuation schemes. It also authorises schemes already in operation for the staff of certain statutory authorities.

As with many pieces of apparently simple legislation, this Bill proved quite difficult to prepare, involving, as it did, five different Acts of Parliament covering 15 different educational institutions, nearly every one with its own superannuation scheme. A considerable amount of inquiry was needed to obtain background information as prelude to preparing the principles of the legislation before turning to the legalities.

It is unfortunate that this preparatory work coincided with the introduction of a new national superannuation scheme for universities. During this transitional period, the James Cook University amended its existing scheme to enable members to derive benefits from it whilst still remaining in the university's employ. No approval of the Governor in Council was sought for the amendment, although the Government's policy in this regard had previously been transmitted to statutory authorities and, as far as I am aware, was clearly understood. I am told that the university believed that the approval of the Governor in Council was not required in this instance. This belief was promptly corrected when word of the amendment reached the Government, and the university council acted quickly to try to reverse the original decision.

By that time, however, a number of university staff had lodged requests for their benefits, which, on legal advice, had to be granted. I believe this is wrong in principle, and it is regrettable that we did not have in force legislation that would have enabled us to prevent such an amendment to the James Cook scheme. The incident underlines the need for this legislation.

As I stated earlier, the three universities—the University of Queensland, James Cook University of North Queensland and Griffith University—have staff superannuation schemes in operation and are at present implementing participation in the new national scheme for university staff. Since their legislation does not specifically authorise such superannuation schemes, it has been decided that the opportunity should be taken to authorise them in this Bill. That is not to say the schemes have been illegal. It has been suggested that certain provisions in the current legislation referring to management of the university and appointment and control of staff could be interpreted to cover superannuation provisions.

Parts IV, V and VI of the Bill cover amendments to each of the three university Acts. The authorisation provision applies also to one rural training school—Emerald—which still has a private superannuation scheme operating for a small number of employees. This scheme was started before an amendment to the State Service Superannuation Act was implemented to cover rural training school staff. As the private scheme has been continued, it should be covered in the authorising legislation, and this is done in Part III of the Bill.

Grammar schools all have private schemes for their staff, but no authorisation provision is required, because the Grammar Schools Act clearly provides for staff superannuation. The necessary basic amendment to the Grammar Schools Act is contained in Part II.

As I stated earlier, as well as authorising current schemes, the Bill implements Government policy requiring statutory authorities to obtain the approval of the Governor in Council before introducing a new scheme or amending an existing one. It is similar to legislation introduced in respect of other statutory authorities.

There is also a provision enabling the Governor in Council, if he wishes, to impose conditions when he is approving of schemes that are being set up or are being amended

after this Act comes into force. One of those conditions, which the Government has chosen to express for the purposes of clarity, is that the Auditor-General be authorised to audit the accounts and records of the statutory authority in respect of the superannuation scheme. I stress that this is not a mandatory nor an automatic provision, but one which may be introduced if necessary.

The Bill thus amends five Acts of Parliament, four of the Acts being amended by provisions common to all, and the fifth—the Grammar Schools Act—by a provision which differs only slightly from the others.

I am sure that the Bill will command the support of all honourable members, who will view it as a necessary piece of legislation to exercise some control over superannuation schemes for statutory authorities.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Smith, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 18 September 1984.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.