

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1984

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Beach Protection Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
Mental Health Act, Criminal Code and Health Act Amendment Bill.

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS**Assent**

Mr SPEAKER informed the House that on 17 September he presented to His Excellency the Governor the amendments to Standing Orders adopted by the House on 28 August, and that His Excellency was pleased, in his presence, to accord his assent thereto.

PAPERS

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

Report of the Nominal Defendant (Queensland) for the year ended 30 June 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamation under—

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1984

Orders in Council under—

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Electricity Act 1976-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Electricity Act 1976-1982

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Petroleum Act 1923-1983

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959-1981

Banana Industry Protection Acts 1929 to 1937

City of Brisbane Market Act 1960-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Fisheries Act 1976-1984

Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923-1981

The Supreme Court Act of 1921

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978

Law Courts and State Buildings Protective Security Act 1983

Fisheries Act 1976-1984

Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act 1982-1984
Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923-1981
Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1984
Traffic Act 1949-1982
State Transport Act 1960-1981
Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act 1969
Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975
Tow-truck Act 1973
Motor Vehicles Safety Act 1980
Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1983
Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979
By-laws under the Harbours Act 1955-1982
Financial Statements and Report of the Auditor-General on the Queensland Coal Board for the year ended 30 June 1984
Reports of the following bodies for the year ended 30 June 1984—
Brisbane and Area Water Board
Queensland Harness Racing Board
Queensland Turf Club
Downs and South-Western Queensland Racing Club
Central Queensland Racing Association.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Queensland Pork Producers State Council

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.8 a.m.), by leave: In the light of recent speculation in relation to the affairs of the Queensland Pork Producers State Council, I consider that I should inform the House of all aspects of the matter which have come to my attention.

The Queensland Pork Producers State Council is a pork-producer representative body, set up under the provisions of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act. As Minister for Primary Industries, I am responsible for approval of the organisation's annual budget and I require an annual report. My department has no representation on the organisation, all members of the State council being directly elected by pork-producers.

On 20 August 1984, Mr Denis Hinton, State president of the Queensland Pork Producers State Council, requested advice from the Director-General and the Director of Marketing of my department on the handling of what appeared to be an administrative problem within the organisation. Mr Hinton advised my officers that he believed that Mr David Collins, executive officer of the organisation, was improperly conducting the business affairs of a private company, Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd, through the organisation and using the organisation's resources. Mr Hinton stated that such activity was in direct contravention of assurances that he, as State president, had received from the directors of this company and that State council's executive officer.

The directors of Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd, which imports products used in pig production and has undertaken the export of some grains and bird seeds, are Mr Robert Wild and Mr John Bryant, who at the time were State councillors of the organisation, and Mr Collins, former executive officer of the State council.

As the extent of the unauthorised involvement between the company and the organisation could not be identified, Mr Hinton asked for departmental assistance. A departmental officer, with a senior officer of the Internal Operational Audit Service, accompanied Mr Hinton to the State council's office.

Their investigation was confined to an examination of the books and, in particular, to the entries shown in the debtors' ledger specifically relating to OTC telex accounts.

Their investigation established that expenditure had been incurred on telex, telephone, postage and letter-head printing on behalf of Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd. A sample inspection revealed that expenditure was being brought to account in the appropriate manner and staff claimed that the intention was to invoice Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd for outstanding telex accounts.

On receipt of this advice, Mr Hinton called a special meeting of the State council on 30 August. At this meeting, State councillors Messrs Wild and Bryant resigned, as did the executive officer, Mr Collins.

My Director-General advised the Auditor-General of developments, and I am informed that the president of the State council has requested an audit by the Auditor-General of the books of the organisation. I am informed also that the State council and the former directors have not, as yet, reached agreement on the extent of moneys due to the council for providing services to Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd and that this aspect is currently being pursued under the direction of the State president.

I stress that the matter is basically one which the organisation itself must resolve. I hope that this can be done at an early date so that the pork industry can address itself to other issues of importance to the industry.

Conservative Party of Australia

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (11.12 a.m.), by leave: In recent weeks, many north Queenslanders have received a brochure from a so-called political organisation, the Conservative Party of Australia, which claims that it is fighting to save the environment from all forms of progress, including the Cape Tribulation to Bloomfield road and tourist and commercial projects from Cairns to Coolangatta.

The party, which has its origins in Byron Bay, is run by its fearless political guru, a gentleman by the name of Mr Fast Bucks. In a dazzling performance, this gentleman recently announced his political ambition of winning a Queensland Senate seat when he gate crashed my Brisbane office. After making it as far as the office photocopier before being escorted out, he satisfied the disappointed media by handing out to workers in Edward Street copies of a so-called report.

Other breath-taking instalments of the "Fast Bucks Reports" concerning other Cabinet Ministers have been promised.

After such a magnificent start to his campaign, it seems only fair to ask who this gentleman is. He is Mr Johannes Van De Knapp, also known as John Christopher Anderson, of Lot 9, News Road, Corrabell, near Byron Bay. He changed his name by deed poll in 1983 to the legendary Mr Fast Bucks.

Among his many claims to fame is his introduction of the Marijuana Party to Byron Bay and the publication of various illegal newspapers attacking police, politicians and any person with whom he does not agree. He associates with a Frederick Christian Dierck, who has changed his name by deed poll to Mr Con Slick. Mr Slick is well known to Byron Bay police as a local hoodlum and drug-dealer.

Mr Fast Bucks's criminal record includes the following—

6 weeks' hard labour for assault and resisting arrest in Victoria in July 1968;

\$100 good behaviour bond for 12 months for larceny in Victoria in February 1974; and

\$200 in fines, plus costs and compensation totalling \$170, for criminal damage in Victoria in August 1981.

Mr Fast Bucks's political future may be cut short, as he is currently on remand until 12 October to the Byron Bay Magistrates Court concerning charges of cultivating 60 Indian hemp plants.

His principal associate in far-north Queensland, Michael James Bromfield, of Woree Caravan Park in Cairns, has an equally unsavoury background. Mr Bromfield's previous

convictions in Queensland include those for drug offences in 1978, possession of property suspected of being stolen in 1980, and the possession of an instrument for smoking (dope) and fraud in Brisbane in 1982. When approached in Kuranda a week ago while handing out Mr Bucks's literature, he advised that he could be contacted at 312 Sheridan Street, Cairns, the address of a number of Cape Tribulation Road protesters.

I am sure that the vast majority of responsible Queenslanders who are concerned about environmental issues would dismiss Mr Fast Bucks's so-called campaign on conservation issues as a sick joke, were it not for his criminal background. The only thing fast about this gentleman is the speed with which he and his associates break the law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (11.16 a.m.), by leave: In this House on 30 August 1984, the member for Pine Rivers said—

“Queensland has set the pace for Handihomes and in my area of Pine Rivers the first Handihome has been opened.”

At the time, I said that the first Handihome in the State was being built at Kallangur, in the middle of the electorate of Murrumba. Mrs Chapman then went on to say that “the Handihome is to be opened in the area of Pine Rivers.” This change, omitting the word “my” from the previous sentence, was an attempt to bring the statement into line with the member's position on the Pine Rivers Shire Council.

In both cases, the statements were incorrect, because in this House, when speaking about “my” area, one usually refers to one's electorate. In the second case, the Pine Rivers Shire Council does not have wards, so reference to “my” area is still wrong.

At the time, I took a point of order so that inaccuracies could be corrected in “Hansard” However, because of the Chair's lack of knowledge of the situation—which is quite understandable, considering the matter is local to the two electorates—the point of order was ruled invalid.

I make this personal explanation so that people are aware of which area they live in. I suggest that this is not the first attempt by the member to border-hop. However, I suggest that she should make it her last.

When a member resides in an electorate other than the electorate that he or she represents, it is not mandatory for the member to represent the electorate of the member's place of living.

Mr JENNINGS (Southport) (11.18 a.m.), by leave: On 7 August, I issued a public statement warning people against buying into a project which was advertised by a company called Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd, with Sir Rupert Hamer advertised as its chairman, and a company called Gold Coast Trust Corporation Ltd, with Sir Wallace Rae as its chairman. On 22 August, I raised that matter in this House.

On 28 August, the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General issued a statement which made it clear that the scheme was illegal, that there was misrepresentation, that there was no firm basis on which an investigator could make a decision on the prospects of the scheme returning a profit, that the company was not registered prior to my statement in Parliament, that the advertisements and other publications were misleading, that there was no detailed expert's report, that if purchasers bought it was not clear what they were buying, that the promoters had used devious means to avoid a clear explanation of the scheme so as to benefit themselves financially, that certain requirements of the Queensland Companies Code were not satisfied, and that the Solicitor-General's Office had been asked to advise on a prosecution of the company and the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs applied to the Supreme Court to obtain an injunction to prevent any further sales.

During the course of my brief speech to Parliament on 22 August, a number of interjections were raised by honourable members opposite in regard to the matter of a

writ that was issued on Monday, 20 August, by Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd, Rupert James Hamer, Brian Richard Goldsmith, and Fritz Heinrich Mader against me.

As I stated in the speech, and as set out in documents that were tabled on 22 August, the sole purpose of that writ was to stop me pursuing any of the Land Bank matters in this Parliament. That action was taken on a misconceived idea that, by issuing a writ, it would make the matter sub judice and I would be ruled out of order. In other words, the promoters of that swindling scheme, who callously set out to defraud people who did not have much money and, therefore, would be too weak financially to be able to fight back, blatantly attempted to misuse the legal system to thwart our right and obligations as members of Parliament to discuss this matter in Parliament, and attempted to deny us the fundamental right of parliamentary privilege.

In my view, it was a shabby, devious legal stunt to try to gag me as the member responsible. That is a tactic to which I am not unaccustomed, as I have been subjected to similar legal processes in another State whilst I was a member of Parliament when I counter-sued for a vexatious writ and won with costs.

I now advise the House that my solicitors, Messrs Pattison & Barry, informed me that the writ brought against me by the company, Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd, and its directors, Sir Rupert James Hamer, Brian Richard Goldsmith and Fritz Heinrich Mader, was discontinued of 3 September 1984.

I also advise the House that there has not been one word of retraction from either Sir Wallace Rae or Sir Rupert Hamer in regard to the derogatory public allegations that they made in regard to me personally, which included that my claims were fantasy, groundless and utter nonsense, that I was mischief-making and that it was just sour grapes on my part. I am also not unaccustomed to those tactics from that type of person.

It should also be drawn to the attention of the House——

Mr Burns injected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns: It has nothing to do with a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns: It has nothing to do with a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lytton has been interjecting in this Chamber far too much, especially on my rulings and under his breath so that nobody else in the House can hear him. The member for Southport has paid me the compliment of showing me his personal explanation. The member for Southport will proceed.

Mr JENNINGS: I have almost completed my personal explanation. It is an important explanation, because the matter was raised by Opposition members during my speech.

It should also be drawn to the attention of the House that Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd instructed its solicitors to issue proceedings against a Mr Edward James Renton, barrister and solicitor of Melbourne, to recover damages.

Furthermore, it should be noted that on Friday, 31 August 1984, Mr Edward James Renton, barrister and solicitor, counter-sued Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd and some directors for defamation. That is an interesting set of circumstances, as Land Bank's original writ against Mr Renton nullifies normal client/solicitor privilege.

The prompt and efficient action by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General in this case should be a warning to all. I hope and trust that the people who put money into the scheme quickly receive a full refund as proposed by the Minister.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (11.21 a.m.), by leave: On the night of 30 August 1984, the member for Warwick misrepresented and misquoted in the House statements

made by me in the Address and Reply debate. He stated, "He went so far as to say that the work-force in Queensland was unskilled and uneducated." Further, he said, "That is certainly not correct."

Mr Speaker, the statement that I made to the House was "that Queenslanders were the least skilled and least educated workers in Australia". My statement is based on a report of the Premier's Department, commissioned by State Cabinet on 21 March 1983, entitled "Towards a Strategy for Technological Development in Queensland", which states—

"Furthermore in comparison with the rest of Australia Queensland has a lower skill workforce.

For example

57% of the Queensland population left school at 15 or earlier as compared with 49% for Australia as a whole;

of those with formal qualifications Queensland has a lower than average proportion with Degrees and Diplomas."

By attacking me, the member for Warwick is attacking the information provided by the Premier's own department. In his own words, he has highlighted the greatest neglect of this State Government—the neglect of our work-force, the neglect of ordinary Queenslanders.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (11.22 a.m.), by leave: I believe that the Queensland Parliament should record that in 1984 Mackay are the Foley Shield grand champions in A Grade, Under 19 and Under 17, thus taking out the grand slam for the first time in the history of the competition.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to curtail the opportunity of members to make personal explanations. However, using personal explanations as a device to revive debates or using them as the member for Mackay has done on this occasion is out of order. In future, if members do not remain within the limits of Standing Orders, they will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. In view of your statement, Mr Speaker, I consider it my duty to say that the people of Mackay would feel it most important that my statement be recorded.

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

Mr HARTWIG: I seek leave of the House to make two personal explanations.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Callide repeat what he said? Does he wish to make a personal explanation?

Honourable Members: Two!

Mr SPEAKER: If necessary, the member for Callide will take his turn. Does he wish to make a personal explanation?

Mr HARTWIG: Yes.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (11.24 a.m.), by leave: On 30 August, I spoke at length about a Miss Pauline Pearse. I asked whether she was the same Pauline Pearse who had been convicted of offences involving drugs and prostitution. I have since been assured by the Police Department that a Pauline Pearse was convicted of such offences. However, I accept the statement by the Miss Pauline Pearse who is the part-owner of Fine Cotton that she is not the same Pauline Pearse to whom I referred in this Chamber. Therefore, I withdraw the question I posed in my speech and the suggestion that the Pauline Pearse who is a part-owner of Fine Cotton has been convicted of offences involving drugs and prostitution.

Subsequently, "The Courier-Mail", in its editorial, saw fit to attack me personally, as much as saying that I should be disciplined by the House. I maintain that privilege is given to the Parliament so that a member of Parliament can, without any interference, raise any issue on behalf of his constituents or in the general public interest. A member of Parliament has not only the right but also the obligation to express concern about matters and to expect that they will be the subject of independent and proper investigation. At times, members of Parliament are forced to raise sensitive issues—issues which they know will bring criticism upon themselves—simply because independent and proper investigation does not occur or because the existing mechanisms for maintaining justice and exposure of truth are interfered with by executive Government or people of powerful influence.

Absolute privilege means just that. Parliament is the highest court in the land. The floor of the Parliament is the place for the cross-examination of a parliamentarian. In neither Great Britain nor Australia can a parliamentarian be cross-examined anywhere else, even by a court or a royal commission, on what he has said under privilege.

The unfettered right of a member of Parliament to speak out is fundamental. Edward St John, then a Federal Liberal back-bencher, brought about the second inquiry into the "Voyager" disaster by question and statement in the Federal House. Leon Punch, a National Party member in New South Wales, even when he could not substantiate allegations, brought about the extension of the Woodward royal commission.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Callide to make his personal explanation. If he has made his point, I ask him to resume his seat.

Mr HARTWIG: The newspaper editorial really attacked me. I am seeking the right to reply. Might I conclude by quoting from "Erskine May—Parliamentary Practice"—

"Any Act or omission which obstructs or impedes either a House of Parliament in the performance of its function or which impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge"—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member is not making a personal explanation. I ask him to resume his seat.

Mr HARTWIG: Mr Speaker, may I read the article?

Mr SPEAKER: No. The honourable member will resume his seat.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Legal Representation of Mr P. J. Walsh

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

With reference to the trial of Peter James Walsh, to his ministerial statement and statements by leading lawyers—

(1) Was the Walsh case not set down for trial at the criminal sittings but were those sittings extended or altered with a judge appointed to hear the Walsh case so that Mr Des Sturgess could defend Walsh and have the case finished in time to take over the defence of Mr Brian Maher in what is called the "Bottom of the Harbour Tax Case"?

(2) Did National Party barrister Mr Des Draydon handle the first few days of the Maher defence whilst Sturgess was finishing off the Walsh trial?

(3) Is it not the practice of judges at the call-over to tell solicitors seeking adjournment of cases because a particular barrister is not available that the calendar will not be altered, that there are plenty of other barristers at the bar and the court will not be held up for this reason?

(4) At the time of the Walsh trial, how many other Supreme Court cases were listed for hearing (a) where the defendant was held in gaol without bail or (b) where the defendant was on bail?

(5) What are the details of the number of other cases taken by Sturgess on behalf of the Public Defender in the years 1982, 1983 and 1984?

Answer—

(1) As the honourable member is aware, Peter James Walsh is a member of a well-known legal family and, in the interests of justice, it was necessary to ensure that the trial judge was not acquainted with such family. A number of judges disqualified themselves from sitting, and this limited the available listing dates. The honourable Mr Justice G. N. Williams was not so disqualified and the trial was listed as the only criminal case before him in the vacation sittings.

(2) Any arrangement made in relation to the defence of Mr Brian Maher was a matter for Mr Sturgess and his instructing solicitor in that case.

(3) The judge at the call-over has from time to time stated that whilst every effort is made to meet the convenience of counsel, dates for cases will not be fixed solely by reference to the availability of counsel.

(4) None.

(5) None.

2. Community Employment Program

Mr D'ARCY asked the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—

(1) Which local authorities in Queensland have availed themselves of grants under the Community 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) All local authorities in Queensland, with the exception of the Barcoo, Bulloo and McKinlay shires, received grants under the Community Employment Program.

(2) A total of 627 projects has been approved for local authorities.

(3) The total cost of projects approved for local authorities is \$69.6m. These projects will attract CEP grants totalling \$49.2m.

(4) In regard to local authority-approved projects, a total of 5 360 jobs will be created, of which 4 554 will relate to specific target groups identified under the program.

(5) Twelve projects have been approved for the Logan City Council, 11 of which have commenced. The total cost of these projects is \$1.8m, of which the CEP grants element is \$1,265,000. These projects will create 120 jobs and, of this number, 108 will be taken up by target group labour.

3. Housing Commission Accommodation

Mr NEAL asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

With reference to the numbers of Queensland Housing Commission dwellings in all categories available for rental in this State—

(1) What is the expected waiting time for (a) rental and (b) home purchase?

(2) How does Queensland compare with other States in this regard?

Answer—

(1) (a) In the areas of the Brisbane statistical division, in which the commission has large numbers of houses, four to six months. For areas with fewer dwellings and country areas, waiting times could exceed 12 months. The overall wait-list for rental accommodation through the Housing Commission has been reducing for the past six months. During that time the wait-list has been reduced by 647. The wait-list throughout the State now stands at 10 055, which is lower than it was in June 1983.

(b) An applicant applying today would be given a first interview in approximately 10 weeks' time. At the first interview, eligibility or otherwise is established. If eligible, the applicant is requested to return within two months with a contract to buy or build.

(2) In regard to rental houses, there is little published information on wait times available for comparison. Information provided in the Housing Commission of New South Wales annual report for 1983 showed a range of wait times extending from 22 months to 47 months for rental accommodation in the Sydney region.

The latest comparative information received on wait-lists for Housing Commission housing in the various States showed that New South Wales, with twice the population of Queensland, had a wait-list five times that of Queensland. In South Australia, which has half Queensland's population, the wait-list was shown to be almost three times that of Queensland.

It is generally acknowledged that Queensland applicants for rental housing, with or without difficult area preference, have considerably shorter waiting times than applicants in all other States, with the possible exception of Western Australia.

No comparative information is available in regard to purchase houses.

4. **Greenvale Nickel Project**

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

With reference to the continued heavy losses of the Greenvale nickel mine which, in 1983-84, amounted to \$32.79m—

(1) Under the guaranteed loan arrangements of the Greenvale Agreement Act, what amount has the Government paid out to date to cover the financial obligations of the Greenvale partners?

(2) What is the approximate total liability of the Government under the Greenvale Agreement Act?

Answer—

(1) The payments by the State to 30 June 1984, pursuant to its commitments under the Greenvale Agreement Act, total \$52,976,346. Such payments are, subject to the project's debt-servicing capacity, virtually all recoverable from the project in the future.

(2) The contingent liability of the State pursuant to its commitments under the Greenvale Agreement Act is estimated at \$77,454,145 as at 30 June 1984.

The actual level of payments will depend on the project's operating position and ability to generate sums for debt service in the future and, as was the case in respect of payments already made, any future payments are recoverable as and when the project's debt-servicing capacity permits.

As a general statement, I would mention that when considering this matter it should be remembered that the State benefits from a rail freight profit which was in effect a quid pro quo for the issue of the guarantee initially. The value of the employment and other benefits to the regional economy that resulted from the Government's provision of the guarantee should also be taken into account.

5. Teaching Staff, State Schools

Ms WARNER asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What staffing scale is used by his department to place teachers in Queensland State schools?

(2) Was a publicly available scale last seen in 1982 and, since then, although principals and departmental officials make reference to the existence of a scale, have no details of the scale been given to teachers?

(3) How many graduates from 1983, who have applied to the Education Department for positions, still remain without placements?

Answer—

(1) The provision of teacher resources to schools is a very complex matter. No single staffing scale is adequate to meet the needs of children in primary, secondary and special schools—or TAFE colleges for that matter—in the range of curriculum areas in the Queensland school system.

(2) The scale referred to was a guide-line for staff provision. Because my department has been making every effort to maximise the staff resources available to children in schools, no fixed staffing scale is now in vogue.

(3) All 1983 graduates from Queensland institutions who were prepared to accept appointments to available vacancies and were suitable for employment have been appointed.

6. Commonwealth Funds for Local Authorities

Ms WARNER asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

(1) Has the funding from the Commonwealth Government to State Governments for local authorities as part of the personal income tax sharing arrangements increased by 6 per cent over the last 12 months and, if so, why has the Brisbane City Council received only a 4.5 per cent increase?

(2) What criteria does the State Government use when deciding how to pass this funding on to local authorities?

(3) What percentage increases have all other local authorities received under these funding arrangements over the last 12 months?

Answer—

The matters raised in the honourable member's question do not fall under my control. I suggest that she address her question to the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer.

Ms WARNER: I do so accordingly. If it is necessary to put the question on notice, that will be OK, too.

7. Independent Living Centre

Mr COMBEN asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the bipartisan criticism of the allegedly low level of funding for the Independent Living Centre, based at Greenslopes Repatriation General Hospital, especially when that funding is compared with the much higher, adequate and reasonable funding given in Labor States—

(1) Why does funding from his department for this essential service total only \$22,860 when the very minimum staffing costs total approximately \$100,000?

(2) Will he recommend an increase in funding in the forthcoming Budget?

Answer—

(1) Since July 1980 the Department of Health has contributed towards the cost of the salary of a senior occupational therapist employed at the Independent Living Centre.

During the 1983-84 financial year a grant of \$22,860 was paid to the centre. That amount was based on the annual salary of a senior occupational therapist.

Financial assistance was also given to the centre by the Department of Welfare Services, the Workers Compensation Board of Queensland and the Commonwealth Community Employment Program. The Commonwealth funding is for a 52-week period from 1 March 1984.

On the figures supplied from the centre, approximately six persons per day visit the unit and approximately seven telephone inquiries a day are received.

(2) It is proposed that an increased grant will be provided to the centre by my department during the 1984-85 financial year.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Secondary Mortgage Market

Mr WARBURTON: I refer the Premier and Treasurer to the Government's reported efforts to establish a secondary mortgage market in Queensland and the reported appointment of Sir Edward Lyons to investigate the establishment of such a market. In the light of the importance and potential of the secondary mortgage market to this State, and the recent initiatives of both the New South Wales and Victorian Governments in sponsoring corporations and abolishing stamp duties on mortgage-backed securities, I now ask the Premier: Has the National Party trustee (Sir Edward Lyons), as reported, been given the job of investigating the establishment of such a market in Queensland? If so, what initiatives has he recommended to the Government, and what action has the Government taken to attract this potentially huge segment of the market to Queensland?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The three main States, that is, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, to put them in their correct perspective, are all seeking to get into this very important market. I think it will have tremendous benefits. This is a very complex matter. It will take quite a deal of investigation and research to discover the best methods and so on to be adopted. Investigations have been taking place for some considerable time. Certain business people, including Mr Miskin, a financier from the south, together with departmental officers, have been working on this matter for some considerable time.

Mr Warburton: Is Sir Edward Lyons involved in the investigation?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: He is one of the businessmen. Sure, his recommendations, together with those of the other people, will come to Cabinet, to the Government, to the National Party and ultimately to this House. I am sure that I will eventually have something very interesting to bring to the House. At this point of time I am not prepared to give the Leader of the Opposition the full details, because he would pass them straight on to Victoria and New South Wales.

Foreign Bank Licences

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a further question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the reported Cabinet decision on 6 September 1984 to telex Canberra and ask that two foreign bank licences be conditional on the banks locating their head offices in Queensland. The Premier and Treasurer will no doubt be aware of the lengthy submissions on the issue of foreign bank licences that have been made to the Federal Government by other State Governments in Australia, particularly the Victorian, Western Australian and South Australian Governments. I now ask: Are we to believe that this rather belated telex to Canberra on 6 September 1984 was the only initiative taken by the Queensland Government concerning foreign bank licences? If it was not, what submissions have been made to the Federal Government, and what specific initiatives have been taken by the Government in this very important matter?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The question of getting foreign banks into Queensland or into the other States has been on the go for a long period. During Mr Fraser's time, we sought to achieve that objective. Indeed, we welcome the opportunity that has presently been provided.

Not very long ago—I think at about the time when I went overseas—it was decided to send an application to Canberra. Of course, no decision has yet been made. There is ample time for the application to be considered and to be included in the Commonwealth Government's decision. We submitted the application on the basis of what Queensland is—the most rapidly growing State in the nation. It is growing at double the national average. There has been a tremendous influx of finance into Queensland and tremendous growth and development are taking place. We set out in the submission to the Commonwealth the basis under which we believe we are justified in asking that these two banks be located in Queensland. It is correct that we have made an application on behalf of the State.

South Australian Budget Deficit

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I draw his attention to the Budget brought down recently by the South Australian Premier, which shows that South Australia is \$65m in debt. I ask: Can the Premier and Treasurer assure the House that the Budget that he will introduce later this week will show that Queensland is in a much healthier financial position? Does he agree that the \$65m debt run up by the South Australian Labor Government contrasts sharply with the prosperity that that State used to enjoy under a free enterprise system of government?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is interesting to note that South Australia has gone in a direction that is opposite to the one that it took under other Governments. South Australia has a deficit of \$65m, which is very disturbing, particularly for that State. Again, that is in keeping with the huge deficits that other Labor States of Australia have accumulated. Those huge deficits, together with the \$8 billion deficit that the New South Wales Government has accumulated in its superannuation fund, demonstrates quite clearly the lack of business acumen of Labor Governments. Of course, that also applies to the Labor Government in Canberra, which has a tremendous deficit. As I have indicated previously, that Government has printed approximately \$13 billion worth of bonds to try to improve the overall situation. That is an artificial way of doing it.

I assure the honourable member for Balonne and the House that Queensland will not have a deficit. It will be a good Budget. Indeed, some very exciting programs will be outlined in it.

Natural Disaster Relief Fund

Mr FITZGERALD: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, I refer to recent reports of alterations to the formula under which the Commonwealth and the States contribute to the natural disaster relief fund. I ask: How will these changes affect Queensland, and how does the new arrangement differ from the present arrangement?

Mr GUNN: The changes will affect not only Queensland but all of Australia. At the recent Premiers Conference, all the States objected strongly to the Commonwealth walking out on its responsibilities relating to natural disaster relief.

All honourable members would realise that any natural disaster that occurs in any part of Australia is of utmost importance. In fact, it is a national tragedy. Good examples are the bush fires in Victoria, and droughts and cyclones in New South Wales or north Queensland.

At present, each State provides for relief a base amount that is set at a certain figure. In the State of Queensland, the base is presently \$4m. If a natural disaster occurs, Queensland is called on for that first \$4m. After that, the Commonwealth meets 75 per

cent of the relief costs, which means that, for every dollar that the State pays out, the Commonwealth pays \$3.

The changes that are envisaged, and which the Government has taken notice of, will mean that the base for Queensland will jump to \$9m, and the Commonwealth has offered to provide extra relief on a dollar for dollar basis. However, the punch line is that droughts will no longer be considered to be natural disasters. That will place Queensland in a very difficult position. All honourable members would agree that one of the problems in a State as vast as Queensland is drought. Because droughts have been taken off the list of natural disasters, the Commonwealth is walking away from its responsibilities yet again.

The Commonwealth Government also wanted Government instrumentalities taken off the list, and that would mean that if a railway bridge was washed away in a major flood, the damage would not be recognised. I took that matter up with Mr Dawkins, and I believe that it has now been rectified.

These changes will be a disaster for the States. The States will bear the greatest responsibility, and the Commonwealth will have less responsibility. But that is no surprise to members in this House.

Shortage of Science and Maths Teachers

Mr FITZGERALD: In asking a question of the Minister for Education, I refer to recent reports in southern newspapers about the shortage of science and maths teachers. I ask: Is there a shortage of such teachers in Queensland? If so, what steps will be taken to correct the situation?

Mr POWELL: Queensland has experienced a shortage of maths/science teachers, but the problem is world-wide. Most people who are skilled in mathematics, in particular, are able to obtain employment in private industry that is more rewarding and more lucrative than Government service.

The shortage is being attended to in a number of ways. Firstly, a course is being offered at the University of Queensland. The Education Department has seconded a teacher to the education section of the university to assist in the preparation of students in the maths/science field. Secondly, a group of graduate teachers working in primary education agreed earlier this year to transfer to secondary education. A ten-week course was conducted at the Mount Gravatt College of Technical and Further Education to upgrade from primary teaching to secondary teaching the methods that those teachers had been using. Thirdly, the department is doing everything it possibly can to recruit people into teaching and, in particular, into the maths/science area.

As I said, the problem is world-wide, and the Queensland Education Department is only just keeping abreast of it. With the three methods that I have just outlined, I am sure that the places will be filled in 1985.

Kangaroo Meat; Salmonella

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Is he aware of accusations to the effect that kangaroo meat was responsible for cases of salmonella that were detected in Europe and the United Kingdom?

Mr TURNER: This matter was first brought to my attention while I was in north Queensland inspecting the sugar industry. I understand that the accusation emanated from the Greenpeace movement and that it was relayed over ABC television and radio.

I asked for an investigation to be made into the allegation. I have ascertained that all pet meat that is exported from Australia is labelled "Pet meat only. Not fit for human consumption" and is dyed a brilliant blue. Kangaroo meat that is sold for human consumption is inspected by Commonwealth meat inspectors.

I was advised also that in Belgium, Luxembourg and other countries in question, no kangaroo meat is allowed to be imported or sold either as pet meat or for human consumption.

It is rather unfortunate that an allegation of this type has been made. It has damaged the kangaroo industry. I would question the motives behind the release of the accusation. The situation is similar to that which arose in Queensland some time ago concerning the film "Goodbye Joey". Allegations that lack substance and truth do no credit to the Greenpeace movement. I hope that in future the media, before they present such allegations to the public, will take the trouble to ascertain whether they contain any substance or truth.

Soil Conservation

Mr LITTLEPROUD: My second question also is to the Minister for Primary Industries. I ask him: In view of the amount allocated to soil conservation in the Federal Budget, can he indicate how much of that money will be allocated to Queensland? Further, will he indicate which recommendations in the Eather report can be implemented this year by the Queensland Government?

Mr TURNER: The Eather report has been accepted in principle by the Government. The committee that was appointed to investigate soil erosion problems was set up under the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern). Implicit in that committee's terms of reference was that trusts, local authorities and local groups have a greater input into soil conservation in their regions. The committee recommended that the Department of Primary Industries take over most of the responsibility for soil conservation.

I indicate to the House and to the public at large that last year the Department of Primary Industries had a staff of 162 persons involved in soil conservation and research, at a cost in excess of \$6m a year. The Commonwealth contribution to the Queensland Government was \$100,000. This year, the Commonwealth has increased its overall spending in Australia to \$4m. Out of that sum Queensland will receive \$600,000 to add to the Queensland Government's \$6m.

Soil conservation is an important issue. It is a national problem. Soil is a national asset. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide adequate funds so that the problem can be addressed.

The member for Condamine represents a grain-growing area. He is aware of the problems that exist. I thank him for raising the issue and for expressing his concern. If the Federal Government shouldered more of its responsibilities, more work could be done in that area.

Disclosure in Annual Reports of Salaries of Company Directors

Mr COOPER: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the proposal by the Federal Government to force company directors to reveal their salaries in annual company reports? Does he agree that that is nothing less than an invasion of privacy by the Hawke Government? Will he give this House an assurance that the Queensland Government is determined to fight the Federal Government every inch of the way on that proposal?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Recently I noticed that the Commonwealth Government is to force company directors to reveal their salaries. Invasion of privacy, as it is termed, has been completely foreign to our way of life and to our attitude for a long time.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is the type of thing that is done in communist countries. They are the only places in which that sort of thing is in operation. The Commonwealth's entry into so many things is foreign to our way of life and to the freedom that we enjoy, and I deplore it. The proposal is wrong in principle. However,

it is in conformity with Commonwealth Government policy generally right across the board to interfere in the lives of individuals.

New South Wales Purchase of Land for Aborigines

Mr COOPER: In directing a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs, I point out that, apparently, the New South Wales Government charges an annual land tax of approximately 7½ per cent and uses that revenue to purchase land for Aborigines. Would the Minister care to verify that statement?

Mr KATTER: Approximately 7½ per cent of all land tax levied in New South Wales is paid into a fund for use by people of Aboriginal descent. Of course, that is a very wide definition, and I will not go into it further.

Each year \$189m is levied in land taxes. Of it, \$14m goes into that particular account.

The hatred and tension created by a tax being levied on one group of the population to help another should be obvious to everyone in this Chamber, including Opposition members.

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—Fifth and Sixth Allotted Days

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 460) on Mr Borbidge's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (12.1 p.m.): It is a tremendous honour to speak in this place as the representative of the electorate of Archerfield, which has a long history of sound Labor representation. The area was ably represented, firstly, by the then member for Salisbury, Doug Sherrington. Following the 1971 redistribution, the area was divided. The electorate of Archerfield was created and was represented with great distinction by my predecessor, the late Kev Hooper.

I pay a tribute to Kev, who gave unstinting and tireless service not only to the people of Archerfield but also to the community in general. It is interesting to note that, although Kev himself came from a humble home in Rosalie with a strong trade union background, the Hooper family roots are in Boonah. A big reunion of the Hooper clan is to be held at Boonah later this year. I know how eagerly Kev was looking forward to attending.

Kev Hooper was a shop assistant at both Bayards and McDonnell & East. He later became an organiser with the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union. He was elected to Parliament at the general election in May 1972 and held the seat at subsequent elections, increasing his majority at each.

He was always active in the Australian Labor Party and had a reputation for never backing away from a fight. He was a foundation member of the Inala Branch of the ALP and was branch secretary for many years before he took over as president. He was a foundation member of the Oxley executive of the ALP and was the executive president as well as campaign director for his close personal friend the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Bill Hayden). Honourable members should recall that it was Bill Hayden who christened Kev "Big Vinnie"—a name which stuck and of which he was extremely proud.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. The Chamber will come to order.

Mr PALASZCZUK: As is well known, Kev and his wife, Terri, raised six children in their home in Inala. He was very conscious of the needs of the families in the electorate. His door was never closed, regardless of the hour or the day. Kev was always accessible.

The Government has designated this as the Year of the Family. I heartily agree, because I have four lovely daughters.

As Kev did so much for other families, I had hoped that the Government would give better treatment to the Hooper family in relation to superannuation payments. It is still my hope that something will be done to alleviate the financial and psychological plight of the Hooper family in general, and Terri Hooper in particular.

As there are quite a few new members in the House, I shall give a brief outline of the composition of the electorate of Archerfield. It consists of the suburbs of Inala, Acacia Ridge, Durack, Rocklea, Pallara, Larapinta and Parkinson—all very fine-sounding names. It may interest honourable members to know that Brisbane's new municipal crematorium is being constructed at Parkinson.

The electorate is very well settled residentially, but Archerfield also has a very diversified industrial base. The electorate contains the Brisbane Markets, Tancred Brothers Pty Ltd Meatworks, the industrial area of Coopers Plains and the industrial belt along Ipswich Road, as well as the Rocklea trots and the Archerfield Aerodrome.

Essentially, the Archerfield electorate contains a high proportion of battlers—people who are struggling to make ends meet. The electorate has a number of very fine voluntary welfare groups that provide local back-up to Government welfare agencies. The Salvation Army, St Vincent de Paul, Meals on Wheels and the Inala Community House spring readily to mind.

Unemployment is unacceptably high. For those who are working, wages frequently are low. Large numbers of welfare recipients live in the electorate. As they have to survive on fixed incomes, they are entirely dependent on Federal and State Government services to alleviate their struggle and to improve their living standards and, of course, their quality of life.

Since coming to power federally, the Australian Labor Party has arrested the decline in the Australian economy. The Federal Labor Government has created hundreds of thousands of new jobs and has begun to reverse the trend under the Fraser Government towards greater inequality.

Unfortunately for the residents of Archerfield, they, like all Queenslanders, have been subjected to pernicious State Government policies that are eroding their living standards. Wage packets are constantly hit by increased electricity charges, motor vehicle registration fees and thousands of other hidden Government charges. Stamp duty has doubled, which has made home-buying more difficult.

Mr Hamill: A high-tax Government.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Of course it is.

Each week the Government Gazette contains dozens of increases in Government fees and charges. Since its election last year, the Government has continued its policy of discrimination against the workers and battlers of society in favour of the rich merchants and speculators. To support that contention, I ask all honourable members to consider the social situations in areas such as Archerfield.

Inala is a suburb in point. Of a population of 21 000, approximately 4 200 depend on Government welfare payments. Of course, that latter number does not include dependent children. Over two-thirds of the work-force receive less than the average weekly wage.

Archerfield, like many other areas in Queensland, requires positive actions from a Government committed to achieving greater equality and greater opportunity. When one considers that the population of Inala is equal to that of Maryborough, the medical

and transport facilities are a scandal. In health services, the Government's provision is 74.4 per cent of the national average, which means that the electorate has no public hospital facility and no funds are provided for the Inala Community Health Centre to operate outside the hours of 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m. The centre has facilities to enable it to operate 24 hours a day. However as it does not, residents are forced to travel long distances to a public hospital such as the Princess Alexandra.

As the area has large numbers of single-parent families, after-hours medical attention is a must. Parents have a great deal of difficulty in convincing a child that he or she can get sick only during working hours. Such a lack of after-hours attention has a great psychological effect on parents. If no transport is available, even the land reserved for a hospital at Mount Ommaney will not assist Archerfield residents.

I point out to the House that the Inala Community Health Centre is the most cost-effective in Australia. The fact that the centre is a model for the rest of Australia is a tribute to the director, Dr Ian Waugh, and his dedicated staff. In the year ended 30 June 1984, a total of 36 877 patients were treated. That gives a daily average of 147. However, the 147 patients treated daily are not all Inala residents. The residents of Carole Park and Camira also use the community health centre. New arrivals in Australia living at the Wacol migrant centre also have access to the centre. That further freezes the people of Inala out of the centre and makes longer the waiting-time for an appointment.

The QEII Hospital at Nathan is 8 km away. For families without transport, it might as well be on the other side of the moon. At the present time, a journey to the Children's Hospital or to the Princess Alexandra Hospital can take up to one and a half hours. That is not a pleasant prospect with a sick child in tow. Of course, it all depends on public transport running. It is presently necessary to go to Oxley or Darra by private bus and then by train to the city. The private bus service ceases at 6.30 p.m., thus effectively isolating the suburb. Is it any wonder that the late Kev Hooper was so vocal about the need for a rail link to Inala?

In October and November 1979, the then Minister for Transport (Mr Tomkins), the Commissioner for Railways (Mr Goldston) and the Metropolitan Transit Authority Chairman (Mr Welding) came to Inala and inspected prospective rail corridors. All agreed that the rail line would be a goer. The MTA promised that a feasibility study would be carried out. Because that body has been disbanded, honourable members may never know whether such a study was carried out and, worse still, they may never know its findings.

The Government candidates in the recent Archerfield by-election both recognised the need for a hospital and improved facilities in the area. They campaigned on the issues. The National Party candidate and the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs even promised a welfare bus to go to the Princess Alexandra Hospital. Three months have elapsed since the by-election. I hope that the sick residents of Inala did not take Mr Jackson and Mr Muntz seriously and go to the welfare bus stop, because they would have had a long, long wait.

I will digress for a moment to inform the House of the fate of my opponents in the election. The independents have departed the scene; they have gone up in smoke. The Liberal candidate, John Shea, is a chemist. He has gone back to managing the day-and-night pharmacy in Biota Street, Inala. My National Party opponent, namely, Doug Jackson, did not fare so well.

Honourable members may recall that he was imprudent enough to admit during the campaign that he had voted Labor in the previous Federal election. That admission may have been imprudent, but it showed that he had a glimmer of common sense. Unfortunately for him, after that admission, his campaign really fell apart. His supporters showed a marked lack of enthusiasm. The result is now history. He came in a very poor third and just retained his deposit.

Worse was in store for him. On returning to his employment at the Queensland Fish Board, this Inala battler was expecting some reward for carrying the National Party

banner but, lo and behold, instead of the expected promotion he got the bullet. I understand that the matter is still unsettled. Doug Jackson was forced to leave Inala. In the interests of justice and fair play, he should be reinstated or a public statement should be made about why he was dismissed.

Mr Veivers: He will vote Labor next time.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I think he is voting Labor already.

The treatment meted out to Doug Jackson has made the few Inala residents who support the National Party very wary about coming forward to seek National Party preselection.

Because of the high Housing Commission content of the Archerfield electorate, I will now comment on the recently renegotiated Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. Queensland is to receive \$82m for public housing in 1984-85. I often heard my late predecessor, Kev Hooper, remark that the biggest number of complaints he received about the Queensland Housing Commission related to the length of time that tenants had to wait for the most elementary maintenance.

I have experienced the same problems myself. I do not criticise the officers of the commission or the maintenance staff because they are simply carrying out Government policy. However, it is only fair that if a tenant is paying his rent he is entitled to expect that repairs and maintenance will be carried out within a reasonable time. I know that successive Ministers have spoken out publicly against a day-labour force. However, an efficient day-labour force is necessary to carry out minor and urgent repairs.

The Federal Government, after receiving submissions and conducting negotiations with interested parties, identified two main objectives to which a new housing agreement should address itself. The first is that housing assistance should be distributed as equitably as possible among those receiving rebate rental assistance, the low-income-earners who are paying the full rent and the low-income-earners who desire to purchase a home. The second objective is that housing assistance should assist those people in the community who, because of their low incomes and the high rents in the private sector, face real poverty. I think that the new agreement has gone a long way towards achieving those objectives.

The key elements of the Federal proposals to meet these objectives include a guaranteed \$1,500m for the first three years of a new 10-year agreement, compared with \$200m a year under the present agreement; easier access by singles and youths to public housing; real cost rents as against the present market rents, with rebates to those unable to afford the asking rent; and more rental/purchase schemes to enable low-income-earners to purchase their own homes. Included in this proposal are plans to ensure that rental homes sold to tenants are replaced so that the stock of rental homes is not depleted.

For 1984-85, the Federal Government has offered the States a minimum of \$530m for general and pensioner funding alone—all in the form of non-repayable grants. In 1983-84, funding from the Federal Government increased by 50 per cent.

One of the benefits that will flow from this increase in funds is the provision of more pensioner units. They are urgently needed. Any honourable member who has visited some of the so-called boarding-houses in the near city suburbs will agree with me when I say that it is an absolute disgrace that, in an affluent society such as ours, pensioners are forced to live in these hovels. In many, hot water is non-existent and toilet facilities are primitive to say the least, but the rents are in the Hamilton and Ascot bracket.

Another reason for increased spending on pensioner housing is that many pensioners and aged persons live alone in large commission homes. In most cases it becomes almost physically impossible for them to maintain the homes, cut the lawns and do necessary repairs. In Inala, in particular, quite a large number of elderly citizens—in the main, widows—fall into this category. Many have lived in the area for more than 25 years.

They have raised their families and helped build community facilities. Although in most cases they would be prepared to vacate the large home for a pensioner unit, they are not prepared to leave friends and familiar surroundings, and that is quite understandable.

I know that the commission is aware of the problem. A block of 20 units has been built in Crake Street, Inala. Recently another block of 16 units was completed in Osprey Street, Inala. But 36 units is only a drop in the ocean. I know that the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) and his officers have inspected that suburb and that they agree that the need is there for more pensioner units. I would once again draw his attention and that of the commission to the large block of land behind my electorate office in Skylark Street. It is an excellent location because it is at a shopping centre and near a bus stop. I hope that, with the increased funds that are available, that land will be developed in the near future.

I turn now to the lack of educational facilities in my electorate. What I have in mind are adult education and TAFE extension facilities. The former St Mark's Leagues Club premises in Lilac Street, Inala, is the ideal building in which to house such activities. It is my understanding that the Education Department unsuccessfully tendered for those premises. The building could be used for day-time classes, night-time classes and at week-ends.

No adult education facilities exist in the area. I must point out that about 20,000 people live in the Archerfield electorate, but they are not offered any organised adult education programs. The nearest centre for adult education classes is the Corinda State School. However, the lack of public transport denies many residents the opportunity to take part in the courses offered in that location.

The setting up of the TAFE extension facilities is Government policy. It is interesting to note that, presently, facilities are being constructed in or are proposed for Kingaroy, Roma and Ingham. They are all in National Party electorates. I hope that the Government will give consideration to the opening of a TAFE extension facility in Inala. The area has the people and the appropriate buildings, which are right in the centre of Inala and close to both high schools.

As a member of the Australian Labor Party, I am very proud of its traditions. Those traditions have been established over generations of struggle by trade-unionists and political representatives. The party was conceived in the 1880s and 1890s out of the great struggles of the shearers, miners and seamen seeking justice, opportunity and a fair go in the face of relentless and ruthless opposition from the entrenched capitalist establishment.

It is ironic that many people who oppose the Labor Party are beneficiaries of the struggles and sacrifices of the men and women in the early days of the party. Without the benefits and opportunities obtained by these heroic pioneers, the opponents of the Labor Party would not have the affluence and success that they enjoy today.

I hope that, in my time in this House, I can achieve, for the people of Archerfield, improvements in housing, transport and medical facilities, and the upgrading of educational facilities. I also hope that people on lower incomes will have the same opportunities as their more affluent neighbours.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (12.23 p.m.): I take this opportunity to comment on various matters affecting this State and its people and to highlight some matters relating to my electorate of Roma.

Like previous speakers on this side of the House, I am thankful that I can honestly and openly express my loyalty to the Crown and to the Australian flag. To have values such as those that the monarchy represents is a privilege that is not to be taken lightly and is not to be rejected lightly.

Those on the other side of the House who would prefer a republic should ask themselves with what values they would replace those we already have. What is the purpose of changing? What would be gained? What would be lost? Too many Opposition

members simply do not have values to adhere to and to turn to; values that they can take as examples and respect. Thankfully, not all are in that category and I urge those who do have a sense of allegiance to hold firm in the face of existing pressures.

It is perfectly obvious that many values to which the vast majority of Australians have held firm for nearly two centuries are under attack. The family unit is one case in point and is probably the most vital. Much has already been said in defence of the family unit and much more will be said in the future.

The National Party in Queensland has given an unequivocal pledge to maintain and support it, and this it will do. But it cannot do it all by itself. The Federal Opposition must assert itself. It must be much more positive and state firmly and clearly its intentions—and then be prepared to carry out its pledges. We must never allow the weakness and vacillation of those years from 1975 to 1983 to occur again. In my opinion, they were seven wasted years; seven years of lost opportunity. The devastation of the Whitlam era could have and should have been repaired during that time, but owing to a lack of commitment, a lack of intestinal fortitude, a lack of will and a lack of strong leadership, that devastation was not redressed, and today we face the prospect of another Whitlam era, this time with public relations being used as a substitute for reality.

I believe it unfortunate, but true, that for the past two decades this nation has had in Canberra perpetual socialist Governments—sometimes under Labor and sometimes under Liberal.

A new commitment is long overdue: a commitment to restore the family unit as the very basis of our society. De factos of all descriptions should not be recognised. At present, the ALP Government's recognition of de factos as eligible for the dependant spouse rebate, equally with wives, is no incentive to the married family unit. This recognition is estimated to cost \$12m in the first year, and will continue to rise as couples decide that it is financially more attractive not to get married. It appears that the sick and warped move by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation to subsidise homosexual and de facto partners required a reciprocal gesture by the Federal Government. These moves are designed to hasten the disintegration of the family as we know it.

The number of victims of broken homes has escalated rapidly and will continue to do so. Today Australia has the second highest divorce rate in the world. Young people are encouraged by the militant feminists to abandon normal family supports for what they call "emancipated models" of the family. There are now 140 000 people, mainly women, on supporting parents' benefits and 230 000 children dependent on them, at an annual cost of \$1.2 billion. The cost should be not only counted in dollars and cents but also measured in human terms, wherein lies the greater calculated and intended destruction.

The Sex Discrimination Act must be repealed. The United Nations Sex Discrimination Treaty and the Federal laws which enact it cover every aspect of people's lives that involves any relationship between the sexes, so that there will be no area of private or public life into which the Commonwealth and its bureaucracy cannot intrude.

We need to examine existing laws and practices and to eliminate those that discriminate against the family. Our attention should be focused on certain international treaties which specifically attempt to push mothers out of the home and into the paid work-force. Successive Governments in Canberra have tailored their policies to comply with these international treaties.

When in Copenhagen in 1980 the Minister for Home Affairs (Mr Ellicott) signed the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, it was against the wishes of the Queensland Premier and his Government. He had asked the Prime Minister to refrain from signing until all States had had time to consider its implications. He was overruled, just as hundreds of thousands of petitioners were overruled in 1983 when the Hawke Government ratified this treaty. When a nation ratifies a treaty, it voluntarily legally binds itself to submit to its demands. This treaty gives the Federal Government power to modify the social and cultural patterns of

behaviour of men and women to eliminate sex-role stereotypes and, by this, the treaty clearly demonstrates that it means the roles of husband as bread-winner and wife as home-maker.

The Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act, which enforces this treaty, has attracted massive resistance from the community. Many people realise that it poses a serious threat to our civil liberties by transferring to a Sex Discrimination Commission the right to determine whom people may employ, with whom they may associate, to whom they provide goods and services, the words they can use and the books they can read.

It is only in totalitarian countries such as Russia and Cuba that such restrictions are imposed, but by Hawke's signing that treaty Australians are now bound to the whims and wills of those sorts of countries. It is my belief that free Australians will not accept such impositions, and it is my intention to constantly expose and highlight the shocking consequences of this Act and others like it.

Australia must now report regularly to the UN committee of 23 delegates, which is chaired by a Russian and will oversee our progress with "modifying the behaviour of men and women". Thus Australia is in the invidious position of changing its laws and customs to gain the approval of such dubious treaty partners as the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Cuba and others. These treaty partners are empowered to investigate our application of the treaty and to take strong action—even of bringing us before the International Court of Justice—if they do not approve of our changes.

As a nation we must realise the importance of a stable family life and the importance of marriage in creating this stability. The problem now is that our laws are being revised to remove any privileges attached to marriage because our national and international agreements make it unlawful to make any distinctions because of a person's sex or marital status.

Enforcement of these laws relies heavily on the external affairs powers used to stop the construction of a Tasmanian dam. By a majority decision the High Court decided that the Constitution could be used in that way to interfere in areas in which the people had never given the Commonwealth power to act.

Australia's Chief Justice, Sir Harry Gibbs, who was one of the three dissenting judges, warned about interpreting the Constitution in that way. Sir Harry said that if Parliament had the power to make laws giving effect to any international agreement to which the Commonwealth was a party, the Federal Executive could give Parliament the power to make laws on any subject whatsoever merely by making an agreement with another country. He said—

"It could, conceivably, by signing the appropriate Treaty, obtain for the Parliament, powers to control education, to regulate the use of land, to fix the condition of trading and employment or to censor the Press, or even to determine the basis of criminal responsibility."

Sir Harry went on to say that there would be no field of power the Commonwealth could not invade and that the federal balance of the Constitution could be destroyed entirely. Then, Australia would be in the very real position of having to take orders from the United Nations. The traditional family, however, has strong bonds of loyalty and commitment between its members. It is that type of family which is the very basis of a stable and democratic society. We undermine it at our peril.

Another iniquitous Act that must be either drastically overhauled or repealed in total is the Australian Heritage Commission Act of 1975. That Act legitimises the control of private property by legislation whereby, in brief, "places of aesthetic, historic or social significance may include all or any part of Australia, with the exclusion of nothing."

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage (Interim Protection) Bill of 1984 should be opposed outright and the whole unfortunate affair reviewed. Most Aboriginal people want to be part of the mainstream of Australian society and do not want the backlash and division such legislation is causing.

I do not know how Opposition members felt when one morning they woke to the news that Ayers Rock had been given away. I know how I felt on that occasion. It does not matter to whom Ayers Rock was given; the fact remains that Ayers Rock belongs to Australia and to all Australians and not to any select group of a different colour or creed.

I felt downright indignant. I wondered by whose authority it was given away. I would like to know who said that the Federal Government could give it away. Who the heck do those people think they are?

For my part, I want Ayers Rock back, and a good deal more of Australia besides! The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage (Interim Protection) Bill of 1984 can only be described as one of the most dangerous and draconian Bills ever presented. No area of Australia is immune from its provisions—private property, municipal areas, national parks, forests, rivers and highways are all vulnerable. All States' laws can be transcended if they are inconsistent with its provisions.

It gives the Federal Minister enormous and outrageous discretionary powers, some unchallengeable in the courts. The Act is subject to international law rather than the law of this country and its Constitution.

Clause 9, for instance, allows any Aborigine to make a written or oral claim to any area or object, whereupon, at the Minister's discretion, the use of such land or object may be immediately frozen for 30 days or longer.

Clause 10 requires any Aborigine making a claim to publish in the gazette and a local newspaper an invitation to the claimant for submissions from interested persons. However, failure to publish notice of a claim does not invalidate it.

The Bill also states that the Minister shall appoint officers who can freeze land for up to 48 hours while a declaration is made by him. Anyone contravening a declaration by the Minister in response to an Aboriginal claim, knowingly or unknowingly, is liable to a fine of \$10,000 or five years' gaol, or both.

Members probably already know that in Western Australia alone about 750 000 sacred sites have been listed by the Perth museum. That Act should be repealed in its entirety and a more rational and reasonable assessment made of sacred sites. Above all, all Australians should be treated equally.

Mr Littleproud: Did you know that every individual Aborigine can declare his own sacred site?

Mr COOPER: Yes, I did.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind the honourable member for Brisbane Central that it is not polite for members to turn their backs on the Chair.

Mr COOPER: It is interesting to note that, following the introduction last April of Queensland's community services legislation, the two Aboriginal communities (of the total number of 14) which objected to a lack of mining rights, and which wanted a continuation of the double-voting system which previously applied, have withdrawn those objections and advised the Human Rights Commission accordingly.

At this stage I record a commendation for the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Bob Katter, Jnr), who performed a most difficult task in bringing down the community services legislation, which, if kept free of Federal interference, will assist Aboriginal people to join the mainstream of Queensland society, which is as it should be.

The Federal Opposition should make clear its intentions with regard to Medicare. This bureaucratic nightmare will, in a very short space of time, become so costly and so ruinous that it will do more harm than good. I will give just one instance. Under Medicare, a 14-year-old girl can obtain a prescription for the pill without having to tell

her parents or even consult them. This strikes at the very heart of the parent/child relationship and exposes the child to enormous pressure from her peer group and from designing adults. The Federal Opposition must give a clear undertaking that it will abolish Medicare and initiate a return to the previous voluntary system.

The prospect of this nation's having its economy compared with that of a banana republic would at first sight appear to be ludicrous. Australia's borrowings, however, now total about \$47 billion, which, when compared with Argentina's \$45 billion, surely gives cause for considerable concern, particularly when in 1970 Australia only owed about \$3 billion. Thus, in just 14 years under Labor and Liberal Governments, Australia's overseas debt has grown by over \$43 billion.

In all States, except Queensland, it appears the national anthem has been changed—by decree of the Hawke executive Government. Again I ask, "With whose authority?" The Federal ALP Government had no mandate for such a deep and significant change—a change that should only be made by referendum. Similar comments apply to the Australian Flag. It just may be that the majority of Australians want a change. For my part, I do not, but the only way to find out is to go to the people and ask them—and not just assume that the majority want a change. "Advance Australia Fair" is a very nice song; so, too, are "Waltzing Matilda", "Song of Australia", "Australia my Homeland" and "I still call Australia home". Slim Dusty makes a good job of "A Pub with No Beer". I like his songs particularly. There are many more, but an anthem is not just a song. It is a prayer, and is not, as a rule, on the hit parade. The Federal Opposition should state clearly that it will hold a referendum to decide the issue—to let the people of Australia make the decision.

It will take a courageous Government (or Opposition) to announce a clear policy designed to reduce big Government and taxation. In spite of the fact that most Australians want smaller Government, fewer bureaucrats and lower taxation, we keep getting more. We are literally told what is good for us. It is high time that more of us became more indignant and insisted on change a little more forcefully.

The Federal Opposition has a tremendous opportunity to alter the face of the Australian taxation scene. With already massive rises in taxation since the Hawke Government took office, with fuel and excise taxes indexed and with a vast array of options open to it to introduce yet more taxes, the Federal Opposition could well take a refreshingly radical position and suggest a new concept of smaller Government and lower taxation.

I am not suggesting for one moment that it would be easy, but nothing worth while ever is. The "Do it, try it, fix it!" attitude should be adopted. Concepts such as a flat rate of tax should be given positive consideration. The Government must stop penalising people for working. There is no longer any incentive. Children aged from 15 to 19 are penalised by high award rates because few employers are able, or prepared, to pay them.

In the 1960s, youth unemployment in the 15-19 age group averaged 3 per cent. The massive increase in that percentage to the current 27 per cent can be attributed to three main factors, one of which was the wages explosion of the early 1970s, which was fanned by the Whitlam Government, aided and abetted by the ACTU, under the presidency of the current Prime Minister, and a Conciliation and Arbitration Commission whose blind, unthinking and naive deliberations have, more than the actions of any other single body, caused our youth to be cast onto the unemployment scrap-heap. One of the Commission's learned number was even quoted as saying that he did not consider increases in wages caused the loss of jobs. How naive can anybody be?

When an employer simply cannot pay any more, he can do only one of two things—either dismiss employees or not put on additional employees. Even the former Minister responsible for industrial affairs (Clyde Cameron)—the Opposition's man—admits the policy of high junior awards virtually killed youth employment. Why on earth does someone not have the courage to right the wrongs of the past and once again give youths a chance to work? There is no doubt that they want to and need to, but if they are out of work for that vital 12-month period after leaving school, untold damage is done to

their morale and their character. The simple, stark fact is that wages for youths are far too high. In the interests of youths and their prospective employers, that must be redressed.

I consider other aspects, such as keeping children at school longer, to be separate from the issue of high wages. No-one will convince me of any fact other than that youths have been priced out of the labour market. Messrs Peacock and Howard could perhaps take a positive position on this issue as well and forget about canvassing ideas for a consumption tax. The ball is right at their feet. While the Hawke Government is almost certain to bring in a wealth tax, a capital gains tax, VAT, or death duties—or all four—the Federal Opposition should be working in the opposite direction and clearly stating its case for all to hear. Too much lip-service is paid to smaller government and it is high time that smaller government became a reality in Canberra.

The fact that in the entire Commonwealth only one man has the ability, the vision, the courage and the tenacity to stand against the tide of socialism is ridiculous. Only one man will not weaken and will not sacrifice his principles. All over Australia people are asking why it is that Queensland has the only Premier worth a candle while at the same time the other States sink further into debt, lawlessness, permissiveness and depravity. It seems incredible that others cannot follow the Premier of Queensland's example, which for such a long time has proved so successful and full of worth.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The interjections that are being made are contributing nothing to the debate. They are not being acknowledged by the honourable member for Roma. I ask that they cease.

Mr COOPER: I quite unashamedly thank the Premier for leading so firmly and for setting such a high standard of leadership for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

I will now turn to matters concerning my electorate. During the past year a number of Ministers have visited the electorate.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr COOPER: I will sort the honourable member out.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Windsor under Standing Order No. 123A. I have asked the Chamber to come to order, but the honourable member for Windsor persists in creating disorder in the Chamber.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. For the first time, the honourable member for Roma acknowledged my interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept the point of order. In future I will listen intently to interjections and decide whether they are acceptable.

Mr COOPER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not mind him one little bit. He is not only unidentifiable, but he is unintelligible and a oncer. After the next election he will not be in this Chamber.

There can be no greater benefit to an electorate than for it to be visited by Ministers of the Crown. For them to be able to see for themselves the needs, problems and the potential of an area is by far the best way of improving the quality of life of the constituents.

Probably the most important development during the year was the reopening of the Roma meatworks. That success story saw private enterprise triumph in the face of challenging odds. With rationalisation occurring throughout the meat industry and about 35 to 40 meatworks closing throughout Australia—some never to reopen—the Roma meatworks, which had been closed for four years, actually reopened.

Early in 1983 a group of cattlemen-cum-businessmen, with considerable experience in the meat industry, purchased the Roma meatworks. One of the criteria for the

reopening was an expression of confidence by the people of the Maranoa and by prospective employees. That expression of confidence was signified by way of a financial commitment. In other words, people were asked to put their money where their mouth was. In June 1983 a prospectus was published. The issue closed in October, undersubscribed. In November 1983, this time under the auspices of Kilcoy Holdings, well-known meatworks operators connected with the Kennedy family, a second prospectus was published. It looked like closing in January, again undersubscribed. The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) was approached for an extension of time to February. He granted the extension, which meant a 25-day stay. In my opinion, that was the single most important factor in the success of the venture. On behalf of the people of Roma I thank the Minister for his prompt action.

During the period, one of the most intensive drives for funds ever witnessed in the district took place. One pensioner couple who could not quite raise the minimum \$2,000 investment otherwise, borrowed a quarter of the sum on Bankcard. Other people formed syndicates. By the deadline, \$1,267,000 had been raised, so that the issue was oversubscribed by more than one quarter of a million dollars. Almost \$1m of the amount subscribed came from the Maranoa district.

The benefits of the reopening of the meatworks on 16 July 1984 are numerous. Firstly, 160 people are employed. Their wages bill will inject \$4m annually into the Roma economy. Most of the employees have signed an agreement under which an employee investment scheme in the meatworks could well reach \$400,000 in a couple of years. I endorse the concept because it can only reduce industrial strife and improve the operations of the company. Cattlemen will save thousands of dollars in freight, and prices offered by the company will match those offered elsewhere. The company itself has experienced managers and directors with extensive marketing and management expertise. Its future is bright. All of this has been achieved without one dollar of subsidy. It is an example to private enterprise everywhere. As a gesture in this saga, the Government, though the Minister for Transport, has decided to meet the cost of moving the railway crossing to facilitate stock movement. The co-operation received from the Federal Department of Primary Industry and the State Department of Primary Industries is to be acknowledged. Finally, the enthusiasm inspired by the local Roma and District Chamber of Commerce is to be commended.

Earlier in the year, the Minister for Transport toured the southern portion of the electorate by rail. He was followed some months later by the Commissioner for Railways. Rationalisation moves have affected towns such as Jackson and Yuleba. It is unfortunate when services and staff are phased out or reduced in small country towns, but the overall savings and improved efficiency are having a marked effect in financial terms and no employee has been retrenched. I commend the Minister on making the hard decisions because the results show that about \$70m was saved in the past 12 months. I believe that Queensland rail will play a very important part in the future of the State and that it justifies support from all quarters.

A constant watch is being kept on ways and means of improving freight handling and freight rates so that Queensland rail can compete more effectively with road transport. In my travels throughout the electorate I have noted keenness among the employees to do the job—and do it well. Whilst I am on the subject of rail, I make a special plea to the Minister for the renewal of the railway administration building in Roma. It has long outlived its usefulness and is not conducive to reasonable working conditions for the superintendent and his staff. I have had many discussions with the Minister on this matter. Prospects certainly look hopeful. I have been encouraged by what the Minister has told me.

I support an inquiry into the distribution of fuel supplies throughout Queensland. Such an inquiry is long overdue and it is of the utmost importance to the areas that have expanded rapidly in the past 10 to 20 years, particularly in the grain-farming sector. I refer specially to an application for a fuel storage depot at Rolleston. At present, this area is not serviced as adequately and efficiently as it should be.

Recently, the area known as the Central Highlands, which includes Emerald and Springsure, has expanded in an extraordinary way. Grain-farming, in the form of sorghum, sunflower and wheat production, increases each year. I have had discussions with the Minister for Transport about upgrading the Springsure-Emerald rail link with heavier track. It is pointless to spend millions of dollars without the potential of economic return, but I believe that a thorough examination should be made of the potential of this area. I will be continuing discussions on these lines. One thing is certain, namely, that the Minister is leaving no stone unturned in his attempts to make Queensland rail the most effective and efficient rail service in the Commonwealth. I commend him on his performance.

When the Minister for Health visited the electorate several months ago a number of matters were brought to his attention. In last year's Budget, sketch plans were approved for a \$6m redevelopment of the Roma District Hospital. In the interests of keeping pace with modern medical facilities for western Queensland, it is imperative that this redevelopment proceed as quickly as possible. I will continue to work closely with the Minister to ensure that this much-needed facility becomes a reality in the shortest possible time.

Small country towns such as Wallumbilla, Injune and Springsure have hospitals. Although those hospitals play an essential part in their respective communities, I believe that their function could well be expanded to such uses as Meals on Wheels and care for the aged. Such a move would enable aged people to remain longer in their home districts and in their familiar surroundings.

Springsure Hospital is in need of a geriatric ward. Submissions are being made to me by a wide cross-section of organisations to have such a ward established, and it is my belief that Springsure is ready for it. Again, the end result would be to keep people in their home and district environment, which is so important, particularly for the aged.

The people of the Roma electorate were fortunate also to have the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs in the electorate recently. I congratulate the Minister on his assumption of the Youth Affairs portfolio. At a time when the Federal welfare bill is increasing at an alarming rate, the Minister and his departmental officers ensure that value is received for every Queensland dollar spent. The essential criterion is to see that those in need receive the best of attention and, if possible, in their home district or environment.

At a time when youth unemployment is at such a staggering level, it is encouraging to know that the Minister for Welfare Services has assumed the Youth Affairs portfolio, as he will bring a refreshing and innovative approach to this most pressing problem.

While on that subject, recently the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs visited my electorate and held an inquiry into youth employment, based on local participation. I believe that that exercise will be successful, and already the committee formed to report to the Minister has been active with submissions. The approach adopted by the Minister is very much the right way to go, as it gives both him and his department a close understanding across the State of Queensland, and I have no doubt that his findings and submissions to Cabinet will be of a most useful nature.

Probably one of the most exciting prospects facing Roma during the next few years is in the field of education. The Minister for Education has made two visits to Roma this year, and has also visited a number of other towns, including Springsure and Rolleston, in an extensive State-wide fact-finding tour. I have made submissions to the Minister in regard to a TAFE extension for Roma and also a rural training school similar to the ones in Longreach, Emerald and Dalby. Roma's population of 7 000 is growing and will continue to grow. Oil and gas operations are intensifying, and trainees in this most technical of industries are in short supply.

Mr Vaughan: How is the oil refinery going?

Mr COOPER: It is going well.

A TAFE extension would be of immense benefit to the district as a whole, in providing facilities covering a broad range of subjects, particularly those affecting the district itself, thus helping to retain our youth in the area and to equip them for the more specialised work-force.

I believe that the district is ready also to enter into serious deliberations with the Minister with regard to a rural training school. Producer organisations, with the support of the Roma and District Chamber of Commerce, are co-ordinating what will be a comprehensive submission to the Minister. I have already made an initial approach to the Minister for his support and advice. I am fully aware that these things do not just appear overnight. I welcome the initiative of the Roma and District Chamber of Commerce and look forward to working closely with it in a real effort to achieve this most worthy institution.

Mr Vaughan: What is the situation with the power station?

Mr COOPER: The position is still under control. In other fields of education, it is obvious that the Roma primary school has reached a stage at which changes are necessary. If viewed as a whole, the education scene in Roma is ripe for a reorganisation and, perhaps, even a pilot project to spearhead the course of education in the years ahead. The Minister must be commended for his effort and performance, which is being noted throughout the State.

I mention here what the member for Condamine said in his speech in the Address in Reply debate. He said—

“The most pressing need in our education system is the need to provide TAFE-type courses in Years 11 and 12 of high school education throughout the State. Some excellent TAFE colleges already exist, but far too many parts of Queensland are not serviced by such colleges.”

Further on he said—

“... the need exists now for our secondary school students, no matter in which part of the State they live, to be given trade, technical and academic training”

I commend and support the member for Condamine with regard to those statements.

Finally, I cannot fail to put in yet another plea for the immediate replacement of the home economics and manual arts buildings at the Wallumbilla State School. Twenty years ago today, the first request was made for their renewal, and the pressure has been constant. I cannot stress the need more strongly. Conditions for pupils and staff are such that immediate action is needed. I have had further discussions with the Minister, and the position is encouraging.

The people of the Roma electorate were pleased to have the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology back in the electorate for the second time. Perhaps one of the most exciting initiatives that rural Queenslanders can look forward to in many years will be the Aussat satellite, due to go up late in 1985. The Minister will enter into negotiations with the Federal Government on terms and conditions for the lease of a transponder on a joint-venture agreement between the Queensland Government and eight regional television broadcasters in this State. Commercial television and radio stations will be able to make regional broadcasts. The venture will open up outback Queensland, and lead to greater decentralisation. Datalink and market intelligence services will be provided to areas that have never had them before.

I commend the Minister and the Government for taking such an initiative. I believe that it will be the greatest break-through in communications ever seen in this State.

While speaking on rural matters, I turn now to one ever-present problem confronting rural Australia; that is, soil erosion. I point out that last financial year, the Federal Government provided \$1m to combat this ever-increasing problem. It retained \$400,000 and distributed the remaining \$600,000 under a formula that gave Queensland \$100,000. By comparison, the Queensland Government's contribution was \$6.4m. If the Federal

Government could match that sum dollar for dollar, this most valuable asset might be protected to a much greater degree. The Federal Government this year has allocated \$4m and, if the previous formula is applied, Queensland's share will be \$600,000, or 10 per cent of the State's contribution.

I am pleased to be able to say that a research station will be established at Roma to serve the Maranoa region. Although funding problems exist, I hope that they will soon be overcome, because the need is evident. Restructuring of the present arrangement may be necessary, but it will eventually be of benefit to the region.

In this financial year, a second soil conservation officer is to be appointed to Roma. If lack of accommodation for him is found to be a problem, it must be overcome without further delay.

I thank the Minister for Primary Industries (Neil Turner) for his support and co-operation in these matters. I commend him for an excellent all-round performance against great odds in a very difficult and demanding portfolio.

Mr Lee: He is a good Minister.

Mr COOPER: My word he is!

During the year, I have had discussions on a number of issues with the chairman of the Queensland Livestock and Meat Authority (Bill Meynink). In particular, we discussed the importance of disseminating to many parts of Queensland, and indeed, Australia, accurate market information for the cattle, sheep and pig industries. The authority has recently introduced a remote computer-to-computer saleyard reporting service at Warwick. This is believed to be a world first. Queensland, through the authority, is the only Australian State to produce an all-State cattle price index to report and analyse weekly slaughtering statistics and to report weekly over-the-hook prices.

The authority has recently launched a more advanced sale system for cattle known as QUEST. This system was developed co-operatively by producers, processors and agents, together with the Department of Primary Industries and the Livestock and Meat Authority, and has the potential to revolutionise cattle-selling in Queensland. The same system could be extended to cover all primary products.

Probably the most important work of the authority relates to its trialling and development of carcass classification for beef and pigs. Carcass classification price schedules are now established in a number of abattoirs and will become the major method of direct payment in future.

One of the many serious issues facing primary producers at present is the demands and intentions of the Animal Liberation Movement. I do not intend to go into detail, but I serve notice that I will be highlighting many aspects of this issue in the near future. I believe that, with the co-operation of the United Graziers Association, it is our duty to explain to those concerned some of the costly and far-out suggestions being put forward by the animal libbers in an endeavour to protect primary industry from some of their excesses.

Probably the most pressing problem faced by people in rural areas is the condition of roads. Since taking office in 1957, coalition Governments have changed the face of Queensland by their commitment to an extensive road system. Roads are communication, transport and defence, and roads provide vital links with townships, communities and business. Roads are also extremely expensive, and in such a vast State, which is very decentralised and has such a small population, relatively speaking, the continued construction and repair of the State's roads is a problem of major proportions.

Queensland has been shockingly treated by the Federal Government, because the allocation under the Road Grants Act has increased by only 6 per cent. That does not even keep pace with construction cost increases, which are estimated at 7 per cent. The Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program allocation shows an actual drop from \$96.2m to \$91m, or a cut of 5 per cent. Even worse is the indexation of the 2c per litre petrol levy, which does not go towards road programs but goes into the

Consolidated Revenue Fund. This sum is estimated at \$500m in total. If those funds were channelled into road construction, they would greatly alleviate the current crisis.

Just as a previous coalition Government faced a mammoth task in 1957, I believe that this National Party Government can, and will, rise to the occasion. In a sense, we are at the crossroads, because roads that have been constructed over the years now need to be reconstructed.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr COOPER: Before the luncheon recess, I was dealing with road construction. A new commitment is required, and the Commonwealth must live up to its responsibilities and play its part to a far greater degree.

I take this opportunity to renew my commitment to local government. I wish to remain close to this tier of government by retaining my position as a councillor on the Bendemere Shire Council, which keeps me close to and abreast of the problems that are encountered. Local government is closest to the people, and funding of it should be commensurate with that most vital responsibility.

Finally, I pay a tribute to a number of organisations and people in the Roma electorate. Firstly, I pay a tribute to the Roma Town Council, in particular to its mayor (Joe Orr) and town clerk (Peter McKenzie), for having the foresight and courage to proceed with plans to build a civic centre in Roma. Such a multipurpose complex is long overdue in a town that I have often referred to as the hub of the west. Roma's future is bright, and the time is right for such a building. I thank the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Bill Gunn) for his support, advice and encouragement in recent times.

I wish to acknowledge the work done by the many Government employees throughout the electorate. One of the most futile, demoralising and counter-productive things people can do is to perpetually knock the performance of others. I have found that when effort is encouraged and acknowledged a real and genuine spirit of enthusiasm is most noticeable. And so to all those people engaged in Queensland Rail, Telecom, SWQEB and CQEB, the police force and the fire brigades, hospitals, schools and ambulances, and others of equal importance, I say a very special thank you for the work they do.

To the people of the South West Area Disabled Association, under the direction of Mr Peter Bolt, I offer a special acknowledgement. We have some problems to overcome with regard to place of occupation and a residence, but overcome them we will.

To Maria Tennant of the Roma and District Family Support Association, a person who carries a tremendous work-load and responsibility, I give special thanks.

And, finally, to my electorate secretary, Mrs Dianne Miller, who serves all of the people of the electorate of Roma so efficiently, I tender my sincere thanks.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (2.16 p.m.): During 1981 and 1982, a number of people were charged with conspiring to defraud in relation to the infamous Russell Island land scandal. Although none of these people were found guilty, in one of the greatest travesties of justice ever seen in Queensland none of the defendants were found not guilty.

Here today, I do not intend to canvass the shonky dealings of the land sharks on Russell Island. What I will do is prove how one of the defendants in the Russell Island case continued with shonky deals right through the period of the trial and under Queensland's ridiculous corporate laws is able to continue no matter how many people he cons or defrauds.

I intend to prove today how one Francis Patrick Luton of 41 Bolinda Street, Eight Mile Plains, has conspired with others to pervert the course of justice in Queensland. To assist in proving this, I seek leave to have incorporated in "Hansard" two statutory declarations signed by Leslie Dyne of Gold Creek Road, Brookfield.

Leave granted.

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, Leslie Septimus John DYNE of Gold Creek Road, BROOKFIELD, BRISBANE in the State of QUEENSLAND, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

I know Francis Patrick LUTON of 41 Bolinda Street, EIGHT MILE PLAINS.

After he was discharged from the RUSSELL ISLAND case, the said Francis Patrick LUTON complained to me that Detective Vince MAHONEY of the FRAUD SQUAD was investigating him in relation to his land dealings at BARGARA, near BUNDABERG.

In approx. May, 1983, I was in Mr LUTON'S office at INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD when he had a telephone conversation with someone. After the conversation Mr LUTON gloated, "That was GOLEBY, the Minister for Harbour and Marines. He is a friend of mine, and he's had MAHONEY transferred off the case. I convinced him that MAHONEY was a labour supporter and that the LABOUR PARTY was going to use the BARGARA investigation to embarrass the GOVERNMENT at the next election"

I later contacted the FRAUD SQUAD and was informed that Detective MAHONEY was no longer handling the BARGARA case.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the "Oaths Act of 1867"

MADE AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant, Leslie Septimus John DYNE in the State of Queensland, this 13th day of September, 1984,

Before me,

J. S. KEOGH J.P.

A Justice of the Peace.

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, Leslie Septimus John DYNE of Gold Creek Road, BROOKFIELD, BRISBANE in the State of QUEENSLAND, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

I know Mr Fred LIPPIATT, Solicitor of LIPPIATT and CO, 231 George Street, BRISBANE.

IN October, 1983, the said Fred LIPPIATT was instructed by another party and myself to place INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD a company under the control of Francis Patrick LUTON and his wife Mary LUTON into liquidation, as the company was unable to pay its debts and because the said Francis Patrick LUTON and Mary LUTON were misappropriating company monies.

Mr LIPPIATT took certain documents from us and dictated details of the petition to one of his staff.

Before we gave him instructions Mr LIPPIATT informed me that he did not know Francis Patrick LUTON, or the company, INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD.

He later commenced to act for Mr LUTON without our consent, and now acts for Mr LUTON and the LIQUIDATORS of INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD.

I have reported these conflicts of interest to the QUEENSLAND LAW SOCIETY, and I am unaware of any action being taken against the said Fred LIPPIATT, as a result thereof.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the "Oaths Act of 1867"

MADE AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant, Leslie Septimus John DYNE in the State of Queensland, this 13th day of September, 1984,

Before me,

J. S. KEOGH J.P.

A Justice of the Peace.

Mr MACKENROTH: During 1979, Francis Patrick Luton was a declared bankrupt, and to enable him to continue in his land speculation deals, he talked his son, Francis James Luton, into acting as a director of his company, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd. To do this, he transferred nine of the ten \$1 shares in the company into his son's name. Those shares have since been transferred back to Francis Patrick Luton. The other share was held by his wife, Mary Elizabeth Luton.

I state that the son, Francis James Luton, is an honest and honourable person who should not be implicated in any of his father's fraudulent dealings, and, in fact, the son, Francis James Luton, is the person who has supplied me with the bulk of the information that I intend to use today.

What must be realised is that the father is a silver-tongued charlatan, who has used and abused people and who has shown through his actions that he considers the smell of money to be thicker than blood. The reason he made his son a director of the company was not to provide his son with a career but simply to use his name. During the time his son was a director, all decisions in the company were made by the father and any questions by the son were met with lies and more lies.

His company, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd, was basically a property development company with its main interests in Tara and Bargara. I will show how Francis Patrick Luton, instead of going about his developments in a businesslike manner, manipulates and fraudulently goes about everything he does. But first I would like to profile the type of person Francis Patrick Luton is.

As a declared bankrupt, Francis Patrick Luton claimed at the beginning of the Russell Island trial that he was unemployed and, as a result, was granted legal aid through the Public Defender's Office. During the trial he often arrived in his Mercedes sports car or took off for week-ends in his Cessna aircraft—unlikely assets for an unemployed bankrupt!

These little toys for Frank Luton had been leased for him through his company, Incentive Programmes.

Being a declared bankrupt and facing charges of conspiracy to defraud were certainly not the type of credentials one could offer to business associates and prospective purchasers of land, so Francis Patrick Luton hit on the unique scheme of buying himself a knighthood, which is not recognised anywhere in the world except in the mind of Frank Luton. The knighthood has supposedly been conferred on Frank Luton by an ancient order that dates back to the eleventh century. As I have checked its credentials and found that, in fact, the order is a genuine organisation that does a great deal of good work in the world community, I will not name it. However, for the information of all honourable members I table a copy of a letter dated 7 May 1982, allegedly granting Frank Luton a knighthood, and a copy of a letter that I received yesterday from the Australian chapter of the order dissociating itself from Frank Luton and from the person Baron Frary Von Blomberg of the United States, who bestowed this useless knighthood on Frank Luton.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Apparently, self-titled Baron Frary Von Blomberg was expelled from the order in the United States after he had been convicted of fraud. He then set up his own branch of the order, which is not recognised anywhere in the world. Baron Frary Von Blomberg set up his order to sell knighthoods to con men and underworld figures to enable them

to appear to be respectable figures. The interesting point is that a bogus knighthood was sold to Frank Luton while he was appearing in the District Court of Queensland charged with conspiracy to defraud.

I would suggest that no legitimate organisation would grant an honour to someone under those circumstances. A local sporting club would not even grant life membership under those circumstances.

Knighthoods do not come cheap, and it would appear from my information that Frank Luton paid about \$25,000 for his knighthood. However, for someone such as Frank Luton, with a criminal mind, raising \$25,000 was not difficult. It must be remembered that, at the time, he was a declared bankrupt who, to gain legal aid, represented himself as unemployed.

Being a master at fraud, Luton devised a scheme to defraud a finance company of the \$25,000. The scheme operated in this manner. Luton arranged his knighthood through a Melbourne con man, Norman Lewis, another self-proclaimed knight. In March 1982, Lewis arranged the sale of his 1971 model Mercedes Benz 350 SL roadster through T. Lamborghini Distributors Pty Ltd to Luton's company, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd. The sale was in the form of a lease financed by General Credits Ltd.

The market value of a 1971 Mercedes Benz 350 SL roadster in perfect condition in March 1982 was \$25,000, but that car was represented to General Credits as being a later model with a sale price of about \$50,000. The lease document shows a lease period of 48 months, with payments of \$1,306.11 per month, and a residual value of \$16,400. Frank Luton then allowed the finance company to repossess the car, which was subsequently sold for about \$15,000.

As a result, without Luton outlaying one cent, Lewis had received an extra \$25,000 to finance Luton's knighthood. It would appear to me that Luton should not use the title "Sir"; rather he should use "Prince Luton", as he is certainly the prince of crooks.

I table a copy of the lease for the information of members.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

I turn now to Luton's land dealings. Through his company, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd, Francis Luton marketed approximately 140 building blocks at Bargara, which is outside Bundaberg. Luton promised prospective purchasers that the land would be provided with services, including bitumen roads. To date no services or roads have been provided, even though Luton has spent all the money. In fact, Luton never intended providing services. It was a clear case of fraud. It was allowed to occur while Luton was appearing in court on a charge of conspiracy to defraud, a charge which was subsequently dropped. Later I will come back to the Bargara land deals. First, I would like to deal with Luton's land dealings at Tara. To do that, I will read a statement made by Harry James Shepherd to the Queensland Fraud Squad. It states—

"My full name is Harry James Shepherd. I am a Company Director and I reside at 6 Boorana Street, JINDALEE, BRISBANE.

In late October my business partner, Mr. LES DYNE, advised me that a company called INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD had approval for a subdivision at KOGAN near DALBY. He said that the Company required \$35,000 to develop the subdivision. Mr. DYNE asked me if I would be able to lend our SUPER FUNDS (L.S.D. SERVICES PTY LTD SUPERANNUATION FUND and M.S.V. SALES PTY LTD SUPERANNUATION FUND) \$35,000 so we could enter into a joint venture with INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD.

I advised Mr. DYNE that by mortgaging my home at 33 Gleneagle Street, Kenmore I would be able to raise the money. Mr. DYNE then introduced me to Mr. FRANK LUTON and an agreement dated 1st November, 1982 was entered into. I was told that approval for the subdivision had been given by the TARA Council and that the money was needed for road works and drainage. I stressed to Mr. LUTON in the presence of Mr. DYNE and Mr. DEXTER that the money was

only to be used for the purpose for which it was advanced. I made it clear to Mr. LUTON that if the money was used for any other purpose I would advise the Police as I had just recently had \$11,500 taken from a trust account of Ray White, Real Estate, at Mackay and I did not want any problems with the venture.

The \$35,000 cheque was made in favour of CARTER CAPNER and CO., Solicitor to be lodged in their trust account. As Mrs. CARTER, wife of TED CARTER OF CARTER CAPNER and CO. held first mortgage over Portion 4, Parish of Malara at KOGAN, the SUPER FUNDS agreed to take a second mortgage as security in the joint venture. Of the 40 x 30 acre blocks to be produced in Portion 4, INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES was to retain 4 blocks to cover the first mortgage payout. The remaining 36 blocks were to be divided equally between INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES and the SUPER FUNDS. Mr. LUTON said he would be able to sell the blocks at \$15,000 each and that the SUPER FUNDS could expect to receive \$270,000 (less cost of selling) for their share in the joint venture. I was advised that the SUPER FUNDS would receive the title deeds for the blocks no later than the 3rd February, 1983. Bearing this in mind I asked my bank, the National Bank at Kenmore Shopping Village, to advance \$35,000 against my home for a period of three months. The bank loaned the money on condition that it was to be repaid in three months.

A few weeks after the agreement was entered into I was advised that Mr. and Mrs. LUTON and child had gone to MALTA where Mr. LUTON was to receive a Knighthood. He returned to Brisbane in January, 1983 when I asked him how the work on the subdivision was progressing. He advised me that the Surveyor, from Toowoomba, had made a mistake in his survey and would have to do further survey work on the property and this would delay issuing of the title deeds for a couple of weeks.

In February I was told by Mr. LES DYNE that Mr. DEXTER (who worked for INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD) had advised him that Mr. FRANK LUTON had withdrawn the \$35,000 from CARTER CAPNER and CO's trust account and lodged it in the C.B.A. Bank at Arana Hills. On the 18th February, 1983 Mr. DYNE and I had a meeting with Mr. Frank and Mrs. Mary LUTON. I expressed my concern that the money had been withdrawn and insisted that the \$35,000 be returned immediately. Mr. Frank LUTON said we should open a joint account so that I would know that the money was being used for the subdivision development.

Mr. Frank LUTON and I then opened a joint account at the Bank of Queensland, Queen Street. Mr. LUTON lodged \$20.00 to open the account and told me not to worry that the money would be put into the account in a few days. (The account number is 60-111256).

A few weeks later I was advised by Mr. DYNE that Mr. LUTON had told him that the TARA Shire Council would not allow 30 acre blocks on the subdivision and that they would only allow 10 acre blocks. I could not understand how this could be as Mr. Frank LUTON had told me that they already had approval.

I was very concerned as I had assured the Bank that the loan would be paid back on the 5th February. I approached my Bank Manager and explained what I knew of the situation at the time and he agreed to extend the loan a further 6 months. I then checked the joint account at the Bank of Queensland and found that no further deposits had been made.

I then had another meeting with Frank and Mary LUTON and they agreed that INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD would give me a first mortgage over a BARGARA property belonging to the Company. I was then to approach my Bank to try to have them accept the BARGARA property mortgage as security for the \$35,000 and so release my house to meet my commitment to the bank. (The Bargara mortgage was drawn up by STOCKLEY and CO., Solicitor and executed by INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES on 16th May, 1983.)

Mr. DEXTER later advised Mr. DYNE and myself that Frank and Mary LUTON had used part of the \$35,000 to finance a world trip and that the rest of the money was also spent by the LUTONS. Mr. DYNE and I approached Frank and Mary LUTON about the money and the subdivision. Mr. and Mrs. LUTON suggested that INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD and the SUPER FUNDS enter into an agreement giving the SUPER FUNDS 6 x 100 acre blocks which were to be sold for \$20,000 per block, the total sum being \$120,000, less selling costs. However this agreement was never put in writing although Mr. DYNE had approached Mr. and Mrs. LUTON on several occasions to do so.

In September, 1983 Mr. Frank LUTON told me he had a buyer for a Marina project belonging to INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD at BARGARA. He asked me what I would settle for and I told him \$120,000 and he agreed to this sum. He then asked me to have an agreement drawn up. I asked Mr. DYNE to draw up the agreement which was executed by the SUPER FUNDS and myself. INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES never executed the agreement.

Frank LUTON later called me on the telephone and asked me to meet with him at his Solicitors, BAKER and LOEL, to draw up the agreement. I agreed to meet with him at Mr. Jim LOEL's office. An agreement was formulated and Mr. LOEL was to send me a draft of this agreement as soon as it was typed. I have never received this agreement.

Mr. DYNE and I then decided to approach Mr. Fred LIPPIATT to have INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD placed in liquidation. Mr DYNE arranged for me to meet with Mr. Fred LIPPIATT as he had to go to Mackay to attend matters concerning another joint venture of the SUPER FUNDS. I went to see Mr. LIPPIATT and he said that he could act for me as he had not heard of Frank LUTON and I told him of the situation between INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD and the SUPER FUNDS. After some discussion Mr. LIPPIATT suggested I ask Mr. DYNE to come with me to see him. I told Mr. DYNE that Mr. LIPPIATT wished to see him to discuss the matters further and execute the liquidation papers. We made an appointment. Mr. DYNE and I went to see Mr. LIPPIATT but the documents were not ready to be signed. Mr. DYNE advised Mr. LIPPIATT of our dealings with Mr. Frank LUTON. Mr. LIPPIATT expressed great indignation and said 'the man shouldn't be allowed on the streets'. Mr. LIPPIATT then made telephone calls to Mr. Ted CARTER of CARTER CAPNER and CO., Mr Jim LOEL of BAKER and LOEL and also CROUCH and CROUCH. Mr. Ted CARTER was not in his office, nor the Solicitor for CROUCH and CROUCH, so he left messages asking them to call him back. Mr. LIPPIATT dictated to his secretary the petition and other documents.

About a week later Frank LUTON contacted me and was very upset that Mr. DYNE and myself had issued liquidation proceedings against INCENTIVE PROGRAMS. He told me if we proceeded at this time it would affect the sale of the BARGARA property. He said he had an American buyer who would pay in the vicinity of \$7,000,000 for the BARGARA Marina project. He then asked me not to proceed with the liquidation at that time so that he would have a chance to settle all his debts if he sold to the American. I telephoned Mr. LIPPIATT and asked him to delay proceedings until I got in touch with him. In December, 1983 Mr. DYNE told me the INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD had gone into voluntary liquidation and that Mr Fred LIPPIATT was acting for INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES.

I went to Mr. LIPPIATT's office to get the mortgage document that I had left on my previous visit. He gave me the mortgage and I asked him if it was true that he was acting on behalf of INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES. He never answered that question but pointed to the mortgage and said 'I don't know anything about that'.

COOPERS and LYBRAND were appointed Liquidators in February, 1984 and since then I have given the Liquidators the mortgages to photocopy and have also shown them copies of Letters of Approval from the TARA Shire Council for the

subdivision. We requested Mr. IRVINE of COOPERS and LYBRAND to report the matter to both the Police and Corporate Affairs. We also asked that Mr. LIPPIATT be prevented from acting for INCENTIVE PROGRAMMES PTY LTD because of the conflict of interest. Both requests have been ignored.

Harry Shepherd"

A number of startling and very concerning matters raised in that statement warrant action by the authorities, whether they be the police, the Justice Department or the Queensland Law Society. Firstly, the \$35,000 loan to Luton's Company, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd, was arranged on the basis that Luton had approval for a subdivision and would use the money for the development. Subject to Incentive Programmes lodging a \$20,000 bond with the Tara Shire Council, that council approved the subdivision on 17 June 1982. Luton never paid the bond and, as a result, approval for the subdivision lapsed on 17 December 1982. Luton did not attempt to extend the approval time on the subdivision and, as can be seen from the statement, the \$35,000 loan was taken out only six weeks before the approval lapsed. After the approval lapsed, the Tara Shire Council changed its policy regarding the size of subdivisions in the area in which Luton held his land. That made his proposal virtually worthless.

It will be noted from the statement that Luton told Harry Shepherd in January 1983 that a mistake had been made in the survey work and that further survey work would have to be done. In fact, at that time, approval for the subdivision had lapsed and Luton had made no attempt to pay the deposit or to do any work on the subdivision.

Next there was the transfer and fraudulent use of the \$35,000 loan from the solicitors' trust account without approval. Some time between 1 November 1982 and 30 December 1982, Luton transferred the \$35,000 from the trust account at Carter Capner and Co. to bank account No. 044-223-036-44135 at the Arana Hills branch of the Commercial Bank of Australia Limited. Of this money \$9,500 was used by Frank Luton and his wife and daughter to fly first class to collect his bogus knighthood overseas. I do not know what the remainder of the money was used for but, in time, it all vanished.

An account was opened with the Security Permanent Building Society, which is part of the Bank of Queensland. The account was opened on 18 February 1983 with \$20, and no further money has been deposited in it. I table a copy of a statement of that account proving the point. It is interesting to note that this account was opened in the name of Sir Francis Luton, evidence in itself of fraud.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

It will be noted from the statement that, right through 1983, Luton continually lied and misrepresented his actions to Harry Shepherd and Les Dyne.

The third point in Harry Shepherd's statement which I believe needs investigation by the police, the Justice Department and the Queensland Law Society is the role played by Mr Fred Lippiatt. It would appear from his actions that he has acted in collusion with Luton. The questions that need to be answered are how a solicitor engaged by someone to place a company in liquidation, could act for the company and place it in voluntary liquidation?

I suggest that the Fraud Squad should investigate and find out whether any assets or cash in Incentive Programmes was shifted between when Shepherd and Dyne contacted Lippiatt and when Lippiatt placed Incentive Programmes in voluntary liquidation. At the least, it would appear that this well-known Brisbane solicitor has acted very foolishly and with a degree of incompetence, or that he has been in collusion with Luton to ensure that Luton got the maximum amount of money out of the company.

I would like now to deal with the placing of Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd into voluntary liquidation, a scenario which really highlights the stupidity of Queensland's corporate laws. In the report lodged with the Corporate Affairs Office the following information will be found—

	\$
Assets subject to specific charges, i.e., mortgages	475,000
Total estimates, realisable assets	6,779,290
Claims by employees	102,000
Preferential creditors	350,000
Partly secured creditors	38,000
Unsecured creditors	485,870
Estimated surplus	5,559,920

If that represented a true picture of the company, why bother placing it in liquidation? It appears to be a gold mine. But the real truth is that placing it in liquidation has allowed Luton to shake off his creditors.

A number of interesting points come to light in reading the Corporate Affairs Office documents. The point to remember is that Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd had a paid-up capital of \$10, which was made up of Francis Luton, nine shares and his wife, Mary, one share. The only real assets of the company at the time of liquidation were its land holdings at Bargara, over which there were mortgages of \$475,000. The mortgages are immediately paid out as these assets are realised by the liquidator. Creditors are paid out of any surplus money in the following order: employees, secured creditors, partly secured creditors, and unsecured creditors.

In the claims by employees for wages, Frank Luton has claimed \$65,000 for himself and \$34,600 for his wife. The secured creditors of the company are Frank Luton and Mary Luton, with the claim being for \$350,000. It has now become apparent that there will not be enough money to pay partly secured creditors or unsecured creditors.

The reason for this is that the majority of land held at Bargara was sold by auction on 1 August 1984, and the amount realised was approximately \$660,000. After paying out the mortgages of \$475,000, the \$185,000 left will be paid to Frank and Mary Luton. The unsecured creditors and partly secured creditors who are owed \$523,870 will receive nothing.

But, once again, we come back to the question of conspiring to defraud and collusion between Luton and his solicitor. The reason I raise this question is that the land which was auctioned for \$660,000 had an estimated realisable value of \$6,970,000. In fact, Luton had been offered \$7m for that land, but the deal had fallen through.

The value on the land was dependent on council approval for certain developments. Luton had obtained approval from the Woongarra Shire Council for a 262-site caravan park, a tennis ranch and sporting complex and a marina. However, Luton and his solicitor allowed the approval on these projects to lapse one month before the auction.

Was this, once again, a case of incompetence or collusion? I would suggest that it was collusion and a deliberate case of conspiracy to defraud, because the person who purchased the land at auction was none other than Francis Patrick Luton. What had been done by allowing the approvals to lapse was to ensure that the land brought the lowest possible price at auction.

After the auction, Luton told the Bundaberg "News-Mail" that he intended to go ahead with his development, subject, once again, to gaining council approval. Luton stated further that Incentive Programmes should not have been put into liquidation—quite a ridiculous statement from the person who had placed the company into liquidation.

Without delving too deeply into the affairs of the company, Incentive Programmes, I ask honourable members just to consider these simple facts and then to ask themselves where the money has gone. The total price paid for the land at Bargara by Luton was \$265,000. Before going into liquidation, he had sold 145 blocks, to which he provided no services, at an average price of \$10,000, which should have left a debt on the land of \$120,000.

When the company went into liquidation, it had mortgages over the land of \$475,000. It supposedly owed \$102,000 in wages, \$350,000 in secured debts and \$523,870 in partly secured and unsecured debts—a total of \$1,450,870, which is a difference of more than \$1.2m. What this really amounts to is a million dollar sting.

One needs to ask how a charlatan such as Luton can get away for so long with his activities. I ask honourable members to consider the few points that I have placed before them today:

- (1) Parading as a knight of the realm;
- (2) Embezzling \$35,000 which should have been used to provide services to an estate at Tara;
- (3) Selling 145 blocks of land without services; and
- (4) Stripping a company of \$1m and then ending up with the assets of the company plus any surplus cash.

I will tell honourable members how Luton has been able to do it. He has been able to do it with the protection of this National Party Government. To prove my allegation, I refer to an article in the "Sunday Sun" on 10 April 1983. It stated—

"Fraud Squad detectives are probing the background of a land salesman who claims he is a knight.

The man allegedly sold more than 200 residential allotments near Bundaberg in what he claimed was a multi million dollar development.

The transactions are believed to have reaped him a tax-free profit of more than \$100,000.

Detectives have extended their investigation to the Middle East to check the dealers claims about a knighthood and diplomatic posts."

Now, I refer back to the statutory declaration of Leslie Dyne, which was incorporated in "Hansard". That statement, in part, said—

"I know Francis Patrick Luton of 41 Bolinda Street, Eight Mile Plains.

After he was discharged from the Russell Island case, the said Francis Patrick Luton complained to me that Detective Vince Mahoney of the Fraud Squad was investigating him in relation to his land dealings at Bargara, near Bundaberg.

In approximately May 1983, I was in Mr Luton's office at Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd when he had a telephone conversation with someone. After the conversation Mr Luton gloated, 'That was Goleby, the Minister for Harbour and Marines. He is a friend of mine, and he's had Mahoney transferred off the case. I convinced him that Mahoney was a Labor supporter and that the Labor Party was going to use the Bargara investigation to embarrass the Government at the next election.'

I later contacted the fraud squad and was informed that Detective Mahoney was no longer handling the Bargara case."

That is one of the most serious allegations that can be made against a Cabinet Minister and I would call upon the Minister to resign from his position in Cabinet until these allegations have been fully investigated. The Minister needs to answer this question: Did he intervene and have Detective Vince Mahony removed from this case?

The Minister for Police should tell this Parliament whether Detective Vince Mahony was removed from the investigation of Francis Luton, and, if so, on what date and for what reason.

I believe that I have raised today a matter which requires urgent action and answers by this Government. It is obvious that Francis Patrick Luton has been able to rip people off with apparent immunity from any laws of this State. I believe that I have produced enough evidence to show that Francis Patrick Luton should be in gaol. Instead of being in gaol, he is able to continue with his acts of fraud with apparent protection from this National Party Government.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (2.46 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech. It is a fitting time to acknowledge that the constituents of the electorate of Cooroora are

great supporters of the wonderful work done by the Sovereign's representative in Queensland, Sir James Ramsay. He makes himself available throughout the electorate—

Mr Comben: It is throughout the State.

Mr SIMPSON: Wait for it. The member for Windsor is very impatient.

The Governor makes himself available to service the needs of the people in my area, as he does in all parts of the State. It is a vast State, but he enjoys his work very much. He is ably supported in his work by Lady Ramsay.

It is unfortunate that Opposition members do not understand the Westminster system of government and the part that the Sovereign has—

Mr Lee: They won't even recognise the flag.

Mr SIMPSON: No, Opposition members will not recognise the flag; the member for Yeronga is right about that. However, Opposition members are hypocritical. They put the Australian flag up behind the Labor Party banner in election campaigns, but the first thing the Federal Government wants to do is take it down and replace it with something else.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. The member for Cooroora is misleading the House. He said that it is the policy of the Opposition to replace the flag. That is not the Opposition's policy.

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

Mr SIMPSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, you are correct in saying that there is no point of order.

Opposition members are very tender on this point because they know—

Mr Casey: Are you trying to say that the Westminster system exists in this Parliament?

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, Mr Casey.

Mr Casey: You are kidding yourself! I do not know where you have been for the last eight years.

Mr SIMPSON: The comments of the member for Mackay are interesting, because he is one who is trying to change this Parliament into something that is not in accordance with the Westminster system. That is hypocrisy.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: I am glad that the honourable member mentioned the word "democratic" As his guru, he would take the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke.

It is fitting that I should now refer to the Boyer lectures given by Mr Hawke. Not only would that gentleman sever our connection with the Crown—

Mr Comben: What has that to do with Westminster?

Mr SIMPSON: If the honourable member waits for a moment, he will be educated.

Members of the Opposition take directions from Mr Hawke. He is on record as having said—

"I would prefer to break the link with the British Crown and have our own president as Head of State."

That is the system that the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) would have, and he would claim that that system is better than the one that operates at present. Mr Casey raised the matter of democracy. Democracy is electing representatives to govern.

An Opposition Member: Fairly.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, fairly. However, what do the Australian Labor Party and Mr Hawke really want? They would have unelected people governing us.

Mr Hamill: That is in the Constitution already.

Mr SIMPSON: Ah, yes; but we on the Government side realise that that is not democratic, and that is why we do not accept that provision in the Constitution.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: I know that Opposition members would rather have such a system. Opposition members make a sham of democracy. They do not support government by elected representatives.

Mr Hawke's comment shows what he really is. He says that he is trying to reduce unemployment, which is very commendable; he says that he is trying to reduce inflation, which is great; he claims that he is trying to promote economic activity, which, too, is great. But we know how he will achieve those objectives—by autocratic government.

Opposition Members: No!

Mr SIMPSON: More tender nerves! Opposition members are happy to sit in a State Parliament knowing full well that their guru, Mr Hawke, would abolish State Parliaments. He has said he would do that. He has said that Australia must have only one Government, in Canberra, with no local authorities and no State Governments. He would have only one Government to govern Australia. He would do away with all State Governments and members of State Parliaments.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members can wriggle and squirm as much as they like. They do not like this.

Mr Casey: Can you tell me the document you are quoting from?

Mr SIMPSON: Yes. I am quoting from the Boyer Lectures.

Mr Casey: Can you give me the date?

Mr SIMPSON: Why? Does the honourable member believe that the date is relevant?

Mr Casey: It is most important, because the document you are quoting from contains a comment that was made long before Mr Hawke was even a member of Parliament.

Mr SIMPSON: A leopard does not change its spots. No matter when these comments were made, it is still Mr Hawke who made them.

Mr Casey: I'll bet you said some silly things five or six years ago.

Mr SIMPSON: No doubt Mr Hawke regrets some of the things that he said, because they give an insight into his attitudes and policies. They also give an insight into the attitudes of Opposition members, who are committed to socialist policies. They take from people according to their ability to give and give to people according to their need. That is the old Marxist policy. Under a Government consisting of Opposition members, taxation in Queensland would be rampant. Opposition members envy successful people, and, like Robin Hood, they would take from those people and give to those in need. The result would be that no-one in the State would be producing anything.

To return to the Governor—he has acknowledged that Queensland is a great State. He has seen it for himself; he moves round the State and observes what goes on. It is unfortunate that we witnessed a disgusting performance by Opposition members who cast aspersions on the Governor and on his Opening Speech. It is very sad that such criticisms are levelled by persons who are elected to this House to represent the people. I remind the House that, under the Westminster system, if Opposition members are

able to convince the people that their policies are the right ones, they might obtain the numbers and be able to govern in their own right.

As the Governor has travelled round the State, he would have realised how well it is being run by the Queensland Government. Because of the vagaries of the seasons and the difficulty of marketing primary produce, Queensland faces problems. It is sad that the Federal Government is not tackling the problems associated with overseas trade, because that is one of its responsibilities. The Federal Government has been loath to assist the sugar industry, which is a large industry in Queensland. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry continues to adopt a head-in-the-sand attitude when dealing with sugar-producers.

The Governor upholds those traditions that are dear to us. The Federal Government would do away with the oath of allegiance. As it does with many things, the Federal Government says, "We will give you an option." Many Labor members of Parliament have not sworn on the Bible when they have taken the oath of allegiance. They have shown no commitment to God. The list of those members of Federal Parliament who made affirmations includes Mr Baldwin, Mr Beddall, Mr Bilney, Dr Blewett, Mr Campbell, Mrs Child——

Mr Comben: What has that got to do with this Chamber, this State and the Address in Reply?

Mr SIMPSON: I am trying to explain to the honourable member the tradition of Westminster, the meaning of allegiance to the Crown, belief in God—the honourable member does not hold with those things, perhaps.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. Under Standing Order No. 120, the honourable member is casting aspersions on me. I am an active Anglican churchman and a member of parish councils. In contravention of Standing Order No. 120, he is casting aspersions upon me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Could the honourable member repeat the words used by the member for Cooroora? I did not hear them.

Mr COMBEN: He said that I was a non-Christian and that I did not believe in God. I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Cooroora to withdraw those remarks.

Mr SIMPSON: I will certainly withdraw them. "Hansard" will show that I did not say that.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not allow cross-firing in the Chamber. The honourable member has withdrawn the remark. I suggest that he continue.

Mr SIMPSON: I have withdrawn the remark.

The list of those Federal members of Parliament who made affirmations includes Dr Blewett, Mr Campbell, Mrs Child, Mr Dawkins, Dr Everingham, Ms Fatin, Mr Fry, Mr Griffiths, Mr Hand, Mr Hayden, Mr Holding, Mr Kent, Dr Klugman, Ms McHugh, Mr Macphee, Mrs Mayer, Mr Milton, Mr Morris, Mr Reeves, Mr Saunderson, Mr Staples, Mr Steedman, Mr Uren, Mr Wells, Mr West, Mr Willis, and Mr Young. That is a long list of persons who have no commitment to God. Opposition members might wonder what that has to do with the Queensland Parliament. The Queensland Parliament operates under the Westminster system with a sovereign head of State. In Canberra, the rule book is held by the sovereign's representative for the defence of the people.

An Opposition Member: Which rule book?

Mr SIMPSON: The Constitution.

Mr Hamill: Is that a rule book?

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member does not see it as a set of rules?

Mr Comben: The Constitution?

Mr SIMPSON: Yes. What are laws if they are not rules?

Mr Hamill: The laws we make from time to time. Aren't you aware of that?

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, but they are not perverted. Of course, they were when Whitlam was in power, and the Governor-General pulled him into line. However, the Governor-General did not say, "I rule you out of order." He said, "Go back to the people and let them decide." History shows that the people threw Whitlam out.

Mr Casey: The rule book you are talking about went overboard with Magna Carta.

Mr SIMPSON: The education of the member for Mackay is sadly lacking. It started with Magna Carta. The Constitution and all of the laws and rules by which we are governed are held in trust by the Governor-General. Until recently, the position in Australia was the same as that in Britain; that is, the Crown was the defender of the people and the keeper of the rules of the realm. That hymn, or prayer, "God save the Queen" really says, "God save us" It asks God to save our protector.

Mr Hamill: What absolute piffle! We don't believe a thing you are saying.

Mr SIMPSON: I ask the member for Ipswich to listen. I know that he does not agree with any of this, and I will return to that point at a later stage.

The Crown's representative in Australia was, until a few weeks ago, in charge of the defence forces. The letters patent giving that responsibility to the Governor-General have been changed. No longer does the Commonwealth of Australia have an impartial representative of the Crown—the Governor-General—protecting the people. In future an elected person—doubtless it will be the Minister in charge of the defence forces for the time being—will accept that responsibility instead of the sovereign head of government. Already the Westminster system in Australia is being changed under Hawke, in line with his Boyer lectures.

Mr Hamill: What a lot of piffle!

Mr SIMPSON: The member for Ipswich indicates that he does not agree with a word that I have said. Of course, he does not agree with having any sovereign representative in Queensland.

Mr Hamill: No, that is not true.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, it is.

Mr Hamill: No, it is not.

Mr SIMPSON: When I give it back to him, he does not like it.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Cooroora totally distorts the position by claiming that I do not believe in a sovereign head of government. Of course we have a sovereign head of government. I ask him to withdraw those comments.

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

Mr HAMILL: Mr Deputy Speaker, it is personally offensive.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am ruling that there is no point of order.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to another point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Ipswich to state his point of order.

Mr HAMILL: I refer to the rule book that the honourable member for Cooroora continually refers to. The Standing Orders contain a provision that, if a matter is personally offensive to an honourable member, he has the right to ask that such reference be withdrawn without qualification. I so ask.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member for Ipswich tell me the words that he considers to be personally offensive?

Mr HAMILL: The member for Cooroora implied that I do not believe in having a sovereign head of Government. Because I uphold the traditions of the Westminster system and as I intend speaking on that subject this afternoon, I find those remarks personally offensive.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is only an inference. I cannot accept the point of order.

Mr SIMPSON: The member for Ipswich caught himself with his own interjection. He claimed that he did not agree with anything I was saying. What I was saying was that the sovereign head of state is the custodian of the constitution and the laws that are made in this place. That is the Westminster system. Now that I have said that he does not believe in that system, he is trying to back out. The people in his electorate will know that, like Mr Hawke, the member for Ipswich believes in a dictatorship, which of course is not democratically elected.

An interesting fact is that Queensland has probably the fairest electoral system in the world. In fact, it comes from the Westminster system. The people of Britain realised the need for equality of representation and that that did not necessarily mean having equal numbers in electorates.

Mr Comben: Come on!

Mr SIMPSON: It appears that I have to explain to the Opposition what is equality of representation. Before Magna Carta, because the sovereigns had the power in their armies, they governed the people. After the Magna Carta, it was the people who made the laws. As not all the people of Britain could meet in the one place, they sent representatives.

Mr Underwood: That is rubbish. After Magna Carta, the people did not make the decisions.

Mr SIMPSON: There is no doubt that some members of the Opposition read fairytales.

Because the representatives made the laws, the key was for the people to have equal access to their representatives. That was not entirely possible, so the best way to achieve the aim was to vary the number of people looked after by each representative. Because of difficulties presented by terrain and communications, the number of people in each electorate was varied by as much as four and a half to one.

Mr Littleproud: Ian Cameron represents the electorate of Maranoa, which is 14 900 times bigger than the electorate of Moreton.

Mr SIMPSON: That is an interesting comparison.

Although all members of the Opposition are howling about it, the electoral system in Queensland was initiated by the Labor Party. In condemning that system, Opposition members condemn those of their party who went before them in this House.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members should make up their minds. A minute ago they were saying that the Queensland system is no good. Are they now saying that, because it was introduced by the Labor Party, it is all right? Because the system takes into account communities of interest and difficulties of communication, it is a good one.

Under the Queensland system, people with a similar community interest have been placed in the same electorate.

The same pattern is reflected in the United Kingdom, where the number of voters varies by up to four and a half to one, in the United States, where the number varies by up to five to one, and in Canada, where the variation reaches eleven to one.

The difficulties of the terrain and access to representation in Canada are similar to those in Australia, yet in Australia, federally, there is the worst possible gerrymander. It is a perversion of democracy when very large electorates are designed in areas with difficult communications. In such areas, people have to wait weeks for a reply to mail sent to their representative, and only a few electors have access to their local representative by way of a local telephone call. The majority have to pay the maximum telephone fee. In contrast, city electors can ride a push-bike around their electorates. Housewives pass the office door of their elected representative each day, or several times a week. That is why there must be a weighting.

Mr Neal interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: As the honourable member for Balonne said, 20 cents gives city electors all-day access to the local member.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: Does the honourable member think that compensates in any way for this ridiculous situation?

Mr Hamill: Give members better access to facilities to service their electorates properly.

Mr SIMPSON: How would the member for Ipswich compensate those members who take all day to fly from one end of their electorate to the other, especially if they are Federal representatives?

Mr Hamill: That's rubbish!

Mr SIMPSON: It is not rubbish.

An Opposition Member: Not flying by Joh's plane.

Mr SIMPSON: If the honourable member were to use a slower aircraft, he would get his figures right.

The honourable member for Ipswich may be able to more readily comprehend this example: If the member for Warrego wanted to service the outer towns in his electorate, it would take him several hours to do that by aircraft.

When housewives in the electorate of the honourable member for Ipswich do their shopping, they can walk from any part of his electorate to his office. That is the difference. Opposition members seem to think that, in some way, there is an ability to make up time.

Mr Hamill: In the parliamentary recesses.

Mr SIMPSON: How would the honourable member cope with the time required to provide basic servicing of the electorate and give equal representation to which I was referring? It cannot be done. In no way can a member be compensated for the time involved.

That is why in Britain the weighting is as high as four and a half to one, in the United States five to one, in Canada eleven to one, and in Western Australia seven to one. Because there is a weighting of two and a half to one in Queensland, Opposition members want people to believe that that is some sort of fiddle. In fact, it is the fairest system in the world. It takes into account community of interest and equal access, and

it gives as nearly as possible equality of representation. Queensland is very fortunate to have such a system.

The proposal to change the flag, which Opposition members are so keen to do, really annoys me.

Mr McElligott: I think you mentioned that before.

Mr SIMPSON: I did, but I got off the subject.

In 1901, a competition was held to find a design for an Australian flag. More than 3 000 entries were received. At that time, five people drew up designs that were very similar. A design was adopted for the Australian flag, and it is very distinctive. If one sees flying the flags of a couple of hundred nations of the world, one finds it difficult to determine to which country each flag belongs. As I said, the Australian flag is very distinctive.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: The flag most similar to the Australian flag would be the New Zealand flag. Of course, the New Zealand flag is different from ours, and most people can quite readily notice that difference.

The Australian people accept the Australian flag, with the Union Jack, the Southern Cross and the Federation Star depicted on it. It is a very good design and the Australian people will continue to support it.

Some people have suggested that the design of the Australian flag should not be changed unless the people agree to a change by referendum. Do Opposition members recall the referendum of 1922, when the Labor Party in Queensland said, "We will find out whether we want an upper House in this State." A referendum was held, and the people of Queensland threw out the suggestion to abolish the upper House. They said, "No, we want to keep our two Houses in Queensland." What did the Labor Party do? It took no notice of the people; it abolished the upper House. That is typical of the Labor Party. It is full of contradictions. Its members are hypocrites when it comes to referendums and what the people want.

This morning, when I was in my electorate, I was surprised to hear that the member for Rockhampton (Mr Wright) had belatedly expressed concern about sick aged people in nursing homes. Belatedly, he said that he would go to see Dr Blewett about the matter.

Mr Prest: Is the Queen Mother sick?

Mr SIMPSON: No. I think that Mr Hawke is a little "crook".

Mr Wright: What is your accusation?

Mr SIMPSON: Although, on 30 November 1983, I urged the member for Rockhampton to do something about this matter, he would not do anything to help the sick aged people in Queensland. At that time, sick aged people in nursing homes in Queensland were being subsidised \$26.65 per day, whereas the subsidy paid in New South Wales was \$32.35, and in Victoria \$45.15. I raised that matter in this Chamber and said that the honourable member for Rockhampton was not doing anything to help those people of Queensland.

Mr Wright: Be honest about it. Those amounts of money represent 70 per cent of the costs incurred by your Government.

Mr SIMPSON: There is no way in which the honourable member can squirm out of it.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. Rather than make a personal explanation at the conclusion of the honourable member's speech, I place on the record that the

figures mentioned by him are not just figures in dollar terms; they represent 70 per cent of the costs incurred by this Government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! There is no substance in the point of order.

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members are being shown up for what they are, and they do not like it. They are not concerned about the needy in the community. That is why I raised this matter in this Chamber in November 1983. I have shown quite clearly the hypocrisy of Opposition members. They do not represent the people at all.

I turn now to a few local matters in my electorate. I will speak about the importance of tourism and primary industries. I have already referred to the plight of the sugar industry and the assistance that is necessary to remedy it. My area is noted for its horticulture and its tropical and subtropical fruits. That fruit is enjoyed by tourists who are drawn to the Sunshine Coast by the warm winters. I am sure that tourists from overseas would also enjoy the Sunshine Coast.

As the Premier knows, and as I found out on a recent overseas study tour, there is a tremendous potential for increased visits to Queensland by international travellers, and they must be catered for. If Australia is to compete with other countries, penalty rates based on a seven-day 40-hour week must be introduced for employees in the tourist industry. Because of the high cost involved in getting to Australia, most international travellers settle for Australia as their fourth or fifth destination. Several other countries are less costly to travel to.

Mr Campbell: What about tipping?

Mr SIMPSON: The absence of tipping is one advantage for Australia, but it is only one of many. Australia has very good water. Tourists are not charged for the use of toilets, as happens on the Continent. Tourism in Australia can be promoted positively in many ways.

However, better roads are needed from Brisbane to the Sunshine Coast to cater for tourists, the local population and those involved in commerce. Although millions of dollars are being spent on the road from Brisbane to the Sunshine Coast, it will still be many years before its advantages are felt.

I urge the electrification of the railway line to the Sunshine Coast as quickly as possible so that the area is serviced more efficiently. There is no way that the Bruce Highway alone can cater for the future transport needs of the Sunshine Coast and of the half of Australia that is north of Brisbane.

Consideration should be given to the development of a traffic corridor between the central business area of Brisbane and Bald Hills.

Because of the increase in population, more schools are being built in the Cooroora electorate. A new school has been built at Coolumb to ease the travel problems of students who live on the coastal strip. It will be a great advantage to students who will be able to utilise the school's sporting and library facilities. Because at present they have to travel by bus to and from school, they do not have time to use those facilities.

The decision to introduce lead-free petrol for Australian motorists is wrong. It will cost Australian motorists an extra \$3,000m, but will not improve their health at all. Instead, it will diminish Australia's liquid fossil fuel resources 8 to 10 per cent faster than would otherwise be the case.

Mr Prest: We've got more oil than Texas.

Mr SIMPSON: Queensland has some oil, thanks to the progressive policy of the Government in encouraging oil exploration in this State.

Mr Hamill: Who created the oil?

Mr SIMPSON: I remind the honourable member for Ipswich that under a Labor Government there is no encouragement for oil exploration whatsoever. That is a good example of the difference between the socialist ethic and this Government's private enterprise ethic.

Whereas this Government encourages people and rewards them for their endeavour and enterprise, members of the Australian Labor Party do the very opposite. They knock down anybody whose performance is better than average and who outshines others. That is the socialist ethic. Without a productive community, it is almost impossible to look after those who are genuinely in need.

To revert to my electorate—the provision of a new hospital in Nambour will go a long way towards meeting the medical needs of the Sunshine Coast. It will help solve the problems that arise when patients cannot be cared for adequately in local hospitals, close to their friends and relatives, and have to be transported to Brisbane or other places. When that occurs, they run the risk of suffering further injury on the roads. The work on the new hospital is well under way, and when completed it will be a great asset for the Sunshine Coast.

Mr Prest: Say thanks to Claude and all the others.

Mr SIMPSON: In this instance, the Minister for Health is primarily responsible. A project designed to save many millions of dollars must be looked at closely, because the finished job will have to stand up to critical evaluation to determine whether the best methods have been adopted.

Time expired.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! Before I call the honourable member for Ipswich, I suggest to some members who are interjecting that they return to their usual places in the Chamber.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (3.26 p.m.): It is tragic that honourable members have had to listen to such a rambling diatribe as that presented by the honourable member for Cooroora. He is insulting the intelligence of the people of Queensland who have to read his speech in "Hansard". Further, he is insulting the intelligence of honourable members, who have been forced to listen to his cock-eyed account of constitutional law. As a former lecturer and tutor in government, I am quite prepared to start a remedial class for the honourable member, and I am more than happy to instruct him and a few of his colleagues on the finer points of constitutional law. Perhaps that will save us from being treated to such nonsense again.

Mr Casey: You will have to start a long way back.

Mr HAMILL: I know that it would be a long way back that I would have to start, but I hope that I would be equal to the task.

My main purpose in rising is to dwell on the more serious side of the abuse of the Westminster system as it appears in Queensland. I say "appears" and I mean what I say. The Queensland system appears to be the Westminster system, but in so many respects the procedures that are followed in this place bear very little resemblance to those that any self-respecting Parliament follows.

I was saddened when I heard the Governor deliver his Opening Speech. I was saddened because I know the Governor to be an honourable gentleman and because the speech with which he was presented contained a number of statistics and comments that, on an examination of the economic statistics concerning Queensland, are shown to be patently untrue.

In July this year, unemployment in Queensland stood at 9.2 per cent of the labour force, which is higher than the national average of 8.4 per cent. Is that the type of statistic that this Government puts up as an indicator of its success or otherwise in dealing with the economy? Contrary to the claims that are made by the Premier and

Treasurer—when he deigns to come back to the State— that Queensland's economy is booming, the evidence shows that that is not so.

The Government's claims that its taxes and charges are low should be looked at in the context of the \$200m that is ripped out of the mining industry each year by way of rail freights and charges. Imposts of that type upon the mining industry are destroying its viability. A good example can be found in the West Moreton field, in my electorate. State Government taxes and charges are preventing the collieries in the West Moreton region from competing effectively on world coal markets. I suggest that the evidence takes the gloss off the Government's economic propaganda.

In his Opening Speech the Governor made reference to the wages pause program. I remind the Government that what has been in operation during the last 18 or 20 months has been the prices and incomes accord, which was an agreement made between the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions before Labor came to office in Canberra. Since then it has been expanded upon by the great success of the National Economic Summit Conference. The prices and incomes accord has worked better than any commentator in Australia would have dared to believe. In fact, the benefits of that accord can be seen in the economic performance of Australia since Labor came to office in 1983. When one contrasts that with the performance in Queensland, one can see quite clearly that the mythology of the Queensland Government in claiming that all things are well in the sunshine State is far from the truth. Recently, statistics came to the fore. As I said, the level of unemployment in Queensland is higher than the national average. The rate of inflation in Queensland is higher than the national average. Other States are outstripping Queensland in growth and employment. All of that is occurring at a time when the Queensland Government is sitting back, like King Canute facing the oncoming tide, believing that by saying the same thing over and over again, somewhere, somehow the public of Queensland will believe its propaganda.

The economy in Queensland is the Queensland Government's Achilles' heel. It has taken one of its own, the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, to highlight the problem. The Minister pointed out very clearly to the people of Queensland that very grave structural problems exist in the economy in this State. Unfortunately, the Honourable the Minister is something of a Cassandra. He can foresee the future, but the rest of the mob on the Government benches cannot. They do not believe him. Unfortunately, it will not be too long before there is so much evidence piled up that the Government can no longer ignore the terrible economic portents of those figures on inflation, unemployment and so on. Queensland cannot afford the continuation of the Premier's cargo cult economics. Quite frankly, I believe that Queensland is on the verge of grave economic problems. Major industries, particularly the mining and agricultural industries, are suffering very bad times. Because Queensland does not have a diversified economy and a strong manufacturing base, the whole of the State is suffering. All of Queensland's economic eggs are in the one basket. The Queensland Government has done nothing to diversify the Queensland economy.

The lack of balance in the Government's propaganda came through very clearly in the Governor's Opening Speech. He needs new script-writers. If he could look to people who could comment competently on the economy, perhaps those sorts of problems would be overcome. The sort of script that was given to the Governor is yet another example of the attack that the Queensland Government has made upon the Westminster style of Government.

Honourable members heard the incoherent ramblings of the member for Cooroora. He did not concentrate upon the National Party's total disregard for the traditions of parliamentary democracy in this State. Not content with continuing an electoral system that devalues the votes of my constituents as against the votes of others in this State—apparently in Queensland the value of a vote is determined by a residential address and not by the number of persons reaching the age of majority—the National Party has continued its attack upon the traditions of this Parliament.

A few weeks ago we were treated to a debate on an amendment to the Standing Orders of this Assembly. Supplementary questions were abolished. As I pointed out during that debate, in the House of Commons the use of supplementary questions has been expanding rapidly because the House of Commons has not forgotten its own role. The role of the House of Commons—indeed, the role of the Westminster Parliament as a whole—is to scrutinise the affairs of the Government. However, what does the Queensland Government do? It hamstring the Parliament in its operations yet again by denying Parliament its traditional role, which is to scrutinise the Executive and make sure that the Government—that is the Cabinet—governs the State in the interests of all and that it governs with propriety. The Government has denied members of one of those privileges.

Each day the period for question-time is reduced to a farce by Ministers rambling on with lengthy ministerial statements which they read into the record of this House. In so doing, they limit the little time that members have in which to probe the Government and the administration of this State.

Mr McElligott: That stuff about Fast Bucks was pretty important.

Mr HAMILL: It was a classic example of the waste of the time of this Parliament. Ministers encroach upon the time of back-benchers of this Parliament with irrelevant political propaganda that quite frankly is more appropriate to a political party's magazine than to "Hansard"

We witness the continuing farce during question-time of Dororthy Dix questions being put without notice and Ministers having two or three typed pages of prepared text in answer. The time is long overdue for the Parliament to improve its procedures. The Government cries, "We are elected to govern. The Government has a right to govern." After all, the Government has a mandate from only 38 per cent of the people. Simple arithmetic shows that the parties that sit in Opposition in this place represent almost two-thirds of Queensland people.

If Parliament is adequately to fulfil its role as a forum in which the people of Queensland can have their problems aired and the affairs of the Government properly examined, we ought to look seriously at the deficiencies of our Parliament. As I pointed out to the honourable member for Coorooora, one of the grave deficiencies in the Parliament is the long parliamentary recesses, which allow months on end of ministerial government. Orders in Council replace the procedures of Parliament in the law-making of the State. We have government by regulation, without reference to the Parliament. Again, that detracts from the standing of this Parliament and limits its ability to exercise its rights and privileges adequately.

The problems go further than that. I know that there will be cries of "Yes, we have heard it all before" but the truth is that this Parliament does not have standing committees to aid the business of government in this State. We do not have parliamentary scrutiny of the Auditor-General's report. We do not have proper Estimates committees to examine departmental Estimates each year. In fact, we do not even debate the Estimates of every department each year. That is unique to Queensland and something of which we certainly cannot be proud. We do not have committees to deal with legislation, except for the Committee of the Whole House, which is simply a meeting of the whole Parliament. Surely joint committees to deal with legislation would stop the sausage machine method that we are so used to and could only benefit the people of Queensland. How often have Bills been introduced into the Parliament only to be returned for amendment in the following session because the subject-matter of the Bill had not been adequately dealt with by the Minister and there had been an oversight? The Government stacks the numbers on the few committees that there are. The balance which is so much a part of the Westminster tradition is not evident in Queensland. So often controversial legislation is brought down in the dead of night when publicity about the issue will be limited. Standing Orders are suspended to have legislation put before

the Parliament and passed before the Opposition and the people of Queensland have adequate time to scrutinise its provisions.

The Mace, which sits on the end of the table, was presented relatively recently. It bears an inscription which I believe is an insult to this place. It reads, "Presented to the Government of Queensland" The Mace is a symbol of the Speaker's authority. The Mace is a symbol of the authority of Parliament, not of the Government. Governments come and go, but the Parliament continues on as a body. That Mace should be forthwith reinscribed. It ought to be stated to be the Mace of the Parliament of Queensland.

If it is not, the Mace appears to be some sort of symbol of the Government's ability to push parliamentary procedures aside and to regard Parliament as but a fetter upon the operation of government in this State. That is quite clearly contrary to every tradition of the Westminster system. Not only has the Government perverted the symbols of the Parliament; it has perverted parliamentary procedure as well. It perverts the Parliament, and it perverts its traditions.

I take the opportunity to applaud the actions of Dr Ken Wiltshire of the University of Queensland, who could stomach this sort of abuse no longer. He had the intestinal fortitude to go public and point out to the people of Queensland as a whole how this Parliament's procedures are being perverted, how the traditions of this place are being disregarded, and how the Government cares not one iota for propriety in government in this State. I hope that the Government takes his comments to heart, because they are the views of a great many people in the community who are really concerned about the traditions of this place. They are certainly not the views of those who sit opposite, who continue to pervert those traditions.

Although the Parliament needs to be upgraded, the Government needs also to look long and hard at the priorities that it has for this State.

In this debate, the Parliament has witnessed a succession of National Party backbenchers rambling on about a whole range of topics that can only be described as being of interest to themselves. However, the main issue that is of concern to the people of Queensland is that of unemployment.

As I said earlier, unemployment in Queensland has now risen above the national average. The days of boom are over, and members of the Government had better get that into their heads and recognise that unless the Government begins to deal with the chronic unemployment in the State, it will go the way of other Governments that have ignored the plight of the unemployed.

I am pleased that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology has joined us in the Chamber. Had he been here earlier, he would have heard the praise that I was heaping on him for his recognition of the unemployment problem. Unfortunately, he has fallen victim to the fact that the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer have ignored his foresight on the unemployment problem. The economic management of this State is a classic case of the blind leading the blind.

I will consider the Queensland Government's record in setting in place job creation programs. That consideration will not take long. If one looks at the Budget brought down by the Premier in this Chamber last year, one sees that the Queensland Government relies totally on Commonwealth Government programs to generate employment in the State. It is the Community Employment Program, an initiative of the Federal Labor Government, which is the corner-stone of State-based employment generation. There is a greater challenge involved in all this, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! My title is "Mr Deputy Speaker"

Mr HAMILL: My apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker.

That challenge is in relation to the education of the young people of Queensland. The Australian Bureau of Statistics released some very interesting figures that highlight the relationship between the ability of young people to obtain employment and the level of education that they have received. In February 1984, some few months ago—and owing to the initiatives of the Federal Government, it has since fallen—unemployment was 10.4 per cent of the work-force. However, at that time, only 5.2 per cent of those with tertiary qualifications were unemployed. For those with trade and technical training, the unemployment rate was 7.3 per cent; for those who left school at Year 12, the unemployment rate was above average, at 11.5 per cent; and for those who left school before completing those last years of high school, the unemployment rate was 12.8 per cent. Those figures show that the higher the level of education reached, the more opportunity there is to obtain employment. What is important is that as the level of education is increased, the duration of unemployment is diminished.

Mr Lee: You actually believe this, don't you?

Mr HAMILL: It is there on the record. If the honourable member does not believe it, that is his loss.

If the long-term unemployment problems in this State are to be addressed, an environment must be created in which young people can be assisted to obtain jobs. The Queensland education system should be looked at very closely. The Government has consistently placed low priority on the education of young people. More students must remain at school longer, because employers are increasingly requiring higher and higher levels of education before offering jobs to young people. Recently, in Mount Isa, I gained the understanding that Mount Isa Mines Limited will be looking for senior qualifications before it employs apprentices. That is another example of the change in what employers want in terms of qualifications before they employ young people.

If one treats this as a priority area one is entitled to look at the Government's performance. The performance of the Queensland Government in education is nothing short of abysmal. If the Government is to improve the educational environment for the young people, it must devise schemes to encourage students to stay at school longer. It must provide adequate education in the light of the technology that is currently expanding throughout the work environment.

I congratulate the Federal Labor Government on its initiative in this area. The Federal Labor Government is giving Queensland funds to develop Queensland's education system simply because the State Government is not interested. In 1984, the Participation and Equity Program was instigated, and Queensland is to obtain \$7.45m from the Federal Government under it.

Queensland rates very highly in the field of disadvantaged schools. As I continue my speech, it will become apparent to all why Queensland schools are disadvantaged. Under the Disadvantaged Schools Program, Queensland schools are to receive \$3.5m in 1984. Under the Computer Education Program, the Federal Government is putting \$852,000 into the Queensland school system to obtain computer hardware and software for schools. Under the Country Areas Program, another Federal Labor Government initiative, \$2.35m is being put into Queensland country schools. That is an indication of the initiative of the Federal Labor Government.

The State Government is consistently underspending on the educational needs of students. A number of Government members are very keen to quote figures, but the basis for the tabulated figures I am about to deal with is the Commonwealth Schools Commission, Australian Schools Statistics, First Edition, Canberra, January 1984, which I seek leave to include in "Hansard".

Leave granted.

TABLE 5.4

Recurrent Expenditure (a) per Student in Government Schools, 1973-74 to 1981-82

(\$ per student, estimated December 1982 prices)

		NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	Six States	NT(b)	ACT	Aust
Primary	1973-74	1 112	1 167	1 049	1 123	1 090	1 101	1 114	na	na	na
	1974-75	1 265	1 279	1 212	1 261	1 270	1 379	1 263	na	na	na
	1975-76	1 347	1 417	1 469	1 384	1 367	1 551	1 397	na	na	na
	1976-77	1 389	1 518	1 549	1 527	1 492	1 635	1 482	na	na	na
	1977-78	1 406	1 613	1 638	1 676	1 551	1 700	1 549	3 148	1 748	1 570
	1978-79	1 448	1 668	1 591	1 798	1 616	1 698	1 588	3 001	1 847	1 609
	1979-80	1 517	1 731	1 615	1 887	1 726	1 805	1 654	3 412	1 929	1 680
	1980-81	1 572	1 769	1 657	2 049	1 751	1 815	1 707	3 101	1 884	1 728
	1981-82	1 645	1 865	1 676p	2 003	1 781	na	1 760p(c)	na	na	na
Secondary	1973-74	1 858	2 058	1 694	2 112	2 183	2 022	1 954	na	na	na
	1974-75	2 041	2 203	1 966	2 345	2 269	2 349	2 139	na	na	na
	1975-76	2 133	2 417	2 077	2 516	2 491	2 440	2 287	na	na	na
	1976-77	2 236	2 495	2 189	2 588	2 577	2 334	2 377	na	na	na
	1977-78	2 317	2 665	2 253	2 705	2 648	2 676	2 486	4 644	3 060	2 509
	1978-79	2 437	2 814	2 224	2 813	2 735	2 793	2 591	4 688	3 166	2 614
	1979-80	2 655	2 951	2 292	2 849	2 921	2 914	2 742	3 944	3 212	2 739
	1980-81	2 761	2 847	2 421	2 934	2 938	2 968	2 778	4 944	3 254	2 802
	1981-82	2 828	2 902	2 406p	2 882	2 920	na	2 810p(c)	na	na	na

(a) Excludes costs of school transport, scholarships, repayment of Commonwealth Loans and preservice teacher education.

(b) Changes in statistical methodology have reduced the comparability of these statistics from year to year.

(c) Estimate based on movements in five States. Tasmania has already adopted a new format for financial statistics recommended by the Australian Education Council and data for the State are consequently incompatible with those for other states.

Source: Commonwealth Schools Commission

Mr HAMILL: Those statistics are very important. They highlight the true picture of school funding in Queensland. Between 1973 and 1982, Queensland generally lagged behind the six-State average in recurrent expenditure per capita on the primary school students in the State. In 1981-82, Queensland's expenditure per primary student was \$84 a head less than the six-State average. In my electorate, with about 4 000 primary school students in Government schools, education has been underfunded by the State Government, compared with the State average across Australia, to the tune of \$336,000 in one year. For the whole of the State, primary education, compared with the average for all States, was underfunded to the tune of \$21m in 1981-82. That is the year for which the most recent figures are available from the Schools Commission.

If honourable members think that is bad, I now deal with secondary education. Over the period of the Schools Commission report—that is, from 1973 to 1982—Queensland has consistently ranked last in its recurrent per capita expenditure for secondary education. In fact, in 1981-82, on recurrent expenditure, Queensland spent \$404 per student less than the six-State average.

Again, I shall extrapolate those figures to my own electorate. There is a very large State high school in my electorate. Its facilities need major upgrading. More than 1 500 students attend the school, and every student has been underfunded by \$404 a year. Because the Queensland Government does not give education the same priority that other State Governments do, that school is missing out on \$660,000 a year. Just imagine what upgrading of facilities that amount of money could achieve in that one high school!

I now look at total spending on secondary education in Queensland. Queensland's secondary education budget lagged approximately \$46m behind the six-State average.

I have totalled up the figures for my own electorate. If Government schools had been funded to the same levels that apply in other States, the Government primary and secondary schools in my electorate would have benefited to the tune of \$1m. That is the sort of money that is needed in schools in Queensland. It is the sort of money that

will provide a better educational environment and a better level of resources in schools to enable young people to get the best possible education from the school system.

I now look at how Queensland compares with Western Australia, which has a similar population age profile and a similar economic make-up. In Western Australia, 34.4 per cent of the population are aged between 0 and 19 years. The figure for Queensland is 34.5 per cent, so it is a very close comparison.

In 1981-82, primary students received \$1,676 per capita in recurrent expenditure from the Queensland Government. The figure for secondary students was \$2,406 per capita. Let me compare those figures with the figures for Western Australia. I will be generous and point out that during the relevant period there was a non-Labor Government in Western Australia, which at least recognised the importance of education to the development of qualifications within the community.

In 1981-82, primary schoolchildren in Western Australia were funded to the tune of \$1,781. In secondary schools the funding level was \$2,920. The Queensland Government is underfunding the education system, and then requiring parents and citizens associations to make up the shortfall.

Recently, I have received a quantity of correspondence from parents and citizens associations in my electorate, and I find that it makes very interesting reading. I refer to some correspondence from the Ipswich East State School. The p. and c. association of that school points out that it has to meet the expense of \$1,000 a year to provide fuel for the motor mower and tools and equipment that are used in the maintenance of the schoolgrounds. It also points out that it believes the Government should be responsible for the extermination of all vermin in all school buildings. Apparently that poor p. and c. association has to meet part of the cost of providing adequate pest control in the school. Also, it has to meet the expense of maintaining the school's administration office equipment, such as the typewriter, stencil duplicator and photocopier.

An ongoing bugbear for that p. and c. association, as is the case with many others, is that it has to provide funds to purchase paper so that teachers are able to copy their work schedules and distribute them to the students. That is the sort of educational necessity that does not receive funding from the State Government. That is why the recurrent expenditure figures per student in Queensland are so low. The State Government requires parents and citizens associations to raise the money. I will put it another way. The State Government requires parents and citizens associations to raise revenue. It is a community-based tax that is raised to augment the funding that comes from the State Education Department. When State taxation is considered, the financial burdens that are placed on p. and c. associations to meet basic requirements in schools should be included.

Some more disturbing correspondence came from the parents and citizens association of the Bremer State High School. If it received the same amount of funding that is provided in the other States for secondary schools, it would be \$660,000 better off each year. After years and years of complaints by the parents and citizens association, the staff and the students of that school, an investigation of the school's conditions was conducted by an industrial officer of the Queensland Teachers Union. His report on the school's environment and its needs makes very interesting reading. The situation at that school would be repeated in other schools throughout the State.

I will summarise the report because it goes into considerable detail. There is no lighting in most class-rooms. As all honourable members would be aware, that creates problems for children when reading material which is placed on the boards in front of them. The relative scarcity of class-room furniture was also mentioned. Apparently, desks and chairs that have been damaged after years and years of use are not being replaced quickly enough. Students have to go to another class-room to obtain adequate furniture for their lessons.

The school still has demountable class-rooms that were placed there on a temporary basis 20 years ago. That illustrates the allocation of insufficient capital to maintain an

adequate building program for schools. The demountable class-rooms, which are hotboxes in summer and iceboxes in winter, have no fans or lighting.

Other class-rooms were not designed to be permanent class-rooms. They are actually recreational areas that were enclosed 20 years ago, obviously as a temporary arrangement. A number of class-rooms have no floor covering and louvres are missing from the permanent and demountable class-rooms. There is very poor noise insulation in the temporary class-rooms that have been constructed underneath the school. Although they were not designed to be permanent class-rooms, they have been temporary class-rooms for 20 years.

In the commercial class-rooms, there is a variety of obsolete typewriters and equipment that cannot be maintained. The school is in dire need of new equipment.

In summary, it can be said that these conditions have a very great impact on the quality of the school environment. The industrial officer from the Queensland Teachers Union who conducted the investigation said—

“The cramped, squalid, decrepit and hence unpleasant conditions have contributed to low student morale, which is manifested in vandalism, academic apathy and unco-operative behaviour.

Staff members attribute the high staff absentee rate, for instance, 108 days involving 57 teachers for May, 1984, partly to stress-related illnesses exacerbated by the poor working conditions, and consequent poor student behaviour.

If the conditions of work do not soon improve, staff morale will decline, having consequences detrimental to teaching proficiency and hence educational progress.”

They are not my words. If, as legislators, we are concerned about ensuring that the best possible education environment is provided for the students of the State that will give them the best possible opportunity for employment when they leave the education system, we cannot tolerate such conditions and we should not let them continue.

Unfortunately, in the Government's legislative program as announced by the Governor, education rated only a very small mention. 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.”

Surely, if the Government is genuinely concerned for education in this State, such a review must go much further than the restructuring of our schools. I hope and pray that in the Budget that will be brought down this week the Government will give education the attention that it deserves by allocating to it more than was allocated in recent years.

Unfortunately, I do not have too much optimism, because last year expenditure on education in Queensland dropped to a 10-year low. In 1973-74, Queensland set aside 24.2 per cent of its consolidated revenue for education; last year, it allocated 21.9 per cent. That real diminution in education funding is reflected for all the world to see in examples such as those occurring in my electorate and in the figures released by the Schools Commission concerning recurrent expenditure on education in Queensland. That drop in funding reflects the low priority that is given by the National Party to education, as instanced by budgetary allocations according to the pecking order in the Ministry.

I want to direct some comments to the restructuring proposals that were publicised throughout Queensland by the Minister for Education. Many people are justifiably concerned that these restructuring proposals are ill-conceived, ill-thought out and quite impracticable.

The Minister's suggestion is that the school system be radically altered, to have pre-school children and those up to Year 3 in one group, to have a middle school from Years 4 to 10, and to combine Years 11 and 12 with TAFE.

Mr Shaw: There is a very great difference in ages, for a start.

Mr HAMILL: That is the very point.

Although the proposal may have wonderful objectives, namely, to improve education for the very young and also for the senior groups, the Government has ignored the needs of that broad range of age groups in the middle. Great benefits can be obtained from having greater integration of Years 11 and 12 with TAFE. However, Year 3 should not be included with pre-school and Years 1 and 2. By the time children have reached Year 3, they have matured to a stage that deserves recognition. They should not be grouped with the infant section in primary schools.

The suggestion that children from Years 4 to 10 should be included in some super middle school is absolutely ludicrous. It is socially and educationally unwise. Why should children of the age of 8 years be included with young adults of the age of 15 or 16 years in the one school environment? The educational, social and emotional needs of those age groups are too diverse to have them in the one school environment. It would not do the younger children any good to be exposed to the sort of social problems that are endemic in the middle age bracket in secondary schools. A range of from 8 years to 16 years is simply too large for the proposed middle school. Furthermore, I do not believe that the Education Department can adequately convert its existing resources to cater for such a three-tier education system.

Mr Shaw: I understand that they are content to drop out of the special education help as well.

Mr HAMILL: Special education has grave needs of its own. Unfortunately, there is insufficient time available this afternoon to refer to them.

The Opposition in Queensland is a constructive Opposition. I believe that a better education environment for the young can be achieved by including Years 1 and 2 with pre-school in an ungraded open system at the early stages of primary school. I believe that there should be an upper primary school from Years 3 to 7. In high school, Years 8 to 10 could be grouped together very neatly, and Years 11 and 12 and TAFE could be easily combined. If the Government adopted the division that I have outlined, the existing educational facilities in this State could more easily be converted to meet a broader range of needs in the education system.

A review of education in this State is long overdue. I would be very disappointed if the Government did not take particular care to meet the emotional, social and educational needs of students and recognise that those needs can only be met adequately by sufficient funds being injected into the education system. If a total review is to take place, let us welcome it. However, we should make sure that the financial needs of our school system—the resource needs in terms of computers and other equipment that are all part and parcel of modern education—are adequately provided for. The burden should be taken from p. and c. associations. The Queensland Government should recognise its responsibilities to fund education adequately. The system needs to be restructured. As I said earlier, if the Government is really interested in reducing long-term, endemic unemployment in Queensland, particularly among youth, it needs to take heed of those statistics that I have mentioned. Greater levels of educational attainment are inversely related to the unemployment level. The provision of the best possible educational environment will encourage young people to stay at school longer and obtain a better quality of education so that they can more effectively compete on the job market. I believe that that challenge lies at the feet of the Government. Unless the Government adequately meets that challenge in the Budget to be delivered in this Chamber on Thursday, an opportunity will be lost.

Time expired.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (4.6 p.m.): I pledge the continuing loyalty of the people of the electorate of Burdekin, through His Excellency the Governor, to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and assure His Excellency that the feeling of support for

traditional values and ideals as epitomised by Her Majesty is firmer than ever in my electorate, as I believe it is throughout Queensland.

I take this opportunity to congratulate, through His Excellency the Governor, the Prince and Princess of Wales on the birth of Prince Henry. I believe that that event adds substance to our loyalty. It gives us great belief in the ongoing traditions of the Crown and all that the Crown stands for. I congratulate His Excellency for the positive emphasis that his Opening Speech to Parliament placed on continuing expressions of loyalty by people throughout this great State. It would be an interesting exercise for honourable members to reflect on how many Opposition members, in their speeches, recognised the Governor and the Queen.

I congratulate His Excellency on his review of the many exciting initiatives being undertaken in Queensland. I point out to those who have seen fit to denigrate the Government and His Excellency by suggesting that Queensland is anything other than the continuing leader of free enterprise and opportunity that the runs are on the board in this State and the total is increasing at a commendable rate, even allowing for the destructive and socialistic Commonwealth Government wolf in sheep's clothing. It is worthy of note that every day sees another quite positive underlining of the shallowness of the Hawke Government's deep-seated determination to create a socialist State and, in particular, to create a peasantry out of all who strive for the betterment of themselves and the nation by engaging in primary production at every level.

His Excellency's Speech noted particularly the Burdekin Falls Dam construction and that the preliminary work was virtually completed. I am happy to say that, since the opening of Parliament, the placing of concrete in the dam wall has commenced. On Monday, 3 September, just after 10 a.m., the historic first pouring took place. I was delighted to be on hand, along with the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (John Goleby), his commissioner (Don Beattie) and other personnel from the Water Resources Commission, to witness the event. The Minister and I placed a horseshoe in the first batch of concrete as an expression of good luck for the project.

The part that the Commonwealth Government is playing in the wall construction must be given emphasis, and I acknowledge that. Funding for that part of the project is being provided from Commonwealth sources. Design work is being carried out by Queensland Water Resources Commission officers. The project is being overseen on site by Mr Paul Johnson and his expert team. The Leighton construction team, led by Mr Rob Williams, is working in a spirit of professional enthusiasm and is obviously highly motivated by the challenge and magnitude of the project. In such circumstances, without any shadow of doubt, the project is assured of success.

I must comment on what I believe to be the disappointing attitude by some members of the Queensland community to support the Burdekin Dam project—an attitude that seems to be part of the Commonwealth Government's long-term planning for water conservation. The attitude seems to be that if everyone cannot have a dam or be part of a water conservation scheme, no-one should. The adoption of such an attitude by individuals and by the Federal Government is difficult to rationalise.

The Federal Government's stated policy that the Burdekin Dam will be the last to be built as a Commonwealth project must surely be the most irresponsible policy ever announced by a Government of this planet's driest continent. Even a cursory study of the resources and needs of the nation would indicate that we have a responsibility not only to provide facilities for the well-being of future generations of Australians but also to utilise as best we can our natural resources and our community's expertise to provide for those countries and people less fortunate than ourselves. I am not suggesting that we should become the suppliers of cheap food to the world at the expense of our own primary producers, as is presently happening with many of our primary products. Projects such as the Burdekin Dam take many years of planning before the huge task of construction commences. To fail to plan for similar water conservation projects in the future is totally irresponsible.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the delays caused by the refusal of the Federal Government to approve special borrowings needed to proceed with vital irrigation work associated with the Burdekin development. If the Premier had not been able to negotiate the removal of special borrowings and the stranglehold over State Governments that they gave people such as Senator Walsh in trying to impose the will of an obstructive Government, I seriously doubt whether the project would have proceeded. The dam might have been built, but it would have been a white elephant without the capacity to utilise the water. I have no hesitation in condemning those members opposite who aided and abetted Senator Walsh in his delaying tactics. Many jobs and contracts have been lost or delayed because of their ignorance of the facts.

As I mentioned in my maiden speech last year, I have a concern for the processes of land utilisation in the lower Burdekin and, in the coming months, I will be seeking to make a positive input, from a local and practical level, in relation to the ways in which the best interests of Government and the primary producers of this State are served by the development.

It is of concern that statements being made in connection with the transfer of cane-farmers from other areas of Queensland give rise to high emotion and exaggeration by those who feel threatened. I assure the House that under no circumstances would I support the Government's directing farmers to change the location of their operation or place of living unless the initiative came spontaneously from those involved and was based on sound economic grounds. To suggest that a Government or a department should uproot people from a locality and from a home that may have taken generations to build up and put them into a pioneering operation is just not on. I hope we live in a country that still defends the right of people to choose where they live and what they do for a living. That is certainly this Government's attitude.

Before I leave the Burdekin Dam project, I pay tribute to the commitment and enterprise shown by those who are involved in on-site construction in an area that would be considered by many to be totally inhospitable. Burdekin Falls township must have one of the most attractive locations of any construction town in the State. Nevertheless, it is a temporary township and, as such, does not have many of the facilities that usually are taken for granted. For instance, it does not have television, a large shopping centre, restaurants, entertainment facilities and so on. However, as many thousands of people in isolated areas do through their own initiative, the growing population of this town is making leisure and working hours better by quickly undertaking community-support projects. I commend those who took the initiative in producing a local newspaper called "Burdekin Falls Dam-It" That is a wonderful idea. I wish them luck in their continuing efforts to make their lives just a little bit easier.

The Water Resources Commission has planned and constructed facilities enabling many activities to be commenced. However, buildings and facilities alone cannot do the job. With the obvious will to make the best of the location and the environment, where previously there was only rock and stunted timber, gardens are springing up. A parents and citizens association, led by Geoff St Clair and three other teachers, has been formed to support the staff and the 72 pupils of the school. Geoff's wife, Narelle, and Ashley Wilson and his wife, Janine, are doing a wonderful job there. The school is growing daily, and it is a great comfort to the families to know that they have a school of such high quality.

An interesting point is that the member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill), who spoke before me, has left the Chamber. He needs to be told that positive projects are being undertaken throughout this huge State. The amount of money needed to maintain this huge State and its educational institutions cannot be overlooked. I draw that honourable member's attention to the fact that one-third of the total Budget of the State is directed towards education. I commend the Government for that. Just as other honourable members do, I certainly look forward to improvements, but people cannot be taxed out of existence.

I return to the subject of the Burdekin Falls township. The village information centre and coffee shop are operational. The general store-keeper (Tom Brown) and his

family are expanding services almost daily. All the community draws on the advice and local expertise of people such as Cec Christiansen, the Water Resources works supervisor, who has been on site for approximately five years.

Worth noting is the policy of Telecom, a Federal Government statutory authority, that does not allow the people of Burdekin Falls township to send money orders. They have to get somebody to go to Townsville, approximately 100 miles away, to send a money order from there. Because of that, the people in the township do not have a facility for making necessary payments to other members of their families, finance companies and so on. I am very disappointed by the attitude and policy of Telecom that precludes those people from having that facility.

Last year I mentioned the importance of the roads linking the lower Burdekin with Ravenswood and the Burdekin Falls. I again emphasise the importance of this project to the people of the three areas in particular, and, in general, the importance of this link to north Queensland tourism. During the last couple of months, I have organised day tours for more than 300 people who might otherwise not have been able to travel to the Burdekin Falls and see for themselves the great project.

The pleasure these people gained from the trip seemed to indicate forcefully the tourist potential of this area which, I believe, will become the playground of north Queensland, and will help to facilitate the resurgence of the once great township of Ravenswood. Currently, buses have to make a 320-mile round trip from the Lower Burdekin to the dam site. If they were able to return via the Hillsborough Road and travel through the rich agricultural lands adjacent to the river, the value of the trip, not to mention the ease of the trip, would be tremendously enhanced.

The current severe economic problems being experienced throughout the sugar industry, which have been worsened in many areas by drought, particularly in the area from Ingham through to Prosperpine and as far south as Mackay, have brought home forcefully the need for diversification in areas that have a total dependence on the production of the one commodity. Even without projects such as the Burdekin Falls dam, the tourist potential is good but, if the cane lands and the dam could be linked, a whole new world would open up.

I pay tribute to the initiative taken by the Burdekin Shire Council under the leadership of Dr John Trace, who must surely be one of the positive, productive shire chairman in Queensland. His ability was recognised recently by his appointment to the Queensland Library Council. That was a worthy and well-deserved appointment.

The Burdekin Shire Council is currently spending \$300,000 on the Hillsborough Road in a positive move to upgrade the tourist triangle, as it is known in that part of the State. Quite recently, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) acknowledged the need to upgrade the road by putting various options to the council.

Much can be achieved by way of local government and main roads funding but, of prime importance, is a moderately substantial input to allow an upgrading of the range section of the road so that it will be safe for bus and other vehicular traffic of the magnitude that is waiting for such an improvement. Once that hurdle is overcome the natural progress through normal funding will follow and the benefits that will flow through tourism and commercial support promise to be spectacular.

This week I was advised by the Minister for Main Roads of the sealing of a further 7½ km of the road between Mingela and Ravenswood. That section is used by many local people. During the construction of the dam, that road will carry a huge volume of very heavy traffic that will play havoc with the daily travel of the local people. They will bear it, in the same way as people up there bear all things, quite philosophically. I commend the Government's initiative in continuing to upgrade this road and recognising the local input of the people in the area.

Last week I was fortunate to accompany the Minister for Primary Industries and several members of his Bills committee on a tour of most of the sugar-producing areas

of north Queensland. Although it was impossible to meet many individual growers, grower organisations were communicated with at the widest possible level. The trip covered the Burdekin area and the Innisfail and Mourilyan areas. We talked to producers and mill people between Mossman and Tully, moved south to Mackay and Proserpine and spoke to the small crop-growers in the Bowen area, who are facing huge problems. Unfortunately I had to leave the trip before the rest of the party returned to the Ingham, Babinda and Tully areas.

The attitude of the ALP members at both the Federal and State levels is very apparent. By their complete and utter disregard of the sugar industry, Labor people are saying very forcefully that Mr Gayler is gone. Without doubt he is a oncer. He will be there for only a few more months.

It is interesting to reflect on the Federal Government's attitude to the structure of the sugar industry. Under the proposed redistribution, the Federal Government has only half of one seat at risk—and that is Mr Gayler's seat. As I said, he has gone. The Federal ALP Government is saying, "What's in it for us?" But a national asset is at risk. The Federal Government refuses to act. It has said, "John Gayler has had it. Why should we spend money on someone who has gone or on an industry in an area in which we don't have any seats?" The farmers recognise the shallowness of the promises of the Federal Government.

I draw the attention of honourable members to an article that appeared in "The Cairns Post" of 28 February 1983 under the heading "Canegrowers' plight needs urgent action, says Kerin". It states—

"The worsening crisis in Australia's sugar industry demanded urgent Federal Government attention. Labor's spokesman on primary industry, Mr John Kerin, said in a statement yesterday.

'The drought, coming as it has on top of the collapse of the international sugar market, has emphasised the urgent need to boost returns from the 1982 pool.

'Labor will sympathetically consider any request for an industry loan and/or an underwriting scheme, to include the 1982 crop.'

Mr Kerin said it was imperative assistance be forthcoming urgently and it should go to those with greatest identified need. He pledged a Labor government to giving the sugar industry first priority in the long line of primary industries neglected, he said, by the Fraser Government.

'The sugar industry is a classic example of this neglect,' Mr Kerin said."

I do not think that any one of the voters in the electorate of Leichhardt will forget those statements.

I wish to jump forward a year. During all that time, the industry has had to struggle without assistance from this wonderful and humane Federal Government.

Mr Tenni: Mr Gayler has done absolutely nothing about it.

Mr STONEMAN: That is exactly the point that I am making. His mates in Canberra have now recognised that he is a oncer, and they have wiped the sugar industry. There is no doubt about that.

Mr Tenni: They have done the same with the tobacco industry.

Mr STONEMAN: I am pleased that the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services has raised that point, because I wish to refer to an article that appeared in "The North Queensland Register" of 9 August 1984, just over a month ago. The person who wrote this article is not known to have any political leanings. In fact, I think that he would be middle of the road in politics. He is certainly not on my side

of politics. I wish to quote what this gentleman said because it emphasises what the Minister has said.

Mr Underwood: Who is the person?

Mr STONEMAN: Mr Neil Naessens. Obviously he is a very perceptive person, because he says—

“It’s funny how the Labor Party always gets into a dizzy state of fury whenever someone says they’re not interested in the rural scene.

Yet whenever they have a real chance to prove their critics wrong they’re too busy getting bogged down in other things.

The recent rounds of State Labor conferences followed by the national conference in Canberra once again underscored Labor’s complete disdain for the subject.

The Queensland ALP get-together in Townsville—”
and who would ever forget that farcical situation—

“had a fairly substantially amended Primary Industries Policy before it but spent little or no time discussing it.”

Mr Underwood: You wrote that.

Mr STONEMAN: Opposition members do not like it. The article continues—

“It was hustled through almost as an after-thought towards the end of the conference and long after its scheduled mid-week spot on the agenda.”

I remind honourable members that there were about 14 factions at that Labor Party conference. The members of the Labor Party had forgotten the reality of the world; they were too busy clawing at one another. The article continues—

“They spent hours and hours on uranium and the undesirability of the mining thereof, women’s rights and other exciting issues, but didn’t bother to seriously deal with agriculture.

At the national conference things were, if that were possible, even worse.

Again delegates had lots of fun bucketing each other and the Opposition and whoever else they found in their respective firing lines, on life-and-death subjects like which uranium mine was to go ahead and which wasn’t or Professor Geoffrey Blainey’s ‘racist’ comments on Labor immigration policies, sexual discrimination and, of course, East Timor.

About the rural sector, Nothing!

To quote Victorian dairy industry leader Bill Pyle:

‘We’ve heard all about uranium mining, we heard all about all sorts of things. But agriculture, which produces nearly 50 per cent of this nation’s income, hasn’t been mentioned. And it won’t be. It’s a bloody disgrace.’

Amen.”

That is the end of that little episode on the attitude of the Labor Party.

I turn now to a release from the Minister for Primary Industries in which he said that Canberra remains anti-sugar. I concur totally with his remarks. That attitude came across time and time again in my trip through north Queensland.

Mr Tenni: You are aware, of course, that although Mr Gayler, the Federal member for Leichhardt, ignores the sugar industry, he was up there supporting the hippies and the greenies. They are now calling him “Mr Reversal”. That is what he is commonly known as now.

Mr STONEMAN: Is he? I will be talking about some of the other people who were supporting the greenies instead of the industries that give this nation the capacity to pay those people to go round with the rent-a-crowds and the like.

Mr Tenni: They were getting the dole plus \$15 a day from the Hawke Government to demonstrate.

Mr STONEMAN: I believe that the rent-a-crowd will come down to the Burdekin area before long.

I will continue with Mr Turner's statement, which is completely and absolutely spot on. He said that the Federal Government continues to make it abundantly clear that it is unwilling to help the sugar industry out of its current depression. He said that it was completely unrealistic for the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (John Kerin) to say that the sugar industry must complete its internal review before Canberra can consider a request to match Queensland's latest financial assistance of \$5m. Mr Turner said that twice in the last few days Mr Kerin stated that hand-outs for the industry are not on. I do not think that we want hand-outs for the industry. Assistance is needed. A national asset is going down the drain and I believe that the Hawke Government has decided that it will not be bothered with Mr Gayler and with the sugar industry.

In his press release, the Minister for Primary Industries said that the industry was waiting in vain for Mr Hawke to honour an election promise to make assistance a top priority and to provide a scheme to underwrite the No. 1 Pool price. As Mr Turner said, it is not a case of a mediocre or inefficient industry asking to be propped up with unlimited financial help. He also said that, at a time when new markets were desperately needed by the rural sector, the Labor Government responded by reducing by more than 22 per cent its assistance for the promotion of exports. The Labor Government has made a reduction of almost one quarter.

I turn now to the recent Federal Budget. I condemn those people who undertook one shallow reading of the Budget and said that it contained no problem for primary industry. My goodness! I suppose that they thought that there was no problem for the nation. As Mr Turner said in a press release, there is no doubt that Mr Kerin is unable to prevail against the short-term political opportunism of Hawke, Keating and their trade union cronies.

I would like to refer to some of the reductions in the Budget, particularly in the natural disaster relief fund. Under the old program, there was a reasonable balance between State and Commonwealth input. As Mr Turner said, if, as is occurring along the coast now, a natural disaster such as a drought occurred in Queensland in September 1985 and required assistance of \$10m, the previous Government would provide \$4.5m in aid. The present Labor Government would provide only \$450,000, which is a reduction of \$4.05m or 90 per cent. In addition, outlays under the general provisions of the rural adjustment scheme have also been cut savagely from \$45m last year to less than \$26m this year, which is a reduction of 40 per cent.

I turn now to "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 18 September 1984, in which Mr Kerin is reported as saying—

"The Federal Primary Industries Minister, Mr Kerin, is ready to talk to the Queensland Government about short-term aid for the sugar industry.

Mr Kerin said at Brisbane Airport yesterday he was not convinced matching a \$5 million state allocation for assistance would solve the industry's problems, but he was prepared to discuss help with his Queensland counterpart, Mr Turner."

It seems that the Commonwealth Government is starting to run scared.

Mr Kerin went on to say—

"All I'm asking is for the Queensland Government to confer with us on what it sees as the solution rather than just request bits and pieces of money.

The Federal Government was not going to give 'sugar-coated' promises in the lead-up to the election to secure the marginal seats of Herbert and Leichhardt in north Queensland."

Today Mr Kerin is saying that the Federal Government would not give "sugar-coated" promises. Compare that comment with those that he made in 1983, when that is exactly what he did; he made sugar-coated promises. At least Mr Kerin is acknowledging that Leichhardt is a marginal seat. That is a very soft way of saying, "Goodbye, Mr Gayler."

Mr Kerin went on to say that he wanted the benefit of the State Government's knowledge of the industry to plan short-term aid.

I wonder why he does not turn to the latest and most astute of commentators on the sugar scene, the honourable member for Townsville (Mr McElligott), who said that the ALP will come to the aid of the sugar-growers. He has made a call for sugar-growers to start talking with the Labor Party instead of the National Party. I have never heard of anything more ridiculous in all my life.

I would challenge Mr McElligott, who seems to have disappeared from the Chamber—I guess he knew what was coming—to tell the House how often he has been down to Giru, in his own electorate, to discuss problems with the sugar-growers. This morning he seemed to enjoy sniping at the Katter family. I should like him to tell the House what discussions he has had with the mill-suppliers in his own electorate.

I have checked on him and found that, unless he has had discussions with them in the last few days, he has not once, since he became member for Townsville, been down to their area. And they are the growers who he claims the ALP will aid! They would not even know him if it was not for his photograph in the "Townsville Bulletin" whenever he tries to discredit the Government. It is disgraceful that he makes such a statement, and even more disgraceful that it receives headlines in the press.

Mr Simpson interjected.

Mr STONEMAN: I know that recently he showed his face for a few minutes when he opened the show. I thank him for having come down to Giru, because I have had to look after the people in the Giru district. I am delighted to do so, but it is Mr McElligott's job.

I am concerned at some of the petty regional attitudes that showed up during our tour of the north Queensland sugar areas. The sugar industry is in trouble right across the board. Certainly, variations occur in the levels of debts, but the net result of the problems arising in the sugar industry indicates to me that all growers have cost differentials of similar proportions. It would seem that if a grower does not owe a dollar he has a chance of getting a cash differential of from \$2 to \$6 a tonne, regardless of where he is in the State. The problem is that that \$2 to \$6 has to be applied against interest and depreciation. Families have to live and children have to be educated. I should like someone to tell me how the average farmer with a peak of from 3 000 to 4 000 tonnes can be expected to work, live, support a family and contribute to the economy of this nation on a paltry few thousand dollars a year.

I am concerned also that misunderstanding has occurred in relation to the self-help facilities that are available in my area. I am disappointed at the attitude of some northern growers, who believe that the Water Resources Commission is putting money into the recharge system in the Lower Burdekin area and that, therefore, the commission should do something about drainage in the north.

I am not saying that the commission should not do something because the recharge system in the Burdekin district is currently costing growers a total input of \$1.5m a year. Not one dollar of Government funds goes into the support of that scheme. Over the years, under the chairmanship of the current chairman, Dick Hughes, from the North Burdekin Water Board, and David Smith, from the South Burdekin Water Board, and their very efficient boards and operators under Mr Pat Toohey and Graham Laidlow, not one dollar of input has come from the Government. They have kept the industry alive totally by a spontaneous levy on local farmers, who are now experiencing a crisis in trying to maintain their own self-help program.

The sugar industry crisis is about survival. It is the same as the crisis experienced by the wool industry in the '60s and the beef industry in the '70s. It is difficult to rationalise survival in the light of current Federal Government attitudes.

I extend my acknowledgement to the people who have helped our self-help community. I commend to members a paper presented on 5 December by Mr Graham Webb, the deputy clerk of the Burdekin shire, to the Institute of Municipal Management in Cairns. It is entitled "Community Involvement—a New Perspective". I commend to all members that wonderful paper that outlines community involvement in the area. It is a blueprint for community self-help. I commend Mr Webb and the council for the work that they have done. I thank Mr Muntz, Mr Goleby, Mr Austin, Mr Hinze, Mr Wharton and other persons for their support. My first visitor since my election to this Assembly was Senator Florence Bjelke-Petersen. She travelled to the north and spontaneously launched an appeal for a nursing unit at a home for the aged. Her assistance is deeply appreciated by my constituents. I will be delighted later this month to welcome the Premier to my electorate. He will fly to the Burdekin area in one of his so-called unnecessary planes to examine what is happening.

A "Townsville Bulletin" editorial in respect to the Government's aircraft states—

"Opposition criticism of the State Government's purchase of two planes cannot be sustained. If their argument is taken to its ultimate conclusion, the Government would save even more if the Premier and his Ministers walked everywhere."

That is an example of the ALP's socialist attitude of wanting to go back to the horse-and-buggy days. It is unbelievable.

The editorial further states—

"The Opposition Leader, Mr Wright, says that the Government is squandering money on a 'swank' jet while police stations and hospitals go understaffed.

However, people in outlying areas of this far-flung State, the second largest of the Commonwealth and the most decentralised, would rank such an investment as quite important.

They may quibble about the extent of the Premier's private air force but its relevance to a huge, modern, developing State such as ours cannot be underestimated."

I applaud that attitude.

I have two or three further points that I wish to make. The first relates to one of two very emotional issues in Australia, particularly in north Queensland. I refer to Aboriginal land claims and the prominence being given to homosexuals.

As to Aboriginal land claims, and I use those words advisedly, I pose a question to those who criticise the Queensland Government, especially politicians and church leaders living in New South Wales and Victoria. Why are they so keen to give northern Australian land to Aborigines? Why not give away some of Sydney and Melbourne? After all, they were the sites of the first settlements. We are all aware that both areas were inhabited by Aborigines at the time of settlement 200 years ago.

In a Christian society, I find claims for sacred sites hard to swallow. I feel the same about demands for special and separate considerations in a society in which there is not supposed to be differentiation between race, colour and creed. I believe that poor and low-income families, regardless of colour, should receive equal assistance. If that were the case—and I emphasise this—the backlash against those thousands of genuine and needy Aboriginal people that I fear is growing would not occur.

Finally, I give my total support to the statement by the Minister for Education (Lin Powell) that teachers who publicly flaunt their homosexuality will be sacked. I acknowledge the right of individuals to have their private lives and morals; but teachers have no right to put at risk the sensitive and precious standards we all look for in the education of our children. Giving credibility to anything other than total support of the basic family structure and behaviour is something that cannot be tolerated. For instrumentalities such as the ABC to give credibility to homosexual relationships—to say nothing of de

facto relationships—by support with tax-payers' money is a blatant misuse of public funds.

I conclude my speech with a quotation from the ALP's north Queensland policy delivered by Mr Hawke in February 1983. In relation to the ABC, he said—

“Let me deal first of all with the question of communications. The Australian Broadcasting Commission—the National broadcasting service—has a staff to service this vast area which is smaller than the staff of the National Broadcasting Commission in Launceston, Tasmania. In spite of this ludicrous situation—”

and this is Mr Hawke speaking—

“the Australian Broadcasting Commission in North Queensland has sought to grapple with a variety of problems, including the important provision of aboriginal broadcasting.

A Labor Government will make a grant to the Australian Broadcasting Commission of \$250,000 to immediately start on the up-grading of its services for North Queenslanders.”

What is now happening up there? In spite of that brave statement, broadcasting services in Townsville and Rockhampton are to be dramatically reduced. There will be no regional television services and no public interest programs such as “Points North”, which were important shows produced by the ABC for the benefit of north Queenslanders. Mr Hawke must have decided that north Queensland will kick out his only representative in a sugar seat. The Federal member for Herbert (Mr Lindsay), who announces the construction of the Burdekin Dam, which is not even in his electorate, every two or three weeks, will go, too. The Hawke Government has totally and irresponsibly denuded north Queensland of its rights.

Time expired.

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (4.47 p.m.): I note that the Governor in his Address said—

“Since the previous occasion in November last year, I have noted, in my travel throughout the State, a renewed confidence and optimism through the community.”

It would seem from what I know that he has not been talking to police officers, particularly in the north, not just in relation to manpower shortages, not just in relation to absurd overtime restrictions that have been imposed, not just in relation to equipment shortages, but in relation to other matters going to the very heart of the operation of the Queensland Police Force and to the morale of its members.

The Queensland Police Complaints Tribunal last week finished investigating a complaint relating to the circumstances surrounding the transfer of Detective Hurrell from the Charters Towers Stock Squad and associated allegations of cattle stealing and related offences. For some time now, I have been in possession of material and information relating to these matters, but I have held back on making a full disclosure until the tribunal had completed its hearing and handed down its findings. The hearing was completed last week. The findings are supposed to be handed down this week, but I note with disappointment—and I am disturbed about it—that the findings of the tribunal were leaked to and published in last Sunday's “Sunday Mail”.

For this reason, I feel that I now have to place certain matters on record. Basically, what I am placing on record is a case which defends the role of rank and file police involved in this matter and also of those police union officers who have been prepared to speak out. All of the officers who have spoken out, to whom I have spoken, have stood up or spoken out on matters of principle—matters affecting the efficient operation of the Police Force—and not on matters affecting the personal, financial or other benefit of themselves or of police officers in general.

Considerable anxiety and consternation exists among police who have some knowledge of these matters. They fear that there may be reprisals against individual officers who may be regarded by the administration of the Police Department—unfairly, in my view—as having embarrassed the department. I trust that there will be no reprisals and no

scapegoats, and I urge the Minister to resist any moves by senior people in the Police Department that could involve these officers in being charged or in some other way penalised. I refer to such union representatives as Senior Sergeant Chant, Detective Sergeant O'Gorman and Senior Constable Hannigan and officers such as Inspector Huey, Detective Hurrell and Detective Dickson.

Relations between the Government and rank and file police are at a very low ebb. Morale will not be assisted by reprisals, which will only make matters worse and further undermine confidence and morale.

The whole history of this investigation and the Hurrell transfer raise serious questions about the administration of the Queensland Police Force. Firstly, there is the issue of Detective Hurrell's transfer from Charters Towers. The leaked findings of the Police Complaints Tribunal contained in last Sunday's "Sunday Mail" reveal that—

"Hurrell was transferred for departmental reasons such as a need for more investigative experience and not because he persisted in any investigation that could embarrass senior police."

Given that Hurrell was a plain clothes detective working in the Charters Towers district, was a member of the Stock Squad and was transferred from detective ranks to uniform as a member of mobile patrols in Brisbane, I find that statement of the Police Complaints Tribunal hard to accept. How that would enhance his investigative experience is beyond belief. It clearly does not ring true as an excuse, whether it comes from the Police Department or from any so-called findings of the tribunal. Only after a fuss was kicked up by the police union on Hurrell's behalf was the compromise transfer of Townsville settled upon. He was also allowed to stay in the detective ranks.

However, when one looks at the original transfer to uniform in Brisbane, one can only be disturbed as to the motive behind that transfer. In support of my concern in this regard, I refer to a report in the "Telegraph" of 2 July 1984 and "The Bulletin" of 4 September 1984 in which the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter) is quoted as saying—

"Constable Hurrell's transfer to Brisbane was not a promotion and because of the distance involved meant that the officer could not usefully participate in any future investigation."

Despite the fact that those comments have been on the record for two and a half months, the Minister has not at any time refuted the comments in public, nor has he sought to make any personal explanation in this House on the basis of misrepresentation. In fairness to the Minister for Northern Development, I concede that those articles also quote him as saying that he had been placed "in a terrible position", and, further, "I do not want to say anything for obvious reasons, and there are enormous reasons".

The articles refer to threats and pressure being brought to bear on the Minister, and it is indeed disgraceful that a Minister of this Government should be put in such a position when standing up for his constituents—assuming, of course, that he did at some stage stand up for his constituents—who are concerned about the activities in the Charters Towers area of Senior Sergeant Milner and ex-Superintendent Stevenson.

I am told that people in the north have complained to the Minister about the activity of the serving police officer and the retired superintendent. In fairness to the Minister, I will leave it to him, and I look forward to his coming into this House and making a statement as to whether or not people in his electorate and others in the north have complained to him and, furthermore, what action he has taken on behalf of those constituents to represent their interests.

The next disturbing aspect of this matter is that, after Detective Hurrell investigated these matters and was transferred in an effort to stop the investigation, it was then taken up by other senior and experienced police—Inspector Huey of Townsville, assisted by Detective Sergeant Whitney of the Roma stock investigation squad. As a consequence of that investigation, Inspector Huey recommended that charges be brought against the senior sergeant and the ex-superintendent.

What disturbs me is that, although there is very much public cynicism over police investigating police, here we have a case in which senior police have undertaken a courageous and thorough investigation of alleged offences by police and retired police, but their recommendation that charges be brought has been overruled at the highest level. That can only undermine public confidence.

The question must be asked why the proposed charges against the former police officer were treated as internal charges, which require the approval of the commissioner before they can be laid. In a case involving an ordinary citizen, once the police officer forms the view that he has sufficient evidence to charge, he goes ahead and charges the person and the matter comes before the court. Not so in this case! At the highest level, a special procedure was directed and it resulted in those charges being laid. It is quite unheard of for the police to have to produce full briefs of evidence and full statements from all witnesses, and to get commissioner and Crown law approval before charging someone. When the police, in their opinion, have enough evidence to charge someone, they do so, and the case is prepared between the time of the charge and the time of the trial.

I propose to table a confidential report dated 22 June 1984 from Inspector Huey in Townsville to the commissioner and to the district superintendent of the Townsville Police District. It recommended that charges be laid against the persons to whom I have referred. I quote the following extract—

“I attach copies of transcripts of interviews I have had with Mervyn Henry Stevenson.”

That is the former superintendent from north Queensland. The quotation continues—

“I intend to pursue a further interview with him to clarify some points. He has engaged a solicitor and any further interview will, as requested, be in the solicitor's presence. On the evidence available, Stevenson has lied on several matters, in his effort to exculpate himself. These lies can be proved by evidence in the courts.”

The report went on to recommend—

“(2) That Senior Sergeant John Milner be charged with 15 offences under the Stock Acts 1915-1979 and the Identification of Cattle Regulations 1976 and Mervyn Henry Stevenson with four offences under the latter regulations.

(3) In the alternative to the charges in (2) above, Milner and Stevenson be charged with conspiring to defeat the provisions of the Identification of Cattle Regulations 1976—section 543 (1) Criminal Code.

(4) That the Commissioner of Police be advised that there was at its highest, a conspiracy to defraud and mislead him to transfer P.C. Constable Hurrell by Stevenson, Milner and possibly Inspector R. T. Grant, or at its lowest, the reasons advanced for the need to transfer Hurrell were exaggerated or based on wrong information.

(8) That Stevenson be charged under section 24 (1) (b) of the Brand Acts 1915-1979 with unauthorised possession of branding irons.

(9) That Stevenson be charged criminally with—

- (a) Stealing a Braham cross bull, the property of Quirk John Costello. S 398.
- (b) Killing the said bull with intent to steal portion of the skin thereof. Section 402 Criminal Code.
- (c) Wilfully and unlawfully killing the said bull, the property of Quirk John Costello or Gordon Leslie Hurrell.
- (d) Conspiring with Milner to prevent the course of justice. S 132 Criminal Code.

- (e) Attempting to prevent the course of justice upon the prosecution of himself on a charge of stealing or upon application by Constable Gordon Leslie Hurrell an order under s 39 of the Justices Act 1886 to 1980.

(10) That Senior Sergeant John Milner be charged criminally with Stevenson as per 9 (d) and 9 (e) above."

One of the responses of the Commissioner of Police (Mr Lewis) in relation to the issues was to claim that there was no evidence of a large-scale cattle-stealing ring. With respect, I agree with the commissioner. I am not suggesting that there is sufficient evidence to prove a charge that there was a large-scale cattle-stealing ring involving one officer and a former officer. However, the commissioner is merely putting up an impossibly high charge that is very easy for him to knock down. At the other end of the scale concerning these issues are matters that can be fairly described as being of a trivial nature. The leaked report of the Police Complaints Tribunal says that there are other matters which are of a trivial nature and do not warrant charges.

A reference to the report that I will table discloses the other matters I refer to, such as these gentlemen's unauthorised grazing of stock on the police common. Those are matters that can be dealt with adequately by internal disciplinary measures or perhaps not at all. Certainly the very serious charge and the very trivial charges probably do not warrant action through the courts in the normal way.

However, what the people of north Queensland and I are concerned about are the basic and smaller offences under the Stock Act and those offences relating to brands. These laws go to the heart of safeguarding against cattle-stealing and to the control of disease in the cattle industry. It is these laws under which other north Queenslanders are being charged every day of the week by Stock Squad officers. But what happens here? Instead of the normal procedure being followed and the suspects being charged and brought to trial, there is intervention at the highest level—when I say "at the highest level", I mean within the Police Department—as a consequence of which no charges are brought.

The commissioner claims to have obtained advice from the Crown law office saying that there was insufficient evidence to bring charges. I call on the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to table the Crown Solicitor's advice, together with all of the statements and all of the evidence put before the Crown Solicitor for his consideration. Police officers to whom I have spoken are flabbergasted that on the key offences involving the Stock Act and the Brands Act, charges could not be brought.

Another aspect of the Crown law advice that I would like investigated is the fact that, at 2.56 p.m. on Monday, 25 June 1984, the commissioner sent a telex, which I shall table, ordering Inspector Huey not to lay charges against Milner and Stevenson. That telex from the commissioner refers to Inspector Huey's report dated 7 June 1984. However, Huey's final report is dated Friday, 22 June 1984, and, on my information, did not arrive in Brisbane until the following Monday, 25 June—three days later. Attached to that report were copies of transcripts of interviews and various other evidence. How could the material sent on 22 June have been adequately considered by the Crown Solicitor in those few hours? Was it even considered? I doubt very much that it was. Corroboration is given by the commissioner's telex which refers not to the material attached to Huey's report of 22 June, but only to the report of 7 June. So I ask whether all of the material—and I mean all of the material, not just the report of 7 June or 22 June—was put before the Crown Solicitor.

However, I also want to place on record the fact that there is more evidence that has not yet come to light and if it is not dealt with in considerable detail in the findings of the Police Complaints Tribunal, it will necessarily render those findings subject to the criticism that they are at best superficial. According to my information, Senior Sergeant Milner not only confessed to the Stock Act offences but also participated in a record of interview with Inspector Huey; furthermore, the interview was tape-recorded,

and the tape recording of that interview in which Senior Sergeant Milner confessed is in the Townsville Police Station.

In relation to the Brands Act offences—the actual branding irons that were taken from Stevenson are in the police station at Townsville. What better evidence could there be? The public is entitled to an explanation as to why somebody is not charged when police receive a complaint, investigate it and recommend charges, and especially where the suspect has confessed. Where the suspect is a senior sergeant of police, one would think that some weight could be placed on his confession to a criminal charge.

What are these Stock Act and Brands Act offences? According to my information, the Stock Act offences involve travelling cattle without a permit, recording false information on way-bills, inadequately describing cattle and using false tail-tags. The Brands Act offences relate to a set of brands being deregistered more than 10 years ago, after being in Stevenson's possession, and his continuing to use them. The brand was reissued in the normal way to another grazier in the north, but Stevenson kept possession of the branding irons and continued to use them. I am told that the Brands Registry recommended prosecution of Stevenson, but that recommendation was overruled, and I seek a full explanation from the Minister as to his understanding of the recommendation of the Brands Registry.

It is an offence to have an unregistered brand. It is an offence to have a brand that is not one's own. Furthermore, it is obviously an offence to use a brand that is not one's own. These offences, which were committed by Stevenson and for which Inspector Huey wished to charge him, go to the very heart of safeguards against cattle stealing and the control of disease; but those charges were not brought. Huey decided in the normal way to charge Stevenson, but he was stopped after he received a telephone call from an Assistant Commissioner in Brisbane. Why, I ask? Why were charges against a non-police officer—a former police officer—treated in that special way as internal charges? Why was Huey not allowed to charge him in the normal way?

I also place on record that I have not communicated, either directly or indirectly, with Inspector Huey or Detective Hurrell in relation to these matters. I have refrained from doing so because I did not want to prejudice their position.

The other recommendation to which I referred that appears in Inspector Huey's recommendations is that charges be laid against the people concerned in respect of the bull calf of one Quirk John Costello. I will table the Queensland Police Department statement of Quirk John Costello, which is four pages in length and which sets out the full facts of that matter.

I also place on record the fact that the information that has been passed to me suggests that the Police Commissioner (Mr Lewis) was on leave, or absent from his office, at the time that the Hurrell transfer was cooked up and carried out. This tends to suggest that, when these matters eventually came to his attention, he was presented with a fait accompli, and was then placed in a position of having to come down either on the side of very senior officers or on the side of very junior officers.

Although that is a very difficult and unenviable predicament, I would, nevertheless, urge the Commissioner to examine more closely the motives of the people who advanced the request and the reasons for the transfer, and redress the situation at the earliest opportunity. Although I cannot say anything definite as to the role of the Minister or the Commissioner in relation to who was responsible for the intervention in the Hurrell transfer to Brisbane, intervention which allowed him to remain in the detective ranks but at Townsville, it seems to me that the Minister or the Commissioner has recognised the injustice that was being done to Hurrell and has been prepared to promote a compromise which is more fair to him. If the Minister or Commissioner has been responsible for that, I would commend him for that intervention. I trust that he did not act merely to avoid potential embarrassment and threats from the union.

However, in relation to the broader issues of the investigation and the recommendations of Inspector Huey and other officers who, at various times, have been involved

in the investigation, there are still many questions to be answered. Public dissatisfaction, and, in particular, dissatisfaction by people in north Queensland—people involved in the cattle industry—will continue unless the two suspects are dealt with according to the usual processes of the stock laws and the brands laws that apply to everybody else on the land. Even if the two individuals were eventually acquitted but, from the beginning, had been charged in the usual way in which everybody else is charged, at least people would have seen that justice had been done and that the usual processes of the law had been followed. But, rather, for some inexplicable reason, there has been intervention to change the usual processes. It is that special treatment, that special intervention, that must be explained by the Minister and which must be addressed by the findings of the Police Complaints Tribunal if this matter is to be put to rest.

I look forward to a definitive explanation from the Minister and to definitive and comprehensive findings from the tribunal, which has been investigating this matter for weeks. I trust that we will not be disappointed by superficial findings and superficial explanations. I trust that the Minister and the tribunal will get to the heart of the matter, and will consider the basic laws that protect people and the industry from cattle-stealing and the spread of disease.

Unless the Government acts seriously about the matter, and unless the Ministers who have come into contact with it—the Minister for Police, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs—get stuck into it and clear it up, they can have no pretensions to supposedly standing up for the man on the land. They can have no pretensions to making sure that all people on the land get equal treatment under the law in these matters.

I turn next to problems in the city of Logan about which I have been approached. I raise this matter on behalf of the Browns Plains Action Group and on behalf of all residents of Browns Plains and of the city of Logan.

This morning I handed the Clerk of the Parliament a petition that will be formally presented to Parliament tomorrow. From the prayer I extract the following—

“That there is an urgent need for the land Sub 1-3 portion 9 Parish of Mitchell—3345-3381 Mt Lindesay Highway, Browns Plains to be zoned Residential B.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, supports the decision of the Logan City Council to have Sub division 1-3 . . . zoned Residential B.”

That petition was signed within a very short period by 175 residents of Logan city, and I am told by people in Logan that I can expect other copies of the petition to be signed by hundreds more people in Browns Plains and Logan.

The Browns Plains Action Group has appealed to the Minister for Local Government—and on that group's behalf I also appeal to him—to accede to its request and to rezone the land referred to as residential B. That should have occurred by now.

On 14 September, the Browns Plains Action Group wrote to the Minister for Local Government and made the following points—

“1. The majority of people living in the area do not want the land zoned industrial. So far 570 residents have signed and submitted petitions to that effect, and more are following.

2. The land in question has already been voted on by the Logan Town Planning Committee as being unsuitable for industrial development.

3. House buyers in the area were informed, prior to purchase that the land was proposed Residential. This information has been given by the Logan City Council in response to enquiries over a period of years.

4. It is considered that there is already sufficient industrial zoned land in the area.

5. It was the intention of the respective councils for this land to be residential for many years. May it be noted that the proposal for residential was dropped only after one of the more recent owners objected to it. With full knowledge of the long standing proposals for Residential, the close proximity of residents, and may we add, without any regard for same residents, this owner had only material gain in mind.

6. Industrially zoned land in close proximity to a housing estate will result in an unacceptable level of noise and air pollution and traffic congestion. These undesirable aspects are obviously going to cause ongoing discontent and complaints in the future."

Given that this land was always proposed for residential zone, given that numerous residents have been assured by the Logan City Council that the area would be rezoned residential, and have acted on that basis, and given that the land in question is surrounded by residential development and therefore is totally unsuitable for industry, one might think it highly unlikely that the land would not be rezoned residential. However, what is justifiably causing concern among the people of Logan are the actions and influence of Alderman Ian Thomas, an alderman in the Logan City Council. His dealings, schemes and statements in respect of this land have been somewhat machiavellian and, understandably, have caused great concern.

Alderman Thomas's company, I. B. Thomas Investments Pty Ltd, became registered as proprietor of this land on 6 September 1982, pursuant to a transfer document dated 24 August 1982. Those dates are significant, because Alderman Thomas was elected in March 1982, which was six months before the transfer to his company of that land.

On his election to the council, he quickly had himself elected to the position of chairman of the town-planning committee. It is hard to think of a more serious or obvious conflict of interests. The whole of the actions of Alderman Thomas and of his perceived influence in the National Party are causing great concern among the people in the area.

He told the people of Logan city and the "Sunday Sun" newspaper on 5 December 1982 that he bought the land in November 1981 and that, "It wasn't even when I was on the council." He went on to say that he bought the land on 7 November 1981 for \$167,000. At that time, he was just plain Mr Thomas, boss of the \$4m a year turnover Thomas Winches at nearby Archerfield. However, as I said, the certificate of title reveals a different story. If Mr Thomas is to be honest with the people of Logan city, he should produce proof to the contrary because of what that certificate of title shows.

Another article appeared in the "Sunday Sun" on 26 December 1982 in which it was suggested that the local residents had at last won a victory against planning committee Ian Thomas's move to set up an industrial estate close to their houses. Thomas replied, "I have agreed to the land becoming residential B. I think the people will feel they have been fairly treated." As I said before, one would think that that would put an end to the matter, but it did not. The manoeuvres by Alderman Thomas have gone on. There have been rescission motions in the council and various other moves to try to ensure that the land was zoned industrial and was not changed to the justified and proposed residential B zoning.

Since the issue of zoning has been backwards and forwards before the Logan City Council on a number of occasions, the motion for rezoning to residential B was eventually passed, after much difficulty, in June 1984. What Alderman Thomas has been up to in the meantime is mind boggling. He claims to have divested himself of the property, but what are the facts?

If one looks at the company documents relative to I. B. Thomas Investments Pty Ltd, one sees that from 1978 Ian Bernard Thomas and his wife, Glen Helen Thomas, were the directors of the company. However, one sees a fairly superficial, transparent but obvious move on his part wherein on 14 December 1983 he resigned as a director. His wife continued as a director and he substituted his son Maurice in his place. Realising

that people had seen through that, he changed directors again by having his wife resign and appointing his daughter Tracy on 8 February 1984.

Being seized of a very fertile imagination, he decided to carry the manoeuvres even further and took the step of changing the name of the company from I. B. Thomas Investments Pty Ltd to Zonba Pty Ltd, in an apparent attempt to distance himself in appearance but not in fact from the beneficial ownership of that property. He now claims to a number of people that the land has in fact been sold by the company. To whom? To Zonba Pty Ltd, or to somebody else? It is surely incumbent on Alderman Thomas to now, for the first time, make full disclosure to the people of Logan city, stop his devious manoeuvres and come clean. At a meeting of Logan City Council, he should table all documents and files relating to the interests of himself and his family with respect to land.

What is the current position? In a letter dated 21 August 1984, the Logan City Council advised a resident, Mr R. Speed, that it had finally acted on the wishes of the local residents and the resolution of council. The letter states—

“As a result of a large petition submitted to council by local residents regarding the existing light industry zone of the subject land, council at its meeting of 18th January 1983 resolved to initiate proceedings to rezone the subject land to residential B. The proposed rezoning was advertised for objection and a number of objections were received from the owners or on their behalf or from a proposed purchaser of one of the allotments. After considerable ongoing debate on the application the council at its meeting on 19th July 1984 resolved that the application to rezone the subject land to residential B be forwarded to the Minister for Local Government recommending the rezoning for the following reasons:—

- (1) The proposed rezoning complies with the council's strategic plan for this part of the city which designates the land for residential purposes.
- (2) Council is in receipt of a petition from a large number of residents of the Browns Plains area in support of the rezoning to residential B and opposed to the land remaining in the light industry zone.

The rezoning is presently being prepared for forwarding to the Minister whose decision is final in the matter.”

Many people have approached me and asked me to raise the matter in the House. They are concerned that rumours are persistently circulating to the effect that Alderman Thomas has retained the beneficial ownership and that he has undertaken various devious manoeuvres to appear to distance himself from beneficial ownership of the property by the time he uses his influence within the National Party to obtain a preferential decision for his own personal benefit.

The people of Logan city are relying on the Minister to do the right thing. I trust that he will. I ask him to set their minds at rest at the earliest opportunity. This matter has dragged on for much too long. If he does not, however, and the wishes of the local people and the local council are overruled, it will surely rank as one of the most cynical and corrupt decisions in the history of local government. I table all of the documents to which I have referred this afternoon.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (5.20 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure, following the Stafford by-election, to stand in this House once more to reaffirm my loyalty and, I am certain, that of the vast majority of the people of Stafford to her Majesty the Queen and to the Governor.

Mr Davis: How about giving the salute?

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member's party is well known for not being interested in supporting the monarchy, Her Majesty or the flag.

Mr Prest: Little Killen.

Mr GYGAR: I understand the upset of the Opposition members. They would rather not accept that I am here, because I stand here as living proof of the extraordinary growth in support for the Liberal Party in Queensland in recent months.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GYGAR: Let me remind the honourable member for Brisbane Central, who is having hysterics, that only the Liberal Party has been able to improve its vote in each of the last three by-elections conducted in this State. The honourable member's colleague, the late unlamented Mr Wright, the former Leader of the Opposition, achieved a true first in Queensland's political history.

Sir William Knox: He had the biggest reduction of vote of any Labor candidate at the last State election.

Mr GYGAR: And not only that, as my leader points out, but not since 1951 has any party in Opposition in this State managed to lose a seat in a by-election. Mr Wright and his colleagues, known throughout the land for their wit, wisdom, extraordinary competence and quick minds, have managed to achieve just that.

What has been their solution? Mr Wright at least had the good sense to jump before he was pushed; but in his replacement we have had not a great leap forward by the Labor Party but a great leap back into the past—back to the old guard; back to the tried and true. One has to understand the mentality of the Labor Party in this State. Its members do not care if it does not work; just as long as it is tried and true.

The fact is, of course, that the ALP in this State is totally unacceptable as a Government to the people of Queensland. That has been proven time and time again, but never perhaps more dramatically than in the by-election in Stafford. The power of that party has now been thrown back into the hands of the old guard, the same little group that was rejected by the ALP 10 years ago—and, incidentally, by the people of Queensland many times—as irrelevant. We witnessed the 1980 intervention. People from the south—the sensible, saner elements, as they portrayed themselves—decided that affairs were so bad that a start had to be made down the road to Federal intervention. The old guard was rejected. Its members were dismissed, thrown out of office by their own colleagues. What do we have now? The group that the party set out to exorcise has once again got the keys to Breakfast Creek. The move from Charlotte Street seems somewhat of a hollow victory now, because the old guard is back, and it is back with a vengeance.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The Leader of the Opposition Business in the House was one of the architects of the little coup by the big four where they swept the board with the attitude: let us get back to the good old days; if you have got the numbers, to hell with what matters.

The old guard leapt into action and discarded the Centre Majority. Incidentally, it is neither in the centre nor a majority, but its members have never let that sort of thing bother them. The old guard also threw away the socialist Left—no proportional representation there—and brought back the true political genius of Queensland—Tommy Burns! There is a man who has really got what it takes. He comes and goes and comes and goes, just like the tide. Then they grabbed the scintillating debaters, the men of intellect, the men of charm and wit, of public poise and presence—the honourable members for Brisbane Central and Port Curtis—to lead them in the House. When I left this place before the last State election, I did not think things could get much worse. Unfortunately, they did, and there they sit.

The clean sweep of the Warburton team has put the old guard back into power down at Breakfast Creek. One of the more interesting questions now to be faced is how will Mr McLean, the State president, who is a representative of the socialist Left, get

along with Mr Beattie, the State secretary, a representative of the Centre Majority, and Mr Warburton, the parliamentary leader, who is a member of the old guard.

Mr Lickiss interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Mount Coot-tha says that it reminds him of scrambled eggs. However, I am more reminded of that infamous pact between Stalin and Hitler. Not since then have we seen such strange bedfellows—hating one another but not strong or game enough to take one another on. Actually, I feel sorry for Mr Beattie, who, like Poland, is stuck between two giants. The only thing they can agree on is that neither of them likes Mr Beattie, which is unfortunate for Mr Beattie, as he is about to find out.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr Innes: The honourable member for Brisbane Central is still trying to get his wife a job.

Mr GYGAR: Yes, indeed.

Mr Davis: There is no problem.

Mr GYGAR: Yes; she will stand again, and again, and again.

Mr Davis: What about you?

Mr GYGAR: I have lost only one election and won four. I would like to see the member for Brisbane Central match that record.

Mr Comben: But how many colleagues have you lost? It is because of people like you your party lost some of its members.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Windsor gets upset again. I am getting used to seeing the honourable gentleman upset. He was particularly upset during the Stafford by-election campaign but he was not as upset as he was on the Tuesday following election day. May he have many more days like that!

I am proud to be a member of the Liberal Party in this Parliament because it is the only party here that even tries to represent the whole of the community. The Liberal Party does not seek to gain or hold power by appealing to sectional interests or by selectively buying off sectional interest groups. The present Leader of the Labor Party in the Federal sphere (Mr Hawke) is about to find out that that path leads to disaster. He has gained temporary power in Canberra by means of a coalition of conservationists, the unemployed, people interested in the arts, research scientists and other disparate groups who, without exception, have now been betrayed by that Federal Government—particularly and tragically the young unemployed.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Windsor interjects again. He obviously believes that all of the people can be fooled some of the time or some of the people can be fooled all of the time. However, he is about to learn that all of the people cannot be fooled all of the time. As he is a member of the ALP in Queensland, I thought, if nothing else, that he and other members of that party would have picked up that lesson since 1957. Regrettably, they have not.

I will now turn to the problems of the young unemployed, who have been so appallingly betrayed by the Federal Government. The plain and simple reason for that is the ALP's domination by the trade union movement. Despite the screams of virtue that one hears from members of the Opposition in this House, in its entire existence the trade union movement has not created a single job—with perhaps a few slight exceptions of the professional trade unionists who usually have never worked a day in

their lives and who unfortunately end up decorating Labor seats in Parliament Houses throughout Australia.

The union movement has not created a single real job. It exists only to serve those who have jobs. It is not interested in those who do not have them.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GYGAR: As is his wont, the honourable member for Brisbane Central is again upset. I refer him to the activities of the Amalgamated Metals, Foundry & Shipwrights Union. Will he tell us some time how many people were employed in the metal industry five to 10 years ago and how many are employed in it now? There is only one simple reason for what has happened, and even the honourable member's mates at the university have to recognise it, namely, that the policies of the Amalgamated Metals, Foundry & Shipwrights Union have affected wages and conditions and industrial anarchy in those industries to such an extent that there are simply no jobs there.

Mr Davis: You are a bigger ratbag now than you were before.

Mr GYGAR: The poor member for Brisbane Central and his colleagues, stuck with these facts, still expect the people of Australia to back this union-dominated party. Labor came out with a whole new world. It had a brilliant new policy and it was to run away from the trade union involvement and hold consultative councils at which everybody was to get together in a big room and all would be friends. What happened? Australia had a triumvirate supposedly ruling the country—big Government, big unions and big business.

Mr White: The corporate state.

Mr GYGAR: It was just as the honourable member so appropriately put it.

It is interesting to recall that the last occasion that a corporate state was tried was in Italy. In those days it was called fascism.

Businesses realise that they have been duded by the ALP yet again. It could be thought that businesses would have learnt, but still they turned up at the conference. The truth about that Government is that it consults with business and negotiates with the unions. Businesses find themselves locked into a system in which they have no real voice but, because they have been spoken to and because they have been consulted, they must supposedly run along with it. Unfortunately the situation is paralleled in the arbitration system, which has been acknowledged in recent reports as no longer being a place where equals meet, negotiate and reach a solution, but a place which has become the enforcement arm of the trade union movement.

The Hawke Government is reverting to character. It is desperately searching in the past for outmoded solutions—the only solutions it is capable of using—because it is struck with the trade union movement which will not give up an ounce of its power and is desperate for more of it. In the end, the Hawke Government will bow again to the class-war dictates of its political masters.

We now see the Hawke Government in a mad rush to an election. Whatever may be said about the present Prime Minister, he is no fool. He learns from history. He appreciates that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. He will not fall into the trap that could have settled Mr Wran if he had waited for an election. Hawke saw that both Wran and Whitlam saved their necks by rushing into early elections. An early election is being proposed by the Prime Minister—this wonderful man of virtue and honour—who said that Parliaments should run their full term. We all recall those words. The honourable member for South Brisbane is nodding in agreement that Prime Minister Hawke was the man who said that Parliaments should run full term. Because of the shadows hanging over the Government, it realises that it must be re-elected before the troubles see the light of day. I refer to the shadows of Labor's retreat from a balanced industrial relations program, its desperation in its efforts to handle people, such as the Builders Labourers Federation, the Amalgamated Metals, Foundry & Shipwrights Union

and others, who have reverted totally to industrial anarchy. In spite of that the Federal Government refuses to even discipline them in the smallest possible way.

We also see the darkening shadow of the involvement of organisations and persons within the Australian Labor Party in organised crime—not just federally, but also in New South Wales and elsewhere. We see the disbandment of the Costigan inquiry before it can chase the money and find out where it ends up. We see this unseemly haste from this so-called open Prime Minister to wind up the Costigan inquiry before it gets to the bottom of this matter. Costigan was great fun while he was pulling out people who had a vague association with the Liberal Party and who had been talking to accountants about tax evasion. It is a different matter, though, when he goes closer to the bone and starts to talk about organised crime, the money men and their links with people in the ALP.

Mr Fouras: That is fancy.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member should not be too upset. He ought to remember what happened to Mr Baldwin in the south.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member protesteth too much. I hope that he will table the telegrams and protestations that he sent to Mr Hawke saying, "Give Costigan his head. Let us see the Costigan report. Let him finish the job. Let us find out who the Mr Bigs are."

Sir William Knox: What happened to Mr Gibbs when he tried to name a person in this House? Bob Hawke flew up and stopped him doing it.

Mr GYGAR: The sudden burst of silence is punctuated by looks of outraged innocence! We hear not a word from Opposition members now. We have suddenly hit a nerve here.

Let us talk about Costigan. Why does the Federal Opposition have to make this continual effort to pry each letter out of the Government? Why have there been these unfortunate clerical errors resulting in the backs of the cheques not being tabled? There is a bit of a coincidence.

Mr Innes: Why did they refuse to put the full powers into the National Crimes Commission legislation?

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member raises one point; let me consider another. Why is there no guarantee that the Costigan referrals will go to the National Crimes Commission? These sorts of questions need to be answered.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The member for Brisbane Central says, "Back to levity. Don't answer the serious ones."

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr GYGAR: If the Federal Government has nothing to hide, the Federal Parliament should be recalled. The honourable member should send another telegram and he should table that one, together with the other ones that he sent indicating his interest in bringing organised crime to book. He should send another one to Mr Hawke saying, "Call back Federal Parliament so that it can all get out in the open."

Mr Fouras: What did the Liberals do about organised crime in the previous seven years?

Mr GYGAR: Did the honourable member for South Brisbane refer to Mr Fraser? Is he the same Mr Fraser who appointed the Costigan inquiry?

I shall now talk about Queensland and, in particular, the Queensland economy.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! I think that if there were fewer interjections the honourable member would be able to proceed with his speech. I would also ask him to address the Chair.

Mr GYGAR: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker, because I am sure that you, like the rest of us here, are interested in the state of Queensland's economy, particularly the state of youth unemployment. It is the one problem that people in the south have been talking about and doing nothing about. It is about time that the members of the ALP and everybody else got serious about it. It is beyond a bad joke that the best solution that the Federal Government can come up with is to send Senator Jones round talking about kibbutzim and young people being sent out to grow sweet potatoes. It is an insult to the intelligence of young people as much as to the rest of the community.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I take it from that interjection that the honourable member endorses the kibbutz and sweet potato solution to the youth unemployment problem.

A number of things have been put into the too-hard basket for too long. No longer can we tolerate their staying in the too-hard basket. The ALP and the trade union movement have just got to face the fact, purely and simply, that junior wage rates are putting young adults out of work.

Mr Davis: Here we are knocking them down—a good old Terry White solution.

Mr GYGAR: If my colleague from Redcliffe has proposed that solution, I take great pride in associating myself with it. It is a fact of life. The troglodytes from the ALP have to realise that. It is the old trade union story again: do not give anyone a job; just look after those who have one.

The point has been reached at which the trade unions must realise that people who do not have jobs have rights, too, namely, the right to work when they want to and where they want to, without the stand-over tactics of trade unions who have no interest in them and who say that they do not care whether they want to work, that they will not let them.

I turn now to penalty rates. It is inevitable that they will disappear. Everyone, with the exception of a few relics from the past, who comments on penalty rates knows that their abolition in service industries, particularly those related to tourism, is imminent. The question is not if but when. Months or years may go past before this inevitable step is taken, and hundreds more of our young people, who could be working and who could have pride of accomplishment and achievement, are being kept on the dole queues by the deliberate act of people who would rather see them collecting the dole than working.

I cannot comprehend why this nation is desperately short of tradesmen when hundreds of young people are crying out to enter trades. Something must be done about apprenticeships.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Windsor can make his cheap gibes when he tells us what New South Wales and Victoria have done about this, because the answer is a great big nothing.

A new solution must be found so that young people do not have to go round cap in hand to local garages and to family friends and do not have to ring up everybody they know saying, "For Heaven's sake, do you know anybody who is a tradesman that I can go to and try to get an apprenticeship with?"

Mr Davis: Every day.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Brisbane Central admits it. He just said that every day young people come to him and say that. It is like something out of the Middle Ages.

The great so-called exponents of education in the Labor Party talk much about universities and CAEs. They should look after the people whom they are supposed to represent, the people about whom they jump up and down in this place and say that they support. They say that they are for the working man. Opposition members should come up with a solution for the working man's kids who want to work, who want a trade and who cannot get it.

Mr Prest: Why don't you tell that to Joh, your leader?

Mr GYGAR: I wait with interest to hear the solution of the member for Port Curtis, apart from quiet abuse of the Government. That honourable gentleman has an amazing mind. He thinks that if anything is wrong, it should be blamed on Joh. To him, the Premier is to blame for everything. I suppose habits are hard to break, because the honourable member has been saying it for sixteen years. It has not worked yet. What the heck? He will keep on trying.

People who want to be tradesmen are out of work in a community that is desperate for trained workers. Greater portability is needed for apprenticeships. It often happens now that businesses that employ apprentices go to the wall. What are the apprentices doing? They are asking whether the Works Department, the Department of Railways or someone else will take them on so that they can finish their apprenticeships.

That must be taken into account. In the short term, that is a solution for some problems, but in the long term, the whole business of trade-training has to be turned up and shaken until something comes out of it. A new way can then be found to give jobs to kids who want them in an economy that needs their training and expertise.

In all this, there is no point in attacking the education system. It is not the education system that is to blame because the complexities of modern society, and the fact that students are staying longer at school, have brought about changes in the type of students who are attending and the type of schooling that is required. It is not enough to jump up and down and say it is the education system. Children used to be taught A, B and C, but now they are not. It is a wider problem, and it must be looked at.

Existing industries must be analysed. There is no scope or capacity to create new jobs under the system that currently operates. Industries, be they manufacturing or processing industries, must be restructured to create more jobs and, first and foremost, to give them access to new markets by cost savings, by restructuring plant and machinery and, if necessary, by restructuring debt structures. Restructuring is slowing down at the moment.

Again Labor's great solution that will provide more jobs is support from the ALP for the introduction of new disincentives to employers. The ALP is delighted at the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission's decision that from now on there will be great lead-times before workers can be laid off. Unanimously, employer organisations, small businesses and big businesses have said that that will prevent them from putting on workers. Yet what do we see from the Labor Party? Do we see keen interest in doing something about creating jobs? No way! Like a turtle, the Labor Party gets back into its shell, and says, "We have to look after the blokes who have jobs, and to hell with the rest! And to hell with those who have jobs if 10 per cent of them lose their jobs!" That is lunacy. There simply is no easy solution. Any member who stands up in this House and says that he has all the solutions to all the problems is a fool. Solutions cannot be found simply.

What we have to do is recognise the problems and come to grips with them. As long as members run round denying that problems exist, Queensland will get nowhere. The longer we put restructuring off, the harder it will be to carry out. Sure, if our

industries are restructured radically now, disruption will occur. However, 1984's disruption will be 1994's catastrophe if we put it off.

Do we prop up an industry such as the motor industry until the stage is reached at which whole huge factories are closed down overnight and hundreds of thousands of workers lose their jobs? That is no solution. Phoney prop-up schemes eventually collapse under their own weight. Consideration must be given now to the economic needs that are required to bring long-term viability to industry. It is not smart economics to prop up systems that do not work and to lose money while deferring the collapse of industries that inevitably will go down.

If Governments spent the same amount of money on creation as on propping up, they would not have the problems that they are facing now in industries. Special-interest groups are surfacing and coming forward with their threats, saying, "Support us, or else!" In a moment of weakness, Federal Governments and others are prepared to throw them a few bob to keep them quiet, and hope that the problems will go away. In terms of restructuring, we have not only to look at the internal mechanisms that exist in industries; we must look at new industries or innovative ways of employing the industries that we have.

I refer to tourism. Everybody in this place talks about tourism. If a member is stuck for something to say, he jumps up and says how wonderful tourism will be in Queensland. How wonderful tourism could be in Queensland is more to the point. Something must be done about it.

Queensland has the greatest aggregation in the world of tourist resorts and tourist attractions. It has an industry that has the potential of employing all the young people, the middle managers who are now being tossed out onto the scrap-heap and the other experienced people right across the board. What is done about it? Virtually nothing.

Over at South Brisbane there exists one college, which is supposed to be a hospitality college training people for the tourist industry. It is the greatest disaster of all time. The tourist industry was not even consulted before the curriculum for the college was drawn up. That sort of nonsense has to stop. Tourism more than anything else can give local jobs to local kids.

We all hear stories of how the kids in Cairns, Mackay, Proserpine and Townsville are growing up and leaving town. They are drifting to the capital in this State or, even worse, to Sydney and Melbourne. The towns in north Queensland should be meccas of employment; the kids should be going there. They are the towns in which the jobs can and should be created.

A co-operative approach is needed between the tourist industry leaders and the Government on a cost-sharing basis. One hears two things about tourism in Australia. The first is that in 10 years' time it will be terrific—that has been said for the last 20 years—and the second is that the service is not up to scratch. I must say that I agree with the second statement. The first one will remain true as long as the second one does, because until service in the tourist industry is brought up to scratch, it will not be able to compete on the increasingly sophisticated markets.

We must start training the people properly to do the job. One cannot blame a young person who has been through an ordinary high school in an ordinary town for not possessing the finesse required these days in properly run international tourist resorts. He ought to be given a chance. A training ground should be established so that people have an opportunity to obtain the experience that they need. Where are those training courses? They just do not exist. While they continue to be non-existent, there will be a lack of staff, and people with all sorts of racist motives will complain, "You can't bring in people from overseas to man a base level of your resort" even if they are the only people who will give the sort of service that the tourists want. Let us provide local youngsters with local jobs in the tourist industry by giving them the tools with which to work. The youngsters of today do not want charity; all they want is a chance. All they want is someone to give them the tools so that they can work. However, we sit

back, call them dole-bludgers and say that they do not want to do a darned thing. They are not given the tools, which is all they need to make something of themselves. That is the crime that has been committed. We will be the same ones who will complain in 10 years' time about the dreadful alienated young marrieds who do not want to work because they have never worked. They should be given the chance now. They should be given the tools now. They will do a great deal of good not only for themselves but also for everybody else. That will require our throwing out a few old, outmoded ideas, which are so greatly epitomised in this Chamber by Opposition members.

The mining industry must be re-examined. Lately its requests for favourable consideration by the State Government have received some chiacking. It must be remembered that all the right is not on the one side. The mining industry has experienced declining profits, retrenchments and a decline in investment. To ensure competitiveness there has been a need to reassess and downgrade our volume of exports. Let us not kill the goose that laid the golden egg. In the good times, during the build-up in the mining industry, everybody got stuck into it and tore millions of dollars out of it. The Queensland Government was no exception; and good on it! The mining industry could pay and the people of Queensland could benefit. Let the Government take the money. Because the mining industry has given so much, its contribution is surely deserving of equal consideration when it is in trouble. The mining industry faces massive imposts. Whilst it could pay, OK; now it cannot pay. If the Government does not do something about it, the goose that laid the golden egg will be killed and the mining industry will be finished. The position must be re-examined so that not only the companies and the Government but also the people who work in the mines receive a fair deal. If they become non-competitive and if our orders are reduced by two or three million tonnes, the people who will really suffer are the workers in the mining towns. A new set of social problems will arise. A new set of solutions and millions of dollars will be needed to solve them. Those problems will not be solved with money alone.

I hope that we will not have to look forward to many more Mary Kathleens. The auction of mining company property makes good news headlines and television news, but I do not want to see that happen in the central Queensland mining towns. However, it will happen unless the problems of the mining industry are sympathetically and properly examined by the Queensland Government and by the Governments in other States. We must stop taking a short view. It is a regrettable but true accusation against politicians that they are far more fascinated by tomorrow's headlines than they are by the next decade's society. We must get away from that—less attention on election results and more on what sort of life we are leaving to our children.

From the miserable drivel that is emanating from the Opposition's clown prince, the member for Brisbane Central, it is clear that the Opposition has absolutely no interest in proper planning for the future. The short-term jab, the little quip, the smart alec comment, the cute little headline in tomorrow's paper are all they are concerned with. I wonder what they think they are leaving to the next generation.

I notice, for example, apart from all of their witticism this afternoon, we have heard not a word about unemployment, not a word about what they would do to help; just, "Let's get in there and knock them again." It does not matter who is being knocked—whether it is the member on his feet, the Premier, the Government, the leader of the Liberal Party or even their own leader on occasions—on a great number of occasions, actually—as long as they knock.

We stand ready to be condemned by the future generations of this State if we sit back and say, "What the heck? We're OK." We all have jobs, haven't we? They are pretty good jobs. What about the future generations? If we jeopardise their future by mortgaging it to find short-term political solutions in the present, we will receive no thanks from the sort of society we are likely to leave behind us. The chaos, the imbalance, the chasing after sectional interests! Isn't it about time someone stood up and forgot about the mob supporting him this week or next week and started thinking about what is good for everyone? It is a desperate and despairing hope to look in the direction of

the Opposition to find it. The ALP has never demonstrated the ability to provide those solutions. That is why in the future it will remain where it is, languishing in the Opposition.

The present Government also has to look to its laurels. It is unexciting, to say the least, and it runs the danger of falling into reactive and negative approaches. It grew up with the prospects of growth and with the realities of growth in the development of the '60s and the '70s. Psychologically and emotionally the Government is tuned in to bigger and better tomorrows. I hope it will not find itself intellectually ill-equipped to face the harsh realities of the '80s and the '90s.

I mention in passing the outstanding support that I have received from the people of Stafford for the last nine years, particularly in the nine months when I was no longer the member and now that I have been returned. Their genuine warmth and their delight at my return I shall always remember. I look forward to representing them here again and I look forward to representing all of them, and not just my mates, which the honourable member for Brisbane Central will undoubtedly find strange and incomprehensible. In the next election we can look forward to even greater things. The ALP, as is its wont, will once again be rejected by the people of Queensland because it is totally irrelevant, as its members demonstrate in this place day after day, and the present aberrations of the present system will be redressed and corrected and there will be a return to balanced coalition Government in this State. The Liberal Party looks forward to being part of it. I appreciate that, once again, the member for Brisbane Central finds that upsetting; but, if he looks at history, he will learn that the natural form of Government in this State is a coalition. It will happen again, much to his dismay and disturbance. He will stay where he is and the coalition will be on the opposite side to him.

Mr Milliner: Members of the National Party don't agree.

Mr GYGAR: They, too, will be proven wrong, because it will happen. As the honourable member for Everton knows, a party cannot govern a State indefinitely with one-third of the votes. Things will even out at the next election. That is when a coalition will occur. The Liberal Party will again be a voice in that Government—a voice for good management, for moderation and for broad involvement in the process. That input, again, will give the people of Queensland the type of Government that they will continue to support, to the dismay of the Opposition and, hopefully, to the benefit of the people of this State. It will be a Government for all Queenslanders, not just for its mates, for trade union cronies and for hacks who can wade their way through the blood of political and factional blood-baths to obtain a safe seat in Parliament, often regrettably only because of the support for their wives, because they do not have it themselves.

Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr NEWTON (Caboolture) (7.15 p.m.): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I swear allegiance to our most gracious sovereign, Queen Elizabeth, to her successors and to her representative, Sir James Ramsay.

Queensland is a lucky State. The Government is encouraging the type of growth and development that will benefit every Queenslanders. As the member for Caboolture, I am witness to the Government's initiative and programs that are assisting in the growth areas of my electorate and the rest of Queensland.

The electrification of the rail link to Caboolture will give to the area's rapidly growing population a fast, efficient link with Brisbane. For this I must commend the Minister for Transport (Don Lane) and his committee.

Schools in my electorate have felt the effects of this rapidly increasing population. The existing schools have been upgraded, staff levels increased, library facilities expanded and class-rooms extended. Areas without schools are constantly being monitored to ensure that, when the enrolments from these areas reach a level sufficient to justify the construction of a school, it has already been built. One such area is Beachmere.

Many members have stated that it is only through the Government's encouragement of the strengthening of the family unit that the community can achieve harmony and order. The Government has promoted the Year of the Family and, in 1985, will be promoting the International Year of Youth.

Illegal drugs pose an immense threat to our families and, ultimately, to our society. I am proud to be part of a Government that intends to enact legislation to provide stiffer penalties for those who are responsible for the illicit trade in hard drugs. The Government does not sit back; it takes action! The enactment of legislation dealing with drug trafficking will be the fulfilment of an election promise and is, I believe, a moral obligation on the Government. That so-called soft drug, cannabis, should never be legalised or even decriminalised and I am astounded at the indecisive policies of the Opposition in that regard.

Another threat to society is that of uncensored videotapes being available to the general public. Recent announcements by the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) have informed the public that the Government will not stand by while society is polluted with trashy videotapes. I question the morals of a Federal Government that is either unwilling or unable to regulate the sale or hire of pornographic videotapes. Every week I receive letters from concerned parents in my electorate who want videotapes censored. The Government will not let the people down; it will not stand idly by.

The Department of Works and Housing, through the Queensland Housing Commission, is providing both low-cost home loans and low-cost accommodation for the families of the State. A recent announcement stated that 29 houses will be constructed in the Caboolture and Deception Bay areas. That will alleviate some of the pressure for accommodation but, with rising rents, an increasing number of families cannot afford private rental accommodation. However, because of the careful management of the State's economy, together with increasing confidence in the business sector, unemployment has begun to fall and an increasing number of families can again enjoy a weekly wage rather than be the recipients of unemployment benefits.

Since my election last October, I have noticed the number of justices of the peace being appointed throughout the State. The office of justice of the peace should be highly respected by the community. Logic states that if every second citizen is a justice of the peace, the usefulness and prestige of the office will be diminished. Before nominating a person for such a position, I satisfy myself—and I trust all members satisfy themselves—that he is a fit and proper person to be appointed.

Mr Vaughan: How do you do that?

Mr NEWTON: I will tell the honourable member. Short of asking the nominees to pass a test, in many cases I have no way of knowing if they possess the ability and knowledge to carry out their duties successfully.

Naturally I am not proposing that every intending JP should study law at the tertiary level, but prospective justices of the peace should be prepared to attend the excellent justice of the peace courses run at night by the technical and further education colleges. Students can also enrol for the correspondence course. The cost is only \$5. It provides intending justices of the peace with the necessary background knowledge so essential to the successful execution of their duties. Under our excellent legal system these officers have considerable and wide-reaching powers. We must ensure that justices of the future are more highly qualified and better able to serve Queensland.

The people can look to the National Party Government for intelligent, constructive policies that will benefit Queensland.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (7.21 p.m.): I intend to refer to some of the matters raised by the Governor in his Opening Speech. As we all know, his speech was written by the Government. Any comments I make on the speech are not a reflection on the Governor himself but on the people responsible for writing the speech.

In the very early part of his Opening Speech, the Governor said—

“Since the previous occasion in November last year, I have noted, in my travel throughout the State, a renewed confidence and optimism throughout the community.

This largely reflects rural rejoicing over excellent seasonal conditions which have followed the breaking of the 1982-83 drought.”

It is remarkable that, later in his speech, His Excellency said—

“My Government is of the opinion that industry and commerce generally have benefited greatly from the effects of the wages pause initiated in 1982 by the then Federal Government.

The net result is that Queensland, and the nation generally, is poised at the beginning of an era when further economic growth can occur.

The Government of this State, through initiatives which I will outline, will do its utmost to sustain this renewed confidence.”

That reveals a complete lack of recognition of the great work done by the current Australian Government towards turning the economy around. It is no wonder that in his trips throughout the State the Governor has found renewed confidence and optimism. I am sure that if he were to travel throughout Australia he would find similar renewed optimism and confidence in the community, thanks to the actions of the Hawke Government—actions that the former Fraser Government did not have the courage to carry out.

I have noted the state of the stinking debate engaged in by some Government members in this House and Opposition members in the Federal House. The tone of their debate indicates that they are bereft of points to use to score off the Hawke Labor Government. They cannot score on the matter of job creation, because in that area the Hawke Government has performed better than any other Government in recent history. They cannot score off the Federal Government on inflation, because it has brought the inflation rate down. They cannot score off the Hawke Government for not introducing financial reform, because it has done exactly what John Howard wanted to do but was not allowed to do by the National and Liberal power-brokers, especially those in Queensland.

Mr Milliner: You see that Government members are nodding in agreement.

Mr UNDERWOOD: They certainly are.

They cannot score off the Hawke Government on the matter of public service reform, because it has got that well under way. They cannot score off the Hawke Government relative to industry reconstruction, because a number of major industries in Australia have been restructured, and restructured so well that they are getting back on their feet again.

It was interesting to note that recently the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology complained that Queensland had not been consulted about the study of the restructuring of the steel industry in Australia. The Minister conveniently forgot that only the States with steel industries were involved in the study. In the approach to the Federal election, the National and Liberal Parties throughout this State and nation have resorted to gutter tactics. They have resorted to creating disharmony, hatred and division and to stirring up dogs that should be left lying asleep.

Firstly, the Liberal/National coalition in the Federal Opposition tried the immigration question. I can remember that very clearly because at the time I was a member of a parliamentary delegation visiting Fiji. Of course, there are not many white faces in Fiji. The disgraceful and shameful debate into which the members of the Liberal and National Parties in the Federal Parliament entered was given prominent headlines in the Fijian press. Having read those headlines, I was ashamed to be associated with Australia.

There are diverse groups of people in Australia. They have come from all continents and as soon as some people wake up to that fact and start to accept it, the better it will

be. It was totally immoral for the members of the Liberal and National Parties to try to score votes on the immigration question. They had no other question on which they could score votes.

The recent drama in the Federal Parliament about crime is still hitting the headlines. Of course, that saga will continue for some time yet. Andrew Peacock and Mr Sinclair, that great moral, uprighteous leader of the Federal National Party, will continue with their courageous campaign against crime. Did not Mr Sinclair have something to do with funeral parlours and false cheques?

Mr Prest: He buried the lot.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Yes. I think that it had something to do with his father. Mr Sinclair has no credibility at all, particularly when it comes to the business of crime-busting. He is one of the great crime-busters. They are deliberately trying to misinform people about the activities of the Costigan inquiry and why reports have not been released. The plain fact of the matter is that most of the Costigan reports have not been released or have been edited because Mr Costigan required that they not be released or be edited so that his inquiry and other inquiries could continue. Of course, the members of the Liberal and National Parties conveniently forget that. The only two issues that they have been able to drag up are hatred and smears.

The main thrust of any campaign by any party in any Federal, State or local government election should be directed towards economic policies and how they affect the lives of both employed people and unemployed people in the community. Paul Keating, the Australian Treasurer, has been named Treasurer of the Year by leading financial and economic reporters in the Western countries, and we must congratulate him for that. Of course, Mr Stone, the former head of the Federal Treasury, who is not noted for being a Labor supporter, made similar remarks when he retired. He went so far as to share a bottle of bubbly with Mr Keating for the benefit of the newspaper cameras. That was an indication from Mr Stone of the high regard in which he held Mr Keating. It is no wonder that Mr Keating was named Treasurer of the Year.

Things have got so bad for the Country Party—I am sorry, the National Party—and the Liberal Party——

Mr Davis: They will always be “Country” to me.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Yes. We will always remember that.

Mr Chipp, the leader of the “Chippites” and a man with long experience in the Liberal Party, has gone on record as saying that there are moves afoot to have Mr Fraser returned as leader of the Liberal Party. The Labor Party would welcome Mr Fraser back as Leader of the Opposition. He really did not have much time as Leader of the Opposition. Because of the way in which he took over the leadership of the Liberal Party, he was not Leader of the Opposition for very long, but I will not go into that matter now.

It would be wonderful to see Mr Fraser back in the saddle. The Labor Party would be assured of remaining in office for a long time in the Australian Parliament and also in the State Parliaments. One could not get two more discredited people than Mr Fraser and Mr Sinclair. Of course, running a very close third is John Howard. He will not back up his own leader in the Federal Parliament because he is conniving to take over the leadership of the Liberal Party. That would also be good for the Labor Party. We all know how, before the last Federal election, Mr Fraser and Mr Howard held back the news about the projected deficit. They went so far as to produce rubbery or false figures to justify their type of accounting or lack of financial credibility at that time.

Mr Veivers: They are bringing Mr Fraser back from under the bed, aren't they?

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right. Mr Fraser found a little room under the bed and he pushed a few commie cans away.

At the last Federal election, Mr Fraser and Mr Sinclair used a scandalous, terrifying tactic to worry the old people of Australia by telling them to put their money under the bed because the Labor Party would take it from them. What lies, what tripe! That shows the tactics that the Liberal-National Party Government resorted to. In fact, that statement by Mr Fraser turned the election campaign from a victory for the Labor Party into a massive defeat for the Liberals and Nationals.

Mr Littleproud: Thanks to Mr Hawke, we now don't have homes for the aged.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I remind the member for Condamine that it was the previous Federal Labor Government that radically improved the funding ratio for homes right round Australia. In my electorate, there is an establishment called Brassall Village, which is sponsored by the Uniting Church. Bill Hayden is treated like a saint at that home because he reformed the funding arrangements for homes for the aged. Right throughout Australia, Bill Hayden is treated like a saint because he was the man in the Whitlam Government who really put nursing homes on the map. The same thing has occurred under the present Federal Labor Government.

Reforms have been made, but Government members would not realise that. The Australian Government had a little trouble with Mr Austin when it was trying to get a submission from him. He was the last State Minister for Health to put in a submission to the joint State/Federal body which was reforming the funding of nursing homes. The Liberal-National Party Government in Canberra destroyed Bill Hayden's scheme and reintroduced the miserable funding arrangements that Fraser, Sinclair and company wanted. It became much more difficult for old people to get into a home, whether it was run as a charitable institution or as a private enterprise. Put that in your pipe and smoke it. Let us get back to what the Labor Party is doing for the old people and what you people took away from them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Ipswich West will address the Chair.

Mr Littleproud: Queenslanders pay \$47 a head for Medicare but Victorians pay only \$40. Explain that one away.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have told the member for Condamine what the Labor Party did for old people. It put them in beds and gave them somewhere to go so that they did not have to live in their hovels, which they could not afford to maintain because they were too poor.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The League of Rights is an insidious organisation in this country and, particularly, in this State. It has various other affiliates that I will not mention, except to say that there is a whole stream of them. It is a little like the Communist Party and other organisations that have nefarious groups that they use for subversion. The League of Rights is one of the most successful if not the most successful subversive organisation in this country. It has become so successful that, through the offices of the Premier and members of the Government, it has been able to write a part of the Governor's Opening Speech. I would like to have a close look at some of the paragraphs in his Speech. He referred to "my Government", but it is worth noticing that the Governor has made it quite clear that it is not his address but that of the Government. His Excellency said—

"My Government, however, views with concern recent trends which attempt to downgrade our traditional links with the Monarchy and will strongly resist any moves to sever such links.

It is concerned, for example, that a change in our National Anthem was proclaimed without any reference to the people, while proposed alterations to the

Australian Citizenship Act remove any reference to the Monarchy in a Form of Pledge of Australian Citizenship.

Many Queenslanders are justifiably apprehensive about moves to change our National Flag and, rightfully, question the reasons for these moves.

The fact remains that our Flag is an accurate and respected reflection of our heritage and my Government's view is that, if any change is contemplated in the future, it should only be made if Australia, as a nation, votes for such change."

Those comments are not contained in the final portions of the Governor's Opening Speech. One would think that his Opening Speech would contain the most important items on the Government's agenda for the coming session of Parliament. I think that most honourable members would agree with that contention. Those remarkable four paragraphs that I quoted are at the beginning of the Opening Speech. Quite obviously, this Government regards those issues—all created by it—as being the most important issues that it has to tackle during this session.

Those comments are, of course, a straight take from the League of Rights. Anyone who has had the misfortune to read some of that organisation's material will realise that. Further, some of the speeches made by members of the National Party verify that claim. That issue, the immigration issue, the crime-buster's program, the anthem and the flag are the main planks in the National Party's platform for the coming Federal election. I wish the National Party luck. It is no wonder that the Labor Party is polling about 60 per cent on the primary vote, even in country areas.

The remainder of the Governor's Opening Speech basically praises the Federal Labor Government's programs. However, as usual, the State Government adopted the tactic of trying to include those programs under its own umbrella of management and responsibility.

Among other things, the Governor said—

"Other major projects which will ensure continued growth of our State include the Burdekin Falls Dam, continuing power station developments, a major hospital construction programme and extension and improvement of the road network.

Preliminary work on the Burdekin Falls Dam is virtually complete and 1984/85 will bring major progress on the dam wall."

Listen to this one—

"Some \$22 million will be spent this financial year, including \$19 million from the Commonwealth."

Including \$19m from the Commonwealth! The Commonwealth is providing nearly all the money.

The Governor went on to say—

"A further \$20 million has been allocated to develop associated irrigation works, including gates for Clare Weir.

More than \$80 million will be spent on hospital projects this financial year, including a new obstetric facility at the Queen Elizabeth the Second Hospital."

Thank you very much, Medicare, for that! Earlier this evening a Government member decried Medicare. But here it is; already it has popped up twice in the Governor's Opening Speech. Hospital works and programs have been made possible because of additional funding made available to Queensland under Medicare. Incidentally, this so-called horrible, socialistic Medicare program, which institutionalised free enterprise medicine, was signed by the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Health, who now are greatly opposed to Medicare. On the one hand, they say, "No, no, no, we do not want it"; on the other, they say, "Yes, we will take it." The proof of the pudding is in the eating; they did take it, and now they are praising it—in a roundabout fashion. Of course, they will not admit it; they are too proud to do that.

I turn to the wonderful housing program that the Federal Government implemented. It gave a tremendous boost to this nation's economy and also provided many young people with homes. It dramatically reduced waiting-lists for Housing Commission houses and pensioner units. It is with pleasure that I noted that the Minister for Works and Housing said that that had occurred.

The Governor went on to say—

“My Government, through the Queensland Housing Commission, will put a record number of families and pensioners into their own homes in 1984/85.

For the first time, total home loans will exceed \$100 million, providing assistance to more than 3,000 low income families.

Building programmes will be augmented by spot purchase of existing houses and units to mix and integrate public housing.”

The mixing and integration of public housing is another policy of the Labor Party. Later—

“The Commission will construct a new 37-home display estate at Wynnum West to show how attractive housing can grace smaller-than-average sites at less cost.”

That is a wonderful wrap-up for the Federal Labor Government's housing program and the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. Of course, no recognition is given to that role of the Federal Government; it is all given to this miserable State Government.

Later the Governor said—

“A new era in rail electrification has begun with my Government's commitment to a \$600 million project in central Queensland.

Planning for mainline electrification is also proceeding.

A sum of \$440 million will be spent on roads this financial year, including \$151 million on State highways.”

Once again, there is no mention of the Commonwealth Government's involvement. Anyone who picks up a document relative to funding will plainly see, and be forced to admit, that it was a State and Federal matter and that the electrification of Queensland's railways began under the previous Federal Labor Government. The massive boost to funding for roads in this State resulted from the election of the Hawke Labor Government and the excellent work done by the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr Morris) in providing funds. During a period of economic cut-backs, Peter Morris was able to procure that additional funding, from which Queensland benefited greatly. I am pleased to report that, as a result of the joint State and Federal program, major road-works are taking place in my electorate.

Mr Vaughan: With bicentennial money?

Mr UNDERWOOD: It is definitely bicentennial money, so the sign says.

Through the Governor's Opening Speech, the Queensland Government is trying to make out that it is in the business of buying satellites. The Governor's Opening Speech states—

“Preparations for the School of the Air-Aussat Satellite programme, planned for 1986, are continuing.”

Why does the Government not have the decency to admit——

Mr Kaus interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member wants somebody to pay for it, and he can do what he likes with it? Well, no-one agrees with that.

The major primary and secondary industry of this State is in serious trouble. It is in so much trouble that many sugar producers are turning away from the National Party and turning to the Labor Party.

Let me turn to the Governor's Opening Speech for a mention of the sugar industry, which is the most important primary and secondary producer in this State. I have looked at the four pages of the Opening Speech made by the Governor and I cannot find one word about sugar. Very little mention is made of primary industries. It is no wonder that that is the case, as I will outline in a moment. There is mention in this Opening Speech of building societies, the Traffic Act, credit societies and related bodies, chattel securities, the Construction Safety Act, conditions and warranties in certain sales and leases, the Railways Act and the Nursing Studies Act; however, there is no mention of the sugar industry, which is Queensland's most important primary and secondary industry.

The Queensland Government is supposed to be a National Party Government. The members on the Government benches who represent sugar-growing areas—there are some Opposition members who also represent sugar-growing areas—should remember the good times in the sugar industry. The Queensland Government was responsible for everything that went right with the sugar industry. The money was flowing out of the sugar industry's ears. The Government went so far as to say that the Ord River project could go ahead and that it would get CSR to help it out. That is how far the Government went. It claimed the lot! If it was good enough to claim the lot then, the Government should claim the lot when times are bad.

Government members come to Brisbane, put their heads in the clouds, travel in ministerial cars and sit in big black chairs that have microphones set in the back of them and act as though nothing is going wrong in their electorates. I have good news for them!

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right. National Party policy is to capitalise the profits and socialise the losses. Its policy is to get people everywhere else to pay for the losses and for the Government to rake off the profits. That is not fair play. It should be even Stephen for everyone. The rowdiness of members on the Government benches indicates that the Government is in a great deal of trouble over the sugar industry.

Let us have a look at what the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) has done. He is a man who is held in high regard in every primary industry in Australia because he is a straight shooter and because he knows his job. The Government knows what he said to Queensland. He said, "Yes, the Federal Government will help out; but let us examine the industry. We have done our homework; you do your own homework. Then we will get together on it." The Government of Queensland said, "No. The Feds have to wear the lot." The Government wears the good times; it wears the bad times as well. I know that it is difficult for Government members to be honest about it.

The member for Mackay (Mr Casey) made an excellent speech on the sugar industry. Everyone should read it. I know that half the National Party members were not present; in fact, they are never in the Chamber. They should read his speech and learn about the sugar industry. The member for Mackay knows what he is talking about.

I turn to another aspect of the primary industry of this State—the hen industry. The Premier makes sweeping claims about Queensland being a low-tax State. What have Kerin and the Federal Labor Government done? They have abolished the hen levy. No longer is there a Federal tax on hens. This mob in Queensland, however, which a long time ago forced the little people out, cares only about the big people. Anybody who is struggling receives no sympathy. This mob just sits there keeping the big fellows in and imposing massive taxes on the hen industry. In comparison, the Federal Government has abolished the hen levy. No wonder there is very little mention of primary industries in the Governor's Opening Speech.

At the moment there is a scandal and political cover-ups concerning pork-producers. Various statements have emanated from the Minister's office in an attempted cover-up. We have had the peanut scandal, the dairy industry scandal, the barley board scandal, the wheat board scandal and the horrible mix-up in the fishing industry, which was one of the first to go. There is hardly an orderly marketing system left in the State to go

wrong. Those boards are riddled with scandal, money going into the pockets of all sorts of people, trips being taken and political cover-ups. If the journalists of this State were able to get to the bottom of it all, that would be the end of the Government. Unfortunately, that has not happened. Along with mining, primary production is the most important sector of Queensland's economy, yet there was very little mention of it in the Governor's Opening Speech. The reason is the incompetence and corruption of the Government.

I turn now to the speeches of two members of the National Party. The member for Burdekin mentioned sacred sites. He raved on in an indecipherable manner about land rights. He was totally incoherent and irrational. He mentioned that this was a Christian country and that he did not have much time for sacred sites. I would like to know what has happened to freedom of religion. Does this Government not accept that a person has the right to worship as he wishes, or to not worship at all? If someone holds a different belief—a religious tradition that is thousands of years old—he is cast aside because he is not a Christian. What does the member for Burdekin want to do? Does he want to bulldoze the synagogues, just as the National Party bulldozed Aboriginal settlements, such as Mappoon? It forced people out at the point of a gun and burnt their houses? Is that what he wants to do to people who are not Christian in their beliefs? It is rather difficult for people such as the member for Burdekin to understand that people might have very old traditions. Many people on that side of the House—and, unfortunately, across the full spectrum of our society—will not admit that traditional medicine exists in the Aboriginal community. People involved in western medicine in those areas admit that traditional medicine has a significant role to play. Once that is realised, it is not difficult to go a step further and appreciate the significance of traditional religious beliefs.

The member for Burdekin later referred to the ABC program "Points North" He wants the Federal Government to step in and take over the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, or to tell the ABC what to do. I remind him and his comrades from the National Party that one of their own comrades——

Government Members interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I am sorry. I forgot that "comrades" is a word that only the Returned Services League is allowed to use, and then only on Anzac Day.

What about Senator Bonner, a leading light of the Liberal and National Party cause in this State? He is one of the commissioners. The member for Burdekin should speak to him about north Queensland. Other people from the conservative side—the Sinclairs and the Anthonys—are the first to get on their soap-box and to cry shame whenever there is a hint that the Labor Party might try to influence the ABC—not that it ever does. However, today a number of the National Party are on public record as saying that the ABC should be politically interfered with. I suggest that the honourable member for Burdekin talk to his Tory mates on the commission and get them to do something about it.

The ripper that I am about to read comes from the Premier's great Enterprise Queensland tour to the old country. Of course, the Premier does not come from the old country; he comes from somewhere else. The article in the "Telegraph" of 4 September is headed—

"Joh takes State battle to Mrs T"

The Premier had a half hour meeting with Mrs Thatcher. The article commences—

"Queensland Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, today took his fight for state rights to 10 Downing Street.

Sir Joh handed Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher a letter, during a half-hour meeting, setting out the links his Government wants to preserve with the British Parliament and monarchy.

Aides said the Premier wanted to make sure Britain was aware of Queensland's position in the event of a breakdown of an understanding between the Commonwealth and States on severing residual links with the UK."

Mr Davis: Do you know what she said when she received the letter? She nearly burst her sides with laughter!

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member is stealing my speech. The article continues—

"The links are enshrined in a British Act of Parliament which must be amended to give any changes effect.

The subject was raised briefly at the last Premier's Conference where, Sir Joh said, it was clear all governments had agreed on a common approach."

The term "Sir Joh" is offensive to the monarchy. The Premier was dubbed "Sir Johannes", which is what he should be called. For him to change the title given to him by the Queen is a mark of disrespect to her.

An aide to the Premier has said that Queensland has agreed to severing links with the old country. Yet members of the Government have stood in this Chamber and said exactly the opposite. The boys and girls from the Government side should get their facts straight and tell the people of Queensland what they are really on about.

Do honourable members remember how the Premier said Queensland would not give in over the border between Australian and Papua New Guinea? However, the Premier gave in. Anybody who talks to the Torres Strait Islanders will be told how those who used to be the Premier's best supporters now laugh at him. The member for Cook (Mr Scott) will confirm that. The Islanders will state what a hypocrite and deceitful person the Premier is. That is the reputation the Premier has gained in the Torres Strait over his statements that he would not back down on the border issue.

The "Telegraph" to which I have already referred continues—

"He said the States would scrap remaining avenues of appeal to the Privy Council but Queensland had insisted on a consolidation of the right of State Premiers to approach the Queen directly on the appointment and dismissal of governors.

Premiers also wanted to maintain the right to make recommendations on Imperial honours."

Because the granting of Imperial honours is one of the National Party's chief sources of fund-raising for election campaigns, it is no wonder that the Queensland Government wants to maintain them. How much does a knighthood cost these days—\$20,000 or \$45,000?

Mr Milliner: \$100,000.

Mr UNDERWOOD: \$100,000 for a knighthood! I wonder how much the big ones cost. No wonder the Premier and the National Party, with the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, want to maintain the right to recommend Imperial honours. Considering some of the thieves, rogues and disreputable people who have received a knighthood in this State, it would be an absolute insult to receive one.

Mr Milliner: I believe you can get them on Bankcard, now.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I am sure that if a person has a sufficient limit on his Bankcard, he can get a knighthood on it. I wonder whether Visa card is accepted, too?

The article in the "Telegraph" continues—

"Sir Joh said Mrs Thatcher was 'very interested in the whole area'

He said Mrs Thatcher did not seem 'quite aware' of what had been happening in Australia.

'I gave her a rundown on the political situation, on attitudes to the anthem, the flag and so on.' the Premier said."

That article appeared in the "Telegraph", which is part of the Queensland Newspapers network. Although I have not been able to find it, I have been told that buried in the back pages of "The Courier-Mail" of the following day was a small story about how the Premier had seriously embarrassed the British Government with that piece of misinformation.

An article in the "Daily Sun", a newspaper printed in opposition to "The Courier-Mail", stated that the Premier had riled Mrs Thatcher and that the envoys had denied support for the Premier's proposition. On the one hand the Premier has said that he has the support of Mrs Thatcher yet, on the other hand because of the incorrectness, putting it nicely, of the Premier's statement and those of his aides, a major diplomatic manoeuvre was required. That article in the "Daily Sun" reported that a rare statement denying support for Sir Joh came from the British High Commission in Canberra. That is the nature of the diplomatic embarrassment that the Premier of this State and his entourage caused the British Government.

The report continues—

"It is understood that the British Government was particularly concerned at being caught up in the constitutional row because of the looming Federal election.

The Queensland Government indicated it would be happy to go along with moves to sever residual links with Britain."

Government members make a deal of noise about the monarchy, the British Parliament, the good old days of the old country and the British Empire, but the reality behind the scenes is totally different.

As well as embarrassing the British Government very recently, in the 1970s the Premier embarrassed none other than the Queen of Australia by the ridiculous, unconstitutional act of declaring her Queen of Queensland. During the constitutional crisis in 1975, the monarchy clearly displayed that it does not and will not become involved in Australian politics at a State or Federal level. However, in the 1970s, for sheer political purposes, the Premier went ahead and embarrassed the Queen.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: It is very bad form to downgrade one's country when overseas.

Some time ago I made a speech about the Premier's role in his Enterprise Queensland campaign in places like Japan. He deliberately set out to downgrade Australia's reputation and create a divisiveness that has had a detrimental effect on Australia's reputation overseas with such important nations as Japan.

I come now to the refusal of an acceptance to negotiate, let alone discuss and accept, a recent million-dollar offer from the Federal Government to upgrade Queensland's tourist and national park facilities in north Queensland. Do Government members realise how much was allocated for the National Parks and Wildlife Service as disclosed in the most recent report? The expenditure summary for 1982-83 totals \$11,457,437. Queensland was offered a million-dollar boost, or an almost 10 per cent increase in the national park budget, and the offer was knocked back out of hand because of the divisiveness which is the hallmark of this Government.

I have a short selection from the litany of crying poor by State Government Ministers. When they are offered \$1m, virtually without strings, they refuse to even talk about it. Where are Government members from north Queensland? I do not see them calling for that \$1m to be spent on the tourist industry, which is one of the main northern industries. National parks are part of the tourist industry, but northern Government members are silent. They do not want the \$1m.

One headline reads, "Labor housing claim hypocrisy: Wharton". The Minister was calling for "more funds which were rightfully Queensland's". Another claims that Mr Tenni criticised the Federal Government's refusal to supply natural disaster relief for roads. Yet Senator Colston said that Queensland had never had so much money. Another

is headed, "Dudded on health, says Austin." The Minister for Health called on me to get more funds from Dr Blewett, and the ALP did. The next one is headed, "Hospitals face cash crises Bjelke threatens to cut service." Another is headed, "Lack of cash hits our hospitals." The next is headed, "State hospitals missing \$20m." Another reads, "Elderly face home crisis." Yet another reads, "\$150m road funds increase is urged." That related to a call by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing for more funds for roads. Another is headed, "Bleak outlook for State's highways." In that, Mr Hinze was reported as saying, "Queensland needs a great deal more money—not less." Another statement calling for more funds from the Commonwealth for roads was headed, "Roads make Hinze ashamed." He was calling for money from the Commonwealth. Another is headed, "Queensland to seek Federal aid for sugar." Another article is headed, "Joh Angry on Sugar Loan." In part, it reads, "The Premier yesterday declared war on the Federal Government over sugar industry finance." The Premier called for \$100m to fill the gap.

The Ministers who have been criticising the Federal Government are the same people who have refused \$1m for national parks, or almost a 10 per cent increase in the budget for national parks. Under the heading "Blast for Federals over University Funds—Advice ignored: Powell", another article states—

"But the Queensland Government cannot do anything except make representations to the Federal Government.

'In 1973 the Federal Government took over the total responsibility for funding tertiary education,' he said."

One hears that almost daily. The Queensland Government was offered \$1m for national parks, which need a large injection of funds, but it rejected the offer out-of-hand.

I could go on for another 40 minutes and not cover the same ground. The National Party Government did not mention the sugar industry in the Governor's Opening Speech. What a shame and a disgrace! It should be thrown out of office.

Mr RANDELL (Mirani) (8.1 p.m.): I have just listened to the greatest load of garbage that I have heard in this Chamber. The honourable member for Ipswich West cannot possibly believe everything that he said. He spoke about sugar cane. I do not know how much sugar cane is grown in the electorate of Ipswich West. He was an excellent companion on our visit to the sugar-growing countries in the South Pacific, but he certainly does not know anything about sugar. It is clear that he does not know what he is talking about. If he remains in the Chamber, he will hear how good the Federal Budget was to Queensland and to primary industries. He will also hear about the broken promises.

Mr Campbell: What about your broken promises?

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member has had his go.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr RANDELL: I thought that the honourable member for Ipswich West had the ability to gather his facts but, after listening to him tonight, I am afraid that he does not have that ability.

I support and congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Surfers Paradise, and the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Fassifern.

Through His Excellency the Governor, Sir James Ramsay, I also pledge my allegiance and loyalty to the Crown. I have had the good fortune and pleasure of meeting Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay several times when they have visited my electorate. On one occasion I met them at a reception in Nebo, and on another occasion I met them at a reception in Dysart when Sir James Ramsay officially opened the civic centre.

Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay mix very well with all people and are accepted by all people. They have travelled extensively throughout Queensland. Sir James is one of the most popular Governors ever, and he has made a great contribution to Queensland. On behalf of the people in my electorate of Mirani, I wish Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay a pleasant and happy retirement.

I share the concern of many members on this side of the House about the trend developing in Australia to downgrade traditional links with the monarchy and to sneer at traditional standards of decency and a basic way of life.

Mr Davis: What about the flag?

Mr RANDELL: I will get to that shortly. I am completely horrified by some of the ways of life and different standards that have been suggested, and, in some cases, implemented, to the detriment of traditional moral standards. The family unit is the basic concept of our society and must be protected at all times. Even though opposite pressures and views come from minorities, they must be resisted with all the strength that we can muster.

I have written down something that was said by an Opposition member. He said—

“I believe that private enterprise, materialism and the competitive ethic of capitalism are leading to the breakdown of the family unit. It is true, and I defy anybody to deny it, that those countries which have taken the capitalist experiment the furthest are the ones which have the most serious breakdowns in the family unit. I am prepared to stand by that statement.”

As I say, that statement was made by an Opposition member and, when he was making it, there was not one interjection.

An Honourable Member: By whom was it made?

Mr RANDELL: It was made by the member for Cairns.

The standards of socialism must be rejected at all times. The majority of people in Queensland still want the free-enterprise system, with the democratic rights that exist under that system.

Mr Casey: The sugar industry is the most socialised industry in Australia.

Mr RANDELL: I will get to the honourable member shortly. I ask him to stick around for a while.

Tonight I intend to speak a little about my electorate, the sugar industry, the Federal Budget, its impact on rural industries and the performance of the Federal Government, and to reply to some of the statements that have been made by Opposition members.

During this debate, several Opposition members have made comments about the RSL. I notice that the member for Mackay is listening intently and I know that he has great respect for the RSL, as I have. Members of that organisation have earned the right to speak about affairs in Australia; but members on the opposite side of the House—

Mr Fouras: Respect for the RSL, but not for the leaders.

Mr RANDELL: I am speaking not about the leaders but about members of the RSL. I have respect for the RSL. My father fought in World War I, and I had an uncle who died in that war. I have a brother and a cousin who fought in World War II. They fought to protect this nation, as did many of my friends, some of whom did not return. I believe that members of the RSL have the right to make comments on the flag and on the national anthem and about how this nation should be defended, because they know the horrors of war and they would do anything in their power to avert any conflict that may lead to war.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr RANDELL: Albert Abbott is a very decent man.

I would like Opposition members to listen to what I have to say. Members of the RSL fought to keep this nation free and fought to retain the Australian way of life. Honourable members on the other side of the House should remember that they can stand up in this place and criticise me, the Premier and the leaders of the Government because they have freedom of speech. They can write a letter to the paper without anyone criticising them. They should remember that they can do that only because members of the RSL and people like them fought for that right. In only about 12 countries in the world have citizens the right to do such things. In many countries, if Opposition members spoke out as they have tonight, they would be convicted of treason, declared enemies of the State and, in some cases, sentenced to terms of imprisonment; in extreme cases, they would be shot.

Recently, a senior Minister in the Federal Government gave Australians the advice that, if the nation was invaded, the enemy should be met with passive resistance.

Mr Kaus: That is shocking.

Mr RANDELL: As the member for Mansfield said, that is shocking. He fought for Australia, and I think that he is disgusted with what is happening.

I wonder what that Federal Minister means. Does he suggest that Australians should bury themselves up to the neck in soil? Should Australians chain themselves to trees or just lie in front of the tanks that come ashore? That would be too ridiculous to think about. Men who make statements such as that are now administering this great nation. Members of the RSL must be ashamed, and some of the fallen men must turn in their graves. Every Australian should be prepared to fight for his family, his rights, his way of life and his freedom.

In recent years, the Federal Government tried to disband the school cadet units, and only public pressure stopped it from doing so.

Mr Davis: Actually, that was a joke.

Mr RANDELL: Well, it was a pretty poor sort of a joke. If it was not so serious, it probably would be funny.

Young people have joined school cadet units voluntarily; it is not a compulsory service. They have developed a sense of pride, discipline and respect for the school units to which they belong. In my own area of Sarina, an excellent school cadet unit is administered by Paul and Pat Carrol, and by many others. I know that they will do everything they can to keep that unit going. They do an excellent job, without thought of personal gain, in the knowledge that the work they do will produce better citizens and a better Australia. I am proud to be associated with them, and I offer them all the help that I can.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr RANDELL: An honourable member asked me how I help them. I am public-spirited and give them all the help I can.

Mr Price interjected.

Mr RANDELL: The member for Mount Isa just made a comment. I think that he is still smarting from the defeat that Mount Isa suffered from Mackay in the Foley Shield. I would just like to say that quite a few members in that team came from my electorate. As I say, we breed pretty good citizens in Mirani. They are bigger and better than those in Mount Isa.

I wish to speak now about several developments in my electorate, which, I believe, is the most progressive and important electorate in the State. It is widely known that Mirani has the Dalrymple Bay and Hay Point export terminals, which, I understand, are the biggest in the world. The rail line linking the Bowen Basin coal-fields has been constructed and is in the process of being duplicated. It is expected that that duplication

will be finished later this year. Contrary to what members of the Opposition say, that is another example of the many jobs that the Government is providing for people in the community. The Opposition says that the Government is not doing anything.

The Minister for transport has announced that a major electrification scheme is to be embarked upon. That scheme is to be designed in the first instance to haul coal from the central Queensland coal-fields to the seaports more efficiently, more economically and more quickly.

Stage 1 will see the electrification of the main line from Gladstone and Rockhampton, west to Blackwater and the coal mines in that area. However, it is Stage 2 in which I am keenly interested. It will involve the electrification of the coal lines from Dalrymple Bay to Hay Point and the coal-fields in the hinterland in my electorate. Eventually it will link up with Stage 1.

I understand that several major contracts have already been let, including contracts for the installation of electrical overhead wiring, transformers, gear and so on. It is expected that the first of the electric locomotives will be operating between Gladstone and Rockhampton by 1986. Stage 1 of the project should be finished by July 1987, and Stage 2 by December 1987. I have been advised that Stage 2 will cost approximately \$300m.

Contracts have been let for the supply of 146 electric locomotives, at a cost of \$189m. In Australia's history, that order is easily the biggest at one time for the construction of rolling-stock. It will create employment at Brisbane, Maryborough, Gladstone and Toowoomba. I am reminding honourable members once again of the initiatives that this Government is taking.

Mr Prest: What are you using for money?

Mr RANDELL: The money will be found, as it is for all other projects.

Mr Prest: Whereabouts?

Mr RANDELL: If the honourable member listens, he will learn that the locomotives will bring a dramatic saving in costs. One fewer locomotive will be required on each joint coal train. Four electric locomotives will do the job that five diesel-electric locomotives do now. A saving of at least one-third will be effected in maintenance costs, and there will also be a tremendous saving in fuel costs. The completed electrification project will save more than 90 million litres of diesel fuel each year. That is approximately half the total Queensland Railway Department's requirements.

The savings that I have outlined are of such a magnitude that the project is expected to be self-funding in approximately 10 years. This project means that millions more export dollars will be earned and more jobs will be created in Queensland. That is something of which even members of the Opposition should be proud.

I turn now to the construction of a tugboat harbour near Half Tide, South Sarina, at a cost of \$14.4m. That harbour will service the coal terminals at Hay Point and Dalrymple Bay. It will be unique in that it will not cost the State anything; the cash to pay for it is available already. Funds for the harbour have been accumulated for that purpose by the Harbours Corporation since 1975.

Mr Eaton: Why couldn't they put the harbour in Mackay where they have a small-boat harbour?

Mr RANDELL: If the honourable member likes to listen, he will hear some more about it. It is more economical to construct a harbour at Half Tide. It will take approximately 18 months to complete and will be managed on behalf of the Harbours Corporation by a joint venture consisting of the coal companies that use the Dalrymple Bay and Hay Point coal-exporting facilities. Apart from the advantages to be gained from locating the tugs in close proximity to the export terminals, and the obvious saving in time—I believe that it takes approximately one hour for a tug to travel from Mackay

down to the ships at Hay Point—a significant saving will be effected in insurance premiums. I understand that within a few years the savings in insurance premiums will pay for the infrastructure. The harbour will be a base for small craft operated by both local people and tourists.

I have impressed on the Minister quite a few times the need for construction of a boat-ramp as part of the original project. That would provide some compensation for the disadvantages that will be suffered by the region during the construction period. A small-boat harbour will certainly bring more trade, with more yachts calling in. It will certainly mean more jobs with the business people.

The honourable member for Ipswich West referred to the Federal Budget. He claimed that it would be of great help to the people of Australia. However, he did not say very much about primary industries.

Mr Menzel: Where is he now?

Mr RANDELL: He has left the Chamber.

I want to deal first with the effects of the May mini-Budget and turn later, perhaps, to the August Budget. The major theme of the Labor party's election campaign centred on the need for consensus and consultation. So far, we have seen very little of either, particularly in primary industries, since Labor came to office.

Labor also has espoused the need for equality of sacrifice in terms of economic decisions it would make. But both the May and August budgetary exercises have demonstrated that the primary industries sector has been hit more heavily than any other industry sector. It has been asked to bear the brunt of economic sacrifices more than any other sector.

In the May mini-Budget the general depreciation allowance was reduced. No such forecast was made before the election. The tax incentive was removed from the income equalisation deposit scheme. The election promise was to maintain the IED scheme and pay a realistic interest rate on deposits. There was no hint that the tax incentive element would be dropped. The excise on aviation fuel was increased by 2c a litre. No such forecast was made before the election. The special depreciation allowance for petroleum storage was abolished. Once again, no such forecast was made. The automatic in-out opting provisions of tax averaging were abolished. The election commitment was simply to maintain tax averaging. Those promises have been broken.

The bicentennial water resources program was cancelled. The subsidy payable under the petroleum products freight subsidy scheme was to be reduced by \$10m in 1983-84. No such forecast was made before the election. The mini-Budget provided for increased interest charges for Telecom and Australia Post, which resulted in higher telephone and postal charges.

I turn now to the August 1983 Budget, which imposed a massive increase in export inspection charges from 1 October 1983 by up to 200 per cent (from \$1.80 to \$5.40 per head for cattle) for the export meat trade. No forecast of such an increase was made before the election. Only \$20m was provided for wool promotion in 1983-84. The election commitment was for the provision of \$28m. Earlier, Opposition members told me that the entire amount had been allocated. Only \$1m was provided for the national soil conservation program in 1983-84. The election promise was to provide \$4m in the first year. Queensland might have received only \$100,000 out of that.

An excise tax was imposed on fortified wine. There was a further cut-back in the petroleum products freight subsidy scheme, especially hitting safe anchorages used by northern fishing fleets. No pre-election forecast of such a cut-back was made. Because of public pressure, the Government backed down on that decision in mid-November. It removed tax concessions for clearing and cultivating new land and swamp drainage. No forecast was made of that move before the election.

The Budget removed the sales tax exemption for oils and lubricants. Again, there was no forecast of that removal before the election.

I turn now to the 1984 Budget. Opposition members have told me that it was a good Budget.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr RANDELL: Not one member of the Opposition is interested in primary industries.

As a percentage of total Budget outlays, the primary industry sector received only half of one per cent, which is less than any other major industry portfolio. Farmers paid an estimated \$25m in 1983-84 because the Government failed to index the rebate on diesel fuel used for on-farm purposes, after it had increased and indexed the excise tax on diesel. The rebate will be indexed, but not until 1 February 1985.

All honourable members know about the tax that has been imposed on the Australian wine industry. Labor is continuing to short-change the wool industry over promotion. In its election campaign, it promised \$28m a year over three years. In the August 1983 Budget it provided only \$20m. For 1984-85, Labor will provide an estimated \$26m. The shortfall of what was promised in the election campaign is \$10m. In 1984-85 growers will provide approximately \$54m towards wool promotion. Honourable members know what has happened to the sugar and dairy industries, and I could go on and on about the dried fruit industry.

The Rural Adjustment Scheme funding has been slashed by \$18.7m, or 42 per cent on last year. Where are the good points in the Budget? In 1984-85, Labor will provide for national soil conservation what it promised in the election campaign that it would provide in its first Budget, namely, \$4m. That is clearly well short of what was promised. Tonight I made some calculations in relation to the \$4m. The Queensland allocation is \$610,000. As Queensland has 3.3 million hectares susceptible to erosion, it has received 26c to combat soil erosion on each hectare. That is the value that the Federal Government has put on the land. It needs to be remembered that soil erosion is irreversible. Once it has been washed away, the soil cannot be put back. It is lost for ever.

Mr Kruger: What has the Queensland Government done about it?

Mr RANDELL: Last year it provided \$6m. Soil erosion is a national problem that ought to be tackled nationally by a Federal Government prepared to face up to its responsibilities.

Mr Price interjected.

Mr RANDELL: The member for Mount Isa knows as much about the land as he does about football—and that is not very much.

The increase from 2.5 per cent to 4 per cent in the depreciation allowance for non-residential income-producing buildings will not act as a significant stimulus to on-farm investment. In addition, there has been another increase in the excise on aviation fuel.

An Opposition Member: This will make headlines!

Mr RANDELL: No, it will not make headlines, but I gain a great deal of satisfaction from alerting the Opposition to the facts.

The 1984 Federal Budget has failed completely to acknowledge that, during the last financial year, agriculture provided the major stimulus to the national economy. The stimulus to the economy for which the Hawke Government is claiming the credit can be traced to the breaking of the drought. The Hawke Government must be looked upon in the same light as that destructive administration of the ALP's great white hope, Gough Whitlam, who ruled this land from 1972 to 1975. I am sure that Opposition members are beginning to shudder when they consider what might happen to them if the socialist trend continues in Australia. They will be shattered in rejection, as the State ALP was in 1974 when it was reduced to 11. The trend is towards such a rejection nationally. Anyone who does not believe me has only to wait until Hawke brings down his Budget next year, if by some fluke he is returned to power.

Mr Casey: Those 11 were pretty good. They were as good as the West Indians.

Mr RANDELL: The member for Mackay might have been the leader—no, at that time he had been thrown out of the party. He was not even one of the 11. He had been thrown out and was an Independent. The trend is towards a similar rejection now.

Let it be remembered that the primary sector of the economy has the power to make or break the Government, and I make no excuse for saying so. A strong rural economy is the basis for a strong Australia. However, the Federal Government does all in its power to attack and demoralise rural people. It will live to regret it.

I will now quote from some statements by Mr Hawke and Mr Kerin. In his rural policy speech delivered on 20 February last year, Mr Hawke said—

“I began this speech by talking about the great contribution which Australian primary industries, and the people, had made to the character and wealth of this country. Governments and indeed, Australians in all walks of life have an obligation to give greater recognition to that contribution.”

When we think what he has done, isn't that a laugh! In support of him, Kerin said—

“Farmers can rest assured they will lose nothing under Labor and stand to gain much.”

They are the broken promises of the Hawke Government.

The sugar industry will wait in vain for Mr Hawke and Mr Kerin to honour the promises they made before the last Federal election to give assistance to the sugar industry. They ought to make it a top priority by providing a scheme to underwrite the No. 1 Pool price. Apart from an initial grant of \$10m last year, they have refused to give anything.

The Federal Government said that it was awaiting the IAC report, yet now it says that it is waiting for an internal review of the industry to be completed before it offers any assistance. Mr Kerin has been quoted as saying that assistance should go to the needy, not the greedy. In reply to that I shall quote from the editorial in the latest edition of the “Australian Canegrower” as follows—

“In response to Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen who relayed to the Commonwealth the Queensland decision to pledge \$5 million towards RAS Part B for 1984/85, John Kerin said his government was not prepared to add a matching \$5 million for the current financial year or beyond.

There was a painful sting in the tail of the Federal response which was to the effect that no further RAS Part B funding would be considered until the Sugar Industry Review Programme had been finalised and its conclusions implemented—possibly mid 1987!

That answer was particularly revealing for two reasons. Firstly, it was out of character with Minister Kerin who sees ‘the need to get funds to those who need them’ In that regard RAS Part B is quite specific in its target—it provides carry-on loans (not grants) to those with an urgent and unfulfilled need for cash for crop production and harvesting. If you prefer, it gives farmers with income problems ‘another crop/another year’ to sort out their predicament. In many cases it will give the over-committed grower and his family a chance to leave the industry with dignity, with the time and manner of their leaving determined by themselves.

In other words, Part B is dedicated to helping growers now—not later!

Secondly, it reveals that John Kerin has not understood the objective of the review programme. It is not intended ‘to dig farmers out of the hole they are in now’. That has to be done by whatever means possible—and as soon as possible.”

Mr Kruger: What is your answer to digging the industry out of that hole? What does your Government intend to do?

Mr RANDELL: The Federal Government should establish an underwriting scheme.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Mr Row): Order! I should tell the honourable member for Murrumba that I am having difficulty determining who is making this speech, the member for Mirani or him. When the member for Murrumba asks a question by way of interjection, I do not expect him to answer it. He should await a reply from the member for Mirani. If he does not receive a reply, he should desist from interjecting. At the moment the member for Murrumba is disturbing the Chamber.

Mr RANDELL: In this House I have always heard a great deal about the plight of the sugar industry and its effect on the workers, the farmers and the towns on the entire eastern coast of Queensland. I am receiving no help from that side of the House now. Once again I ask every honourable member of this House to support me in the call for assistance from the Federal Government.

I said that I would reply to some of the contributions that have been made to the debate. I shall reply to the honourable member for Mackay who, once again, displayed his lack of knowledge of the sugar industry in his lengthy speech in this House on 30 August.

An Opposition Member: He can play football, though.

Mr RANDELL: I do not know how many members he had on his team. Certainly the country boys were the strength of it.

In an endeavour to politicise the sugar industry's problems, he sprinkled his speech with half-truths and figments of his imagination. I say that with all sincerity.

The industry is a large earner of foreign currency for the nation and the Hawke Government cannot shirk its responsibilities when, because of the price problems and the export market, the industry is at its lowest ebb. In the good years, the Federal Government reaps the benefits by way of taxes. It is a national problem that should be handled by a national Government with the guts to get in there and do something.

The member for Mackay alleged that the Government has not done enough for the industry. The help given by the Queensland Government has been outlined on many, many occasions, but what has the industry received from the Federal Government—broken promises and practically nothing else! Although most of the outbursts from the member for Mackay are not worthy of response, I feel that it is necessary to correct some of his falsehoods. In 1976, the European Economic Community was a net importer of sugar and literally no-one could have forecast that, within a few years, it would develop into the second largest exporter of sugar in the world. If Australia was wrong in signing the 1977 International Sugar Agreement, so were all the other exporters and importers, including the USA. All honourable members know how easy it is to speak with the benefit of hindsight. If the honourable member had had the ability to forecast the chain of events in the world sugar market from 1977 until now, he would still be Leader of the Opposition. However, nobody could have forecast that.

The honourable member for Mackay also spoke about the poor quality of Queensland's product. I remind him that the industry is recognised for its high quality product. Using almost all of the criteria to measure the quality of raw sugar, its quality is the best in the world and I am proud of that. The industry became conscious of the importance of quality in the 1950s. In fact, the financial incentive scheme for mills was introduced in 1956 when a penalty was applied for the first time. That scheme has now been expanded to embrace a number of quality criteria.

The honourable member's call for industry-backed research is not new. I take my hat off to those in the industry who in past years saw the writing on the wall with regard to the need for a quality product. Their actions have benefited both growers and millers.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member had his say. He lambasted the Government. He should let me answer him. He will have to cop it. Tonight, Government members had to listen to the member for Ipswich West speaking about the Hawke Government.

The honourable member for Mackay may not like this, but he will have to sit there and cop it.

Surely it is not too difficult for the honourable member to appreciate that, in times of surplus and low world market prices, buyers are interested only in purchasing from those having a high-quality product. Others are forced to take "as is" prices, leaving them in an even worse position. Queensland has the best quality sugar in the world, and I am proud of it. I know the honourable member for Mackay is proud of it, too. Many of his comments are made only for purposes of political expediency.

The honourable member told us that, with the loss of the United Kingdom market, Rex Patterson signed a long-term agreement with Japan. That is not the full truth; it is only half the truth, and he knows that.

Mr Casey: You know full well that the Commonwealth signs the agreements.

Mr RANDELL: Because of the Federal Government's export controls, Rex Patterson may have signed an exchange of letters between the two Governments. The agreement was a commercial arrangement between the buyer and the seller, as are all contracts for the sale of Queensland sugar. CSR Limited is the appointed agent for the Queensland Government and, as such, it negotiates and signs all contracts. Rex Patterson did not own the sugar. I am not criticising Rex Patterson, because he is a friend of mine and I have a high regard for him. The Commonwealth Government did not sign the agreement.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr RANDELL: Because I have only limited time, I will not answer the honourable member.

The Japanese market for sugar has declined because of high internal support prices. The member for Mackay knows that. He has had his chance to make a speech. He knows that the Japanese markets declined because of high internal support prices, increased usage of alternative sweeteners and higher domestic production.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There are far too many interjections. It is difficult to hear what the honourable member for Mirani is saying. I suggest to the honourable member for Mackay that, in the circumstances, his eloquence is wasted.

Mr RANDELL: During the decline, the industry in Queensland has maintained roughly the same percentage share of the Japanese market, which is the State's most important export market.

As for the USSR market, let us get one fact straight: the industry does not have to beg any buyer to take its sugar at world market prices. Buyers come to the industry because of the quality of Australian sugar. Let there be no mistake about Australia having the highest quality sugar in the world. I will say time and again that I am proud of that. The USSR market was developed over some years. I understand that a very good trading relationship exists. The actions of the cane-growers in becoming involved in the fertiliser business is very helpful to that trade. But these arrangements are not tied—barter or otherwise—to the sale of sugar. The honorable member knows that. Anyone who has attended an annual conference of one of the industry associations knows that.

The United States quota system is actually assisting the industry because of the high prices being received for that sugar, albeit for smaller quantities exported to that market. The industry's biggest worries with the United States of America—and the honourable member for Mackay may have mentioned this—relate to the type of farm program that will replace the existing program in 1986, and the loss of the market for sugar because of the generous umbrella for high-fructose corn syrup production provided by the farm-support scheme for the domestic cane and beet sugar industries.

Mr Casey: You know why Coca Cola won't use that sweetener; it is because of our quality problem.

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member knows that that is not right.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! To use some sugar jargon, I suggest to the honourable member for Mackay that he is "floctuating" the debate.

Mr RANDELL: As for the other main markets—Queensland is the major supplier to Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, New Zealand and Canada, and ranks either second or third in China.

I am amazed that the member for Mackay has used this Chamber to criticise and condemn the judgement of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. I would remind him that the board is composed of three voting members. One member is elected by the growers; another is appointed by the millers. The Government appoints the chairman, who, by legislation, must be a Supreme Court judge.

The only period during which it could possibly be claimed that there may have been political influence was when a Labor Government amended the legislation to allow the late Forgan Smith to be appointed chairman of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. The present Government again amended the Act to make the chairman of the board a Supreme Court judge.

To claim that the Government has given the Rocky Point mill a \$1m hand-out is just another indication of how lacking in knowledge of the sugar industry the honourable member for Mackay is. The Rocky Point mill and the Rocky Point Mill Suppliers Committee appealed to the board for an increase in the mill peak by 9 000 tonnes of sugar for one year only. The appeal was successful, and I am sure that that judgment was arrived at after much evidence was considered. To claim that there was Government interference is a despicable allegation for the member to make.

I still believe that the Federal Government could do much to help the sugar industry. The honourable member would do well to support this Government in trying to get that assistance. I know that he supports the Government in this matter, but he stretches the truth a little bit in trying to make political capital out of the misfortunes facing the sugar industry.

I could speak about roads, water supplies and other matters in my electorate, but I do not have the time tonight. As other members wish to speak in this debate, I conclude on that note.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (8.37 p.m.): The Address in Reply debate gives members an opportunity to speak on many subjects. I listened to the member for Mirani, the so-called sugar expert. I expected him to tell the House what the Premier of this State achieved in spending \$250,000 on an overseas trip to the United Kingdom. The Premier was rejected by the Prime Minister of that country.

When the Premier returned to Queensland, I expected him to tell us how he would help the ailing sugar industry. I have waited to hear some pronouncement from his news conferences, but he has been as silent as a tomb. We have not heard anything from him. That is a classic example of the way in which the Government operates.

The Government is trying to do in 1984 what it tried to do in 1974, that is, push all the blame for the inadequacies in this State onto the Federal Labor Government.

I have been a member of this Chamber since 1969, and I have heard many Government members moaning and whinging about soil erosion. What have they done about soil erosion themselves? Half of them want the money provided under soil erosion schemes for their own broken-down properties. When Government members come into the Chamber with plans to overcome the soil erosion problem, they will get the support of the Labor Government in Canberra.

Mr Eaton: The present Federal Government gave \$1m for that purpose last year. It increased the allocation this year. We are hearing all the criticism now. Before the money was provided, we heard no criticism about anything.

Mr DAVIS: That was a perfect speech from the member for Mourilyan. What he said is correct.

Members of the Labor Party are accused of being against primary industries. What rubbish! Many members in this House have been involved in primary industry and have come from primary industry stock, as I have. Every time I get the opportunity, I speak about primary industry because I am conscious of what our land means. Members of the Labor Party love the land and support the land because they have the interests of primary producers at heart. They are not like the crowd on the other side of the Chamber, the members of the Government, who get up in this place time and time again and bleat, whinge and moan and do absolutely nothing else.

I do not like to criticise the Governor. From what I have read in previous debates on the Address in Reply, it seems that the Governor had been placed in a position of having to deliver political speeches. It is unfair that the Governor of this State is handed a brief by the political propaganda machine of the National Party Government. I must say that it is getting worse. The Governor's Opening Speech this year is a good example. He stated—

“My Government, however, views with concern recent trends which attempt to downgrade our traditional links with the Monarchy.”

Where are they? I do not see them and I do not understand why members on this side of the House have to get up in this place time and time again to pledge their loyalty. There is no more loyal political party in this country than the Australian Labor Party. That loyalty was proved during the war years and in peace-time. I say to Government members that I do not have to stand up in this place and pledge my loyalty. The people of Australia know which is the most loyal political party.

Mr Eaton: The Governor did not want to do that; he was forced by the Government.

Mr DAVIS: What the member for Mourilyan says is true.

One paragraph in the Opening Speech reads as follows—

“Many Queenslanders are justifiably apprehensive about moves to change our National Flag and, rightly, question the reason for these moves.”

I ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker: Where is the disloyalty if people wish to say that there should be a change in the flag? I could not care two hoots about whether the flag is changed or not, but all Australians and all Queenslanders should have the right, if they wish, to put their views forward to change the flag. That is not being disloyal in any way. Was the Canadian who changed that nation's flag disloyal? If the people want to change the flag, that is up to them.

In another part of the Governor's Opening Speech, the Hawke Labor Government was criticised for changing the national anthem. That is one of the greatest innovations of the Hawke Government. Australia's gold medal winners at the Olympic Games were as proud as punch when the Australian national anthem, “Advance Australia Fair” was played. I defy any member of the House to stand in Queen Street and say that he is in favour of again changing the national anthem. He would be laughed out of the State.

In the Opening Speech, reference was made to a referendum. Government members must be the greatest hypocrites of all time when they say that they want a referendum. If my memory serves me correctly, time and time again in reply to an Opposition request for a public accounts committee and for other changes, the Premier has said, “The Government is here to govern.” That is exactly what the Hawke Government has done. The Federal Government changed the national anthem because, to use the terminology of the Premier, it is the Government and it is there to govern.

Mr Fouras: Do you think that the Premier would hold a referendum as to whether or not we want "Advance Australia Fair" in Queensland?

Mr DAVIS: On behalf of the member for South Brisbane I challenge the Premier to test the feeling of the State. A local government election will be held next year and, at a very small cost, he can put to the people of the State: "Are you in favour of changing 'Advance Australia Fair' back to some other country's national anthem?"

Mr Cahill: No.

Mr DAVIS: I guarantee that the honourable member for Aspley, who is a real nationalist—by that, I mean a real Australian—is well and truly in favour of "Advance Australia Fair".

Under this Government, which was formed by members of the National Party plus two—or is it plus three now that the honourable member for Ithaca has gone over and sided with National Party members?—democracy has gone downhill much faster than Opposition members thought it could. That has happened over the past 10 months or so since the election. Democracy is going downhill every day the Parliament meets.

Question-time has become a farce. I thought that by now the new Government back-benchers would have a little more backbone. Yet at question-time we see the farce of Dorothy Dix questions. Each morning, Dorothy Dix questions are handed to back-bench members so that they can be directed to the incompetent Ministers for answer.

I suggest that the Standing Orders Committee alter the Standing Orders to provide that when Dorothy Dix questions are to be asked, members of the Opposition be given an opportunity to read the answers before the Ministers get up and read them. That would save a tremendous amount of time.

The honourable members for Aspley and Toowong are eloquent television performers. They are well and truly used to cue cards. In order to assist those Government back-benchers who have trouble with words containing more than three or four letters, perhaps Mr Speaker could have installed one of those——

Mr Cahill: A prompter—an auto-cue.

Mr DAVIS: That is it; an auto-cue or a prompter. Those words are television jargon, which I am not used to. Either an overhead projector or a cue-card system could be installed to assist some of the National Party members and Ministers.

The honourable member for Mirani, who has just resumed his seat, read a prepared brief in answer to comments made by the Opposition members earlier. That is typical of what is occurring under this Government. I hate saying, "When I came here in 1969 ..." However, I will say that when I came to this place in 1969 the Cabinet contained competent Ministers such as Doug Tooth and Gordon Chalk——

Mr Innes: Liberals.

Mr DAVIS: I am pleased that the honourable member for Sherwood has entered the Chamber. I have not forgotten the Liberal Party; later I shall talk about its efforts.

I give credit where credit is due. Ministers such as Doug Tooth and Gordon Chalk would not only present legislation or the Budget, they would also reply to members who had spoken. They had the competence to reply to comments made by members. Since the National Party came to power, however, very few Ministers have had sufficient competence to reply to Opposition members' contributions. What Ministers have been doing is have their offices pass on to Government back-benchers replies for delivery on their behalf. That is pathetic.

Before the recess for dinner, honourable members heard a speech by the recently elected member for Stafford (Mr Gygar), who has made a return to this Chamber. While he was speaking, I shut my eyes and thought to myself, "Nothing has changed." In his usual nasty manner, he attacked political parties.

Mr Neal: He was out of the House for as long as you were.

Mr DAVIS: I was out of Parliament for only a short time. However, my circumstances were different; I had a short dispute with my electors. The difference is that they threw him out. The member for Stafford had a hard time gaining endorsement. He attacked political parties by some cheap political grandstanding. I thought that it was rather amusing.

Those members who were in the Chamber on that fatal day when it was moved that the establishment of a public accounts committee be debated would remember that Liberal Party members voted with the Opposition because they believed that a public accounts committee should be established. The first statement made by that great fighter for democracy was, "I believe that there should be a coalition." I assure honourable members that, from what I have heard of that great fighter for democracy, he will grovel his way back to that side of the House. There is no risk about that. I hope that the members of the Liberal Party will show just how much gumption they have. I have a feeling that on the Business Paper there is a notice of motion for the establishment of a public accounts committee. Perhaps when that motion is moved we will hear whether their views have changed. I am sure that the Opposition will receive the same support that was given by the Liberal Party on the last occasion.

Mr Innes interjected.

Mr DAVIS: The member for Sherwood is a great lover of Sir Samuel Griffiths. He is a small "I" Liberal who professes to believe in democracy with a capital "D". He is one person who will certainly support democracy in Queensland. I look forward to the day when the members of the Liberal Party show their support for democracy. I was nearly going to refer to the seven Liberal members of Parliament, but unfortunately the Liberal Party has recently lost one of its members. I would have thought that, for the sake of democracy, a statement would have been made informing the Parliament why the member for Ithaca left the Liberal Party. I heard a rumour that he left the Liberal Party purely and simply because the current member for Stafford was endorsed, and I understand that that is correct. While on the subject of seating arrangements in this Chamber, I point out that I always thought that under the Westminster system—I might have to ask Mr Kaus or Mr Miller or others who have journeyed to the great House of Commons where the Westminster system operates——

Mr Neal interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I doubt what the honourable member says, because that journey now seems to be purely a National Party junket. Government members travel to the House of Commons, but when they return we hear nothing more from them. They always say that the British system of democracy is terrific, but no move is made to implement it here. Mr Deputy Speaker, you may be able to tell me whether I am correct, but I always had the impression that the Opposition sat on the left-hand side of the Speaker and that Government members sat on his right-hand side. However, I notice that the member for Ithaca sits on the right-hand side of the Speaker. Perhaps he is not an Independent. Perhaps the rumours that I have heard that he might be an Independent Liberal Party-cum-National Party member are correct.

The member for Stafford (Mr Gygar), who so nastily attacked the Labor Party, is certainly not free of any stigma.

Sir William Knox: He could hold his seat in the by-election. That upsets you, doesn't it?

Mr DAVIS: No, it does not upset me.

I was pleased that the member for Stafford finally received the acknowledgement of the Liberal Party and was endorsed. I know that the member for Nundah, the leader of the Liberal Party, fought like hell to see that he did not get in. I was very pleased that yesterday's hero was overturned by the new small "I"—or was it middle-sized "I" or

coalitionist—Liberal. It is all very well for Liberal Party members to say that they won easily. However, if 39 votes had gone the other way, the Labor Party would have won the seat. As somebody once said, the difference between winning and coming second is the difference between kissing someone else and kissing your sister. I do not want to denigrate the Liberal Party.

Sir William Knox: We take it as a compliment.

Mr DAVIS: There is nothing wrong with the Labor Party. We are in Government federally and we will be in Government in this State after the next election.

I will now leave the Liberal Party. As somebody has said, if there is another ballot for leader—they have been critical of our leadership problems over the years—it will be a case of, "It's your turn next time, Angus.", or, "What about giving Terry a go?" That is Terry Gygarr, of course, not Terry White. The only one who has not been given a mention is poor old Norm. However, enough of the Liberal Party; it does not worry us very much.

I turn now to a local issue that has received a great deal of publicity over the last few weeks. I refer to the Spring Hill Fair. Normally, I would not criticise a charity, but the Spring Hill Fair has received publicity because the Brisbane City Council said to its convenor that certain conditions had to be met before a permit would be granted. The Spring Hill Fair requires the closure of Leichhardt Street and the adjoining streets. Over the years there have been problems because fire brigades and ambulances were unable to travel through what is an arterial road.

First, however, I will give some background to the matter. Even though the Brisbane City Council opposed the granting of a permit, by some means or other a permit was granted by the Police Department without any consultation whatsoever with the Brisbane City Council. I shall ask questions in the House in an attempt to obtain answers from the Police Department.

The Spring Hill Fair is run by a Miss Cecilia McNally. It commenced about 10 years ago, in 1973 or 1974. The original idea was to assist the Liberal Party. I do not know how a so-called charity could obtain permission to close off streets to run an event for a political party. At that time Miss McNally was a member of the Liberal Party. About \$3,000 was raised, but, unfortunately for the Liberal Party, Miss McNally would not hand it over. There must have been a falling out. Miss McNally, like the member for Wavell and the member for Merthyr—and perhaps the member for Ithaca—joined the National Party. It was the Country Party at that time.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I did not notice the Minister there. I am glad that the member for Wavell has joined us in the Chamber. He may have been involved with Miss McNally at that time. At that early stage he may have given her instructions on how to change to the National Party. I repeat that the \$3,000 raised by Miss McNally was supposed to go to the Liberal Party, but she took it.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I do not know whether the member for Wavell advised her. At that stage he was not a member. In any event, she would not give the money to the then Liberal Party candidate; she kept it. That resulted in a nice blue in the Liberal Party and that branch was disbanded. Miss McNally then joined the National Party.

That has been the history of the Spring Hill Fair. I do not believe that there is any sort of organisation or executive, but somehow or other Miss McNally and her friends are able to get the ear of somebody very important in the National Party and in the Government. I ask this question of every member in the House: How many people do they know who, without running any organisation or charity, can individually get permission to conduct licensed booths and run raffles and still have enough punch left in the community to be able to have roads closed?

Mr Austin: She knows someone!

Mr DAVIS: She knows someone?

Mr Austin: The former leader of the Opposition.

Mr DAVIS: Is that a joke?

Mr Austin: No.

Mr DAVIS: I am sorry.

In the short time I have left tonight I should mention an article written by Ian Miller whom I have always regarded as one of the bright journalists in Queensland. The article is on one of the myths expounded by the political propaganda machine of the National Party.

Mr Kaus interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I am sorry; I suppose the member for Mansfield does feel left out. I forgot to mention that he is yet another person who jumped that thin grey line over to the National Party.

Mr Fouras: Do you know there are more Liberals sitting with the National Party than current Liberal members in the House?

Mr DAVIS: That is an interesting observation and I give full credit to the member for South Brisbane for bringing it to the attention of the House.

In regard to the article by Ian Miller, I am sure the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), whom I regard as one of the bright lights of the financial world of Queensland—there is much argument in my party over that—would be able to answer the statement that one myth that should be dispelled right from the start is that poor old Queensland does very badly at the hands of the terrible socialists in Canberra in terms of tax-sharing on a per capita basis. That is more or less a joke, of course. These figures absolutely amaze me. New South Wales receives \$506 per person; Victoria, \$502; and Queensland, \$754.

Mr Austin: Excuse me——

Mr DAVIS: No, I am not asking the member for Wavell who does not have the ability to answer this question. I want the big barramundi, not one of the little tiddlers. I want an answer from the member for Somerset, the financial guru of this State. If he does not answer off the cuff tonight, I am sure that he will discuss it with Leo tomorrow and will be able to give the House some really good, straight-from-the-shoulder stuff.

I notice that the member for Merthyr has just entered the Chamber; I have already mentioned him.

Mr Miller's article studies the per capita grants that the State receives from tax-sharing.

Mr Gunn: You could not even understand it yourself.

Mr DAVIS: I am glad that the member for Somerset, who is partly responsible for finance in the State, has decided to speak. I do not pretend to be the greatest economist in the State but, rest assured, I am quite willing under any circumstances to debate finances with the member for Somerset. I reckon I will come out on top. With all due respect to the member for Somerset, to be quite truthful I regard him as being rather incompetent in matters of finance.

Mr Gunn: Fancy being judged by you!

Mr DAVIS: Have honourable members noticed that when the honourable member for Somerset is asked a question he generally answers, "Oh, we won Government." I have been waiting to find out why the Minister has not answered this question. The

Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology is also mentioned in this article. Because of this statement I am sure that the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer has read this article—

“But the infamous Ahern report led to an extraordinary reaction from the Deputy Premier and Minister assisting the Treasurer, Mr Bill Gunn, who described it as ‘utter hogwash’.”

The Ahern report has been standard reading for members of the ALP, but without even reading the report, the Minister Assisting the Treasurer described it as “utter hogwash”. I should like him to answer Mr Miller’s article, because that will save questions being asked in the House.

Mr Gunn: It would not even be worth wasting breath on.

Mr DAVIS: To make sure that that is in “Hansard”, I point out that the Minister said that Mr Miller is not worth answering.

The member for Cunningham, before he was defrocked as a Minister, made a comment to the effect that the Daintree area should never be touched. I should like to know what he thinks now that the Government has wrecked the area.

Opposition members are very interested in having the matter of video films debated. An article by Marion Smith referred to a statement made by the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, (Mr McKechnie), that he had no intention of attending a special Commonwealth/States meeting in Melbourne to review Australia-wide laws regulating pornography. As well as describing the meeting as a political exercise—and it was called largely in response to the concern about what are usually referred to as video nasties—Mr McKechnie said that it was not his duty to waste his time as a Minister of the Crown. Marion Smith said that she had been reliably informed that the Minister will not be wasting his time while the meeting is proceeding in Melbourne because from 25 to 30 September he will be leading a tourist junket around western Queensland and the Northern Territory! That is a classic example of the thoughts of a Minister who is alleged to be considering bringing in a Bill to regulate some of the censorship laws in Queensland.

Mr Lane: What is your position on pornography?

Mr DAVIS: It is quite clear. I do not believe that the people of Queensland are different from those in New South Wales. I certainly hope we will not go through the sort of rubbish we went through in 1974.

I should remind some of the newer members that, in 1974, this Government introduced a Bill to try to criticise and condemn the Federal Labor Government’s policy on the censorship of films.

Mr Lane: That happened several times.

Mr DAVIS: I am referring to the censorship of films. Government speaker after Government speaker rose in the Chamber——

Mr Lane interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I do not think that the Minister for Transport was a member of this Assembly at the time. He was still in the Police Special Branch, watching the people in Trades Hall and trying to watch me.

Mr Lane: 1974 was a bad year for you.

Mr DAVIS: We can all be nasty.

The Government introduced that legislation. Government speaker after Government speaker rose in this Chamber and said that he had seen an R-rated film. The then member for Mount Gravatt and the present member for Ithaca had seen “Last Tango in Paris”.

Mr Lane: Couldn't you get a crack at it?

Mr DAVIS: None of the Opposition members had even heard of it. During a recess, members were out in the area where the bar is presently located. A film called "The Age of Consent" was being screened on television. There was a nude scene in the film. At the time, six members of the Liberal and Country Parties were around the set, and when the nude scene came on they adjusted the fine tuner. I only hope that we will not hear that sort of criticism on this occasion.

I hope that when the legislation is introduced it will provide for adult censorship. Nasties on child pornography, etc., should not be allowed into the country. At the same time, other movies should be judged from the point of view of adults.

Mr Elliott: I would hate to see your glasses getting fogged up.

Mr DAVIS: I am glad that the member for Cunningham mentioned that. When Mr Newbery was the Minister in charge of film censorship, he took all the members of his party, including the member for Cunningham, to a little theatrette in Roma Street. They had a beer and prawn night. All they saw all night were the banned films that the rest of the people of Queensland were not able to see.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (9.12 p.m.): It is quite a challenge to rise to speak after such a diatribe. The member for Brisbane Central spent most of his time speaking about the Liberal Party. He brought honourable members up to date with newspapers that are three weeks old, and ended up in a state of incoherency. At one stage, I thought that he might have been thinking of defecting to the Liberal Party.

Tonight, I intend to speak about youth unemployment, the problems facing business, especially the small business community, the contribution that migrants have made to this State and the impact of the recent Federal Budget.

Before beginning, I join with many other members in expressing loyalty and support to the monarchy through our Governor, Sir James Ramsay. Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay have been unfailing in their willingness to traverse the State and to meet people. At the same time, they have given considerably of their time to many voluntary and charitable organisations throughout Queensland. I know that my constituents in Redcliffe join with me in expressing appreciation to both of them and in wishing them well in their forthcoming retirement.

There is no doubt that one of the most pressing problems facing Australia is the totally unacceptable level of youth unemployment. Although there is much politicking about the efforts in various States, with ALP members trying to promulgate the idea that the situation is far worse in Queensland than in the other States, and Government members, on the other hand, suggesting the reverse, the truth is that the figures throughout Australia are really a human tragedy.

For the benefit of the parliamentary record, I state that the figures for the various States at March 1984, as a percentage for the 15 to 19 year-old-age group, are: Tasmania, 33.2 per cent; New South Wales, 28.9 per cent; South Australia, 27.2 per cent; Western Australia, 26.9 per cent; Queensland, 23.1 per cent, and Victoria, 22.2 per cent. Although, by comparison, States such as Queensland and Victoria are better off than the other States, the figures are far from satisfactory and represent a terrible tragedy. To my mind, they are staggering. But it is not surprising when one considers the apparent collusion between industrial courts, trade unions and the ACTU, and the inaction of Federal and State Governments over the years. On a national basis, the comparative figures from the 1960s are very interesting. In 1964, the figure was 2.2 per cent; 1965, 2.8 per cent; 1966, 3 per cent; 1967, 3.8 per cent; 1968, 3.7 per cent; and 1969, 3 per cent. What a remarkable and quite staggering difference!

When one considers the actual number of permanent jobs available for young people, it almost seems that a deal has been done between employer bodies, corporations, Governments and big unions to discriminate against young people. For example, junior rates of pay have been eliminated from most awards. A junior award is becoming

rarity. That is reflected in the absence of young people in employment in small business. I am sure that every honourable member can remember young people working on farms and young people with jobs at service stations, at corner stores and so on. Just about every retail store of any consequence had young people working, even if only at menial jobs. Frankly, because of the rates of pay, the wage structure and the great impost on business today, in particular small business, business can no longer afford to employ young people.

In the few awards in which junior rates have been retained, those rates have been increased dramatically relative to adult awards. I am not suggesting that young people should be paid substandard wages, but wages have really got out of hand. So many businesses simply cannot afford to pay the wage levels that have been awarded by industrial courts, particularly over the last decade.

The Wran Government in New South Wales has announced its intention of doing away with junior rates of pay in the retail industry from January 1986. That is a good example of insanity. All that will do is put another bunch of kids out of work. It is certain that pressure will be applied on other States to do the same type of thing. The ACTU policy is that junior wage rates be further increased relative to adult wages. That will only exacerbate the situation.

Governments at both State and Federal level continue to discriminate against young people by choosing employees on the basis of experience. In members' electorate offices, how often have honourable members had young people ask them, "How can I get a job? Everywhere I go, people say that they want people with experience." How in the name of goodness are young people going to get experience if they cannot get a start in life?

Mr Prest: How many do you employ?

Mr WHITE: The member for Port Curtis may be interested to know that I am one of the few people, on this side of the House, at least, who has actively employed many young people over the years, and I still do.

Mr Prest: But how many now?

Mr WHITE: Something of the order of 25.

As I said, it is a bit like a catch-22 situation. Kids cannot get experience; consequently, they cannot get jobs. The problem has become very serious, because a whole generation of young people has become increasingly alienated from society. I have dealt with many young people over the years. They say that nobody cares, and very often they come from broken families. Governments do not care; business does not care. So a terrible situation has developed in which almost a generation of young people alienated from the rest of society has been bred. It is probably one of the most serious problems facing the country today. I know it is easy for honourable members to stand up and speak about it in this place; it is much more difficult to find solutions to the problems.

In some instances it seems that Governments are insensitive. Even the New South Wales Minister (Mr Barry Unsworth), who, incidentally, was formerly an official in the New South Wales Trades and Labor Council, said that the smart unemployed youngsters are those who spend their days at the beach surfing. What an indictment that is of a Minister of the Crown to put them down like that! Surely it is time that rates of pay were reduced and the apprenticeship system was restructured. It literally has fallen round us and is now in bits and pieces. Employers are continually saying that they cannot afford apprentices, that apprenticeship involves too much red tape and messing about. We have to look seriously at restructuring the whole apprenticeship system.

To my mind, youth employment is basically a form of education. Every young person is deserving of that opportunity. In other words, education on the job should be an alternative to secondary education for those young people who do not have the academic skills to move on to secondary and tertiary education. I am a firm believer in education and regard as a tragedy the fact that only approximately 35 per cent of our young people remain in secondary schools until final year.

Mr Smith: Less than that.

Mr WHITE: It may be less, but the figures that were given to me and the references that I had used reveal that 35 per cent is the level. However, perhaps the honourable member for Townsville West knows better than I do.

In the United States of America, Canada and Japan, which I visited recently, more than 70 per cent of young people complete their final year at high school.

When the figures are transposed to tertiary education, in Queensland they are even worse. There is no doubt that in an age when Australia needs to become more productive, more entrepreneurial and more competitive, Australia should be doing what most other countries, particularly those in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, have done over the last 20 years, namely, put additional resources into education.

It is only through education that young people—I am talking not necessarily about secondary or tertiary education but about the whole ambit of education—will be able to acquire the skills necessary to enable them to live in a new world, to grow up and to embrace technology. Unless we accept that challenge, we will be confronted with further youth unemployment and we will also be doing a grave disservice to our young people.

I was heartened by recent comments made by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, who made his views very clear. They are quite similar to mine. I suggest that the Government set up some sort of task force on youth unemployment. I see that the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs is in the House. I am pleased to see some of the new initiatives that he is taking. Some sort of task force should be appointed to look at youth unemployment as a matter of urgency. Better still, it should be done in association with other Governments, even the dreaded socialists in Canberra. Whether we like it or not—I do not like it—they are in power, and it is essential that we work together with them to solve major problems of this nature that will not be solved simply on a State basis.

Bandaid schemes, such as the Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme, the Youth Employment Support Scheme—for which the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs is responsible—and the Commonwealth Employment Program, as good as they may be, are meeting a need only in the short-term. They are not the long-term answer. I am not knocking them because, at the moment, what else do we have to offer to so many young people? YESS, which is operated through the Department of Welfare Services, has done a remarkably good job on a very cheap and economical scale. For that reason, I have been a great supporter of it. It gives a chance to so many people who are not able to help themselves. The track record of YESS, in terms of value for dollars, is excellent. I commend the Government and the Minister for the expansion of that scheme. I am sure that the member for South Brisbane would join with me in my remarks. When I was a Minister, that was a matter that he continually raised with me.

I would like to refer briefly to the recent Hawke Budget, particularly as it affects the poor and families. The kindest thing that one could say is that it has been a massive public relations exercise designed to hoodwink the people about the Treasurer's so-called tax cuts. I have a copy of the "Telegraph" to remind members that millions face a tax jump and that, in reality, as we all know, Mr Keating has given most people \$7 a week but he had picked up \$22 a week in recent times.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr WHITE: I knew that objections would be raised by the Opposition, but they are the facts of life, whether the Labor Party likes it or not. The truth is that the total tax revenue has increased by 10.5 per cent, making Mr Keating the highest taxing Treasurer since World War II. That is a record.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr WHITE: As the member for South Brisbane well knows, through the tax indexation system and as a result of inflation over the last two to three years, the average person's weekly tax has increased by \$22. The honourable member cannot get away from that. As from 1 November, people will be \$15 down the tube. That is what it gets down to. I repeat that Mr Keating will go down in history as the highest taxing Treasurer since World War II.

A look at Budget outlays discloses that those outlays are 31.1 per cent of gross domestic product, a figure that even the Whitlam administration did not attain in its dizzy days of spending.

Mr Neal: Are you aware that 42 per cent of gross domestic product is spent on the public sector as opposed to 31 per cent 10 years ago?

Mr WHITE: The honourable member might be referring to the number of people who are employed in the public sector. Over the past decade there has been a massive increase from 25 per cent to the figure mentioned by the honourable member for Balonne. It is a dramatic increase. It is not a recent event. The former Liberal Government must accept some responsibility for not putting a clamp on the expansion of the bureaucracy during its period in office.

Mr Lee: There is the assets test.

Mr WHITE: The member of Yeronga has raised the issue of the assets test. I will not resume my seat before making some comment about that. An extraordinarily large number of aged persons reside in my electorate. I believe that it has the highest percentage of aged persons of any electorate in this State.

Returning to the outlays to which I referred previously—the outlays reached a figure that even the Whitlam Government did not attain. The spend-now-and-pay-later policy must inevitably mean a worsening of our economic position in the future. It is a case of sunny days now and storms ahead. It is a case of putting the act together for the short-term benefit. I suppose that the reality is that the Hawke Government has taken an unwarranted economic risk because of an impending early election.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr WHITE: As the honourable member said, it is terrible that our young people will be placed in a position of having to pay the piper in the future.

As I said earlier, unemployment is a great tragedy. I do not wish to repeat what the honourable member for Brisbane Central said. I regard Mr Herbert, a financial writer for "The Sunday Mail", as a responsible economic commentator. He makes the point that high unemployment is still Australia's biggest problem and that the Budget will not fix it. That says it all.

Mr Innes: He was the adviser to the last Labor Government in this State.

Mr WHITE: Yes. That is an interesting fact. Labor members do not seem to have made much use of his advice.

The recent improvement in the economy has been brought about primarily by the ending of the drought. That is borne out by the large provisional tax payments that have flowed to the Federal Treasury. The recovery of the world economy in general, and particularly the recovery in the United States, and the beneficial impact of the former Liberal Government's wage pause program have resulted in the Hawke Government's being in a favourable short-term position. Many of us who read the speech of the former Secretary to the Treasury, John Stone, are concerned about his comments on the Budget.

The Hawke Government has presented us with full wage indexation but no assurance that the unions will keep their side of the bargain. We know that already more than 300 applications are before the arbitration commission for wage increases over and above the CPI under the loophole of the special and extraordinary circumstances.

Mr Smith: What about price increases?

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Townsville West must realise that, if we continue to price ourselves out of the market by extraordinarily high wages and prices, it will inevitably lead to more and more people being unemployed through an even greater deterioration in our competitiveness on the world market.

I could say, to sum up, that the Hawke Budget was a sweetheart deal, as the member for Stafford said earlier today, between big Government, big business and big unions. There is nothing in the Budget for small business. It has done nothing of consequence to assist the unemployed, families or the poor.

At this stage I indicate my support and admiration for the wonderful contribution made to this State and our nation by the migrant community over so many years. It is a matter of considerable regret that in recent times migrants have become a pawn in a cheap game of politicking. It is a matter of shame that, after so many years of success and harmony under the former Liberal Government, the present Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr West) has caused the bipartisan approach to migration to fall into disrepair. Migrants, whether from Hungary, Hong Kong, Vietnam, the United Kingdom or the United States of America, make a contribution in their own way to our nation. They have enriched our society. They have provided skills and expertise in so many areas—in the culinary arts, in the fields of economics, business and finance and in the professions. One of the great pleasures I enjoyed in recent years was having the ministerial responsibility that enabled me to create a new division of migrant services, which has now been elevated to subdepartmental status. I congratulate the Government, and pass my congratulations to the Minister, who is in the House tonight. I repeat that migrants have made a significant contribution to this country. In common with very many other people, I am extremely unhappy that the debate has been turned into an acrimonious one. Its racial overtones are simply a disgrace. I am pleased to say that my electorate of Redcliffe has a high and growing percentage of migrants. Over the years, I have made many of them my friends. Many are of Asian descent, and many others are of British descent.

I find considerable hypocrisy in the hysteria propagated in recent times by the ALP. Everybody knows that the Labor Party has had a long tradition of having a righteous view on race. Everybody knows that the ALP historically was an upholder of the White Australia policy. The current debate over Asian migrants is abhorrent. The sooner we return to the policy pursued by successive Liberal Governments, the better for this country.

I make a brief mention of small to medium-sized business. This is a subject that has been raised in the House to an extent that some members on the Opposition benches might consider to be *ad nauseam*. Nevertheless, I know people who are interested in this area. If I do not continue to speak about it, the message will never get through.

I am sure all honourable members know that the businesses to which I refer are from small to medium size and employ anything from one to 50 people. As a whole, they employ between 50 and 60 per cent of the work-force of this country, depending on one's definition, and make a contribution to the GDP of approximately 46 per cent, which is really a tremendous contribution. Heaven knows, only now are Governments starting to come to grips with the problems facing small business.

As all honourable members know, I am not an advocate of Government intervention, but I am an advocate of Governments setting a climate to help businesses, particularly small operators, to get off the ground. It is only through small businesses developing into medium-sized operations and then growing into corporations that employment and opportunity in this country will be increased.

I hope that the coming State Budget will contain measures to help business, for by helping it the Government will enable it to operate more efficiently so that it will be in a position to increase staffing levels. I think it may have been Don Chipp—I am not a fan of his, but if he did make this statement, I will give him credit for it—who said

that if every small business was able to employ one extra person, this country would not have an unemployment problem. That probably sounds a little philosophical but, nevertheless, even if small business could go half-way along the track, wouldn't it be a great thing if young kids, in particular, could be given jobs?

The problems of small business arise from many causes, but the three most important are taxation, the rapidly-increasing accumulation of rules and regulations with which small businesses are fettered today and the difficulty of developing management skills.

Mr Smith: Pay-roll tax.

Mr WHITE: I will come to that in a moment.

A number of people who do not understand business adopt a very simplistic attitude and think that if the Government can make a grant or something of that nature, the problems will go away. One of the key solutions is the development of skills, of training and of management techniques. I am pleased to see that the Small Business Development Corporation has made a start in that area.

As the member for Townsville West pre-empted, the question of pay-roll tax is something of great sensitivity. Not only is it a regressive form of taxation, but it is a tax that discriminates against employment. The member for Nundah and leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox) has called for a reduction of pay-roll tax. If the Government was to grant a substantial reduction in pay-roll tax or, better still, a phasing-out of pay-roll tax over a period, that would go a long way to helping many small businesses. The grouping of businesses for the levying of pay-roll tax is iniquitous. That means that people with a number of businesses who are locked into different partnerships get grouped together and are all hit with pay-roll tax. As a result of that, many of them whom I know and who have made representations to me over the years have said, "Look, we have just got to the stage where because of taxation it is not a proposition to open another business."

At the moment I imagine it is too much to hope that Queensland will follow the leadership of the United States of America, Canada and West Germany which practise discrimination positively in favour of small business. I am sure the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, is becoming more informed about the problems of small business and I look forward to the day when it is no longer a problem for people like me and other members of the House who are vitally interested and is something that people do not have to press the Government about.

The second great source of problems comes from the ever-increasing accumulation of regulations, some of which appear to have been enacted and then forgotten. Only recently I had somebody in my electorate office who told me he had to deal with seven different Government instrumentalities—that is local, State and Federal—before he was able to operate his business. That is just mind-boggling. It is absolutely ridiculous and something has to be done about it. There are many ways of tackling the problem and a good idea that has been suggested by some people is that of the one-stop shop where people who want to operate a business go to the one place and let that organisation sort out the bureaucratic regulations.

Over the years a number of members of this House have raised the question of including sunset clauses in legislation. They are clauses that clearly set a time limit for the operation of legislation, thus ensuring that old legislation is reviewed and, if necessary, repealed and replaced by new legislation to take changing needs and requirements into account. In order to deal with the accumulation of regulations and red tape, I can see no reason why this Assembly, or the Government, cannot form a committee to review the problem of redundant and unnecessary regulations. That committee could aptly be called, "the red tape committee". However, I guess that in this Parliament it would be wrong to expect that we could have a committee of that nature because parliamentary committees do not seem to be in favour with this Government.

I, in line with many other Queenslanders, am very sad to hear of the effects that rail freight charges and royalties are having on companies such as Mount Isa Mines. I note with considerable regret the words of the chairman of Mount Isa Mines, Mr Bruce Watson, who said that there seems a long way to go before conditions in the industry will improve to acceptable levels.

I do not know the exact cost of that company's freight charges and royalties, but a recent press report referred to \$70m. That is a substantial cost impost on a company that is having considerable difficulty in coping with the world market. Recently, Mount Isa Mines was compelled to lay off a number of Brisbane employees. I am sure the Government must be aware of the multiplier effect and the consequent negative impact on the economy brought about by the loss of jobs.

Age pensioners are rarely acknowledged, or not acknowledged as often as they should be. As I said earlier tonight my electorate has an extraordinary high percentage—I think about 34 per cent of residents on the age pension or some other sort of welfare pension. Pensioners do not really have a strongly organised body to argue their case and, because of age or infirmity, are unable to advance their own case. The Queensland Government has acted with some sensitivity with rate remissions for pensioners. That was a welcome initiative brought forward by the Liberal Party and its then Leader and Treasurer, Dr Edwards. Many pensioners have been very pleased about this wonderful innovation.

Most pensioners have worked long and hard during their lives and deserve an honourable retirement. They should have little or no cares to cope with in this world. Without doubt the assets test that has been fiddled with by the Federal Government has caused a great deal of concern. It is another instance in which anyone who has been frugal and saved money to look after himself is to be punished. The assets test is an elaborate and complex activity for so many pensioners. I fear that more Federal public servants will be terrorising pensioners by asking all sorts of idiotic questions and getting them to fill out large forms.

Mr Lee: An extra 1 200 have been employed for that specific purpose.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Yeronga has drawn to my attention the fact that 1 200 extra public servants are to be employed to harass pensioners. That is a terrible indictment. If an asset test is necessary, surely there is a better way of administering it than employing additional public servants to harass aged people.

In a world of inflation, pensioners and people on fixed incomes cannot always afford to buy the things that they should be able to buy after a life of hard work and toil. As with all other costs, housing and rent costs are increasing but, in many instances, pensioners and those on fixed incomes are not equipped to cope with increased costs. Housing accommodation is a perennial problem. The current rent for a flat in my electorate, if a person is lucky enough to get one, is about \$70 a week. How in the name of goodness can a pensioner exist after paying so much in rent?

In fairness, I must say that the Queensland Government has a reasonably good record in building low-cost accommodation, but I know from my own experience in Redcliffe that there are more pensioners awaiting homes than there are homes available. The Minister for Works and Housing is in the Chamber, and I take this opportunity to thank him for the efforts that the Housing Commission has made in providing pensioner units in my electorate. That is very much appreciated. Progress is being made in that area.

On the question of housing, the Governor, in his Opening Speech, said that the Housing Commission will put a record number of families and pensioners into their own homes in 1984-85. Like so many members on both sides of the Chamber, I look forward to that. I wish the Minister every success in his endeavours in that regard.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (9.46 p.m.): I am delighted to be able to take part in this Address in Reply debate. In doing so, I pledge, through the Governor, my loyalty and that of my constituents in Cunningham to Her Majesty. Some Opposition members

see something strange about pledging loyalty to the Crown through the Governor of the State. I certainly do not.

Mr Smith: Say a few words about the flag.

Mr ELLIOTT: If the honourable member remains in the Chamber long enough, he will probably hear me get to that matter.

This is an appropriate time to say a few words about the Governor and Lady Ramsay because, as many members would realise, they probably will not be here on the next occasion when we have an Address in Reply debate.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is typical of what one expects from that member who sits on the left-hand side of the Chair. He makes inane comments behind his hand. On a scale of one to 10, the intelligence shown in the interjections would rate one.

All of us have been lucky to have seen the Governor in action throughout the State. Unfortunately, it cannot always be said that the people who hold the office of Governor are as great a success as the present Governor is. I take my hat off to him. It must be a very difficult job. There is an old saying about walking a fine line between maintaining respect for the position of Governor and having the common touch.

I have always been tremendously impressed at the way in which Lady Ramsay has carried out her duties. All of us pay her the highest respect. She has shown great warmth and genuineness, an interest in people and an ability to be able to mix with people from every walk of life. That is an outstanding talent for someone in that position.

Mr Davis: Will you talk about soil erosion?

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, I will definitely talk about soil erosion.

Mr Davis: On your property, which is the worst on the Darling Downs?

Mr ELLIOTT: It would probably be some of the best land on the Darling Downs. The honourable member has referred to the wrong end of the Darling Downs.

It is important for all of us to look at the Budget that the Federal Government has introduced. Many of us are concerned about some of the matters in it. Before I mention some of the matters that upset me greatly, I should mention something in the Budget that pleases me, and that is the increased funding for tourism. For four years, as a Minister and as a back-bencher, I have been saying that not enough money is being spent on developing tourism throughout the nation.

During this debate, I heard an honourable member say that if one is short of something to say, one can speak about tourism. That may be so; but that member should recognise that the tourist industry does hold out the greatest hope for employment, especially for young people. Surely one of the greatest problems that society faces today is that of unemployed young people. Obviously, it is of great concern to everyone.

The tourist industry is progressing at a very great rate, and more money is being invested in it. Proportionally, more people are being employed in the tourist industry in Queensland than in any other State in the Commonwealth. That is not a coincidence, or fate, or anything else. It is because a number of people are doing their bit towards promoting the tourist industry. The incorporation of the Tourist and Travel Corporation into the mainstream of tourism in the State has had a tremendous impact on the industry. I quite earnestly believe that—

An Honourable Member: It has probably improved a bit.

Mr ELLIOTT: It may be that the industry has improved since I resigned as Minister.

The figures are very interesting. Because I had been Minister for Tourism, it gave me great pleasure to notice that the number of tourists to inland Queensland has

increased. I am sure that many people think of tourism as being something that happens on the Gold Coast or on the Barrier Reef islands. But, of course, the tourist industry involves much more than that.

The inland areas of Queensland are of tremendous interest. More and more people in society, particularly those who live in high-rise accommodation, are searching for something. They are seeking their past, their heritage and their birthright, and they are finding them in many of the tourist areas over the length and breadth of the State. That is of tremendous value to the State, particularly in relation to employment in the tourist industry.

The last speaker from the Opposition (Mr Davis) threw out a challenge to me to speak about soil erosion. You can bet your life, Mr Speaker, that whenever I stand in this place as a member of Parliament, I will speak about soil erosion. It would be a nice change for me to be able to give an accolade to the Federal Government, because the previous Government and the present Government must stand condemned for their inaction.

A lot of money was spent on reports, and one report indicated that about \$650m to \$750m was needed, purely and simply to hold the line of soil erosion where it was at that time. What was done about it? As the member for Mirani said, the Government spent only a measly \$100,000 last year. The State Government spent almost \$6m in the same year. However, when one considers what is spent in other places around the State, it is not enough.

I know that the new incumbent of the Primary Industries portfolio lives on the land and has grazing and farming interests. He is a Minister who will come to grips with the problem. He understands it and is doing his level best to increase the funding for the control of soil erosion.

Mr Casey: You must agree that one of the problems has been indiscriminate clearing by some primary producers.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes. There are a number of problems. It is not good enough to point the finger at any one problem.

However, the overall problem concerns planning and the setting up of plans for farms. Any number of farmers in the State are keen to get on, to do well and to pay for the improvements themselves.

At present, Queensland does not have the number of officers that it needs to do both the office work and the field work necessary to plan this particular exercise. Look at the developed areas of this State, particularly the Darling Downs, and see the destruction that is wrought every time heavy rain falls. Project such a situation into central Queensland and imagine what will happen there. The problem in central Queensland will be of far greater magnitude than it ever has been or will be on the Darling Downs. The soils in central Queensland are probably worse in terms of washability, land-holders have bigger areas and they use bigger equipment. Regrettably, in many instances they are not instigating any sort of conservation measures, such as contour banks.

The honourable member for Mackay mentioned clearing. Land-holders should be convinced that they need to clear land on a key-line basis and leave strips of timber round the contour instead of going to the expense of putting in contour banks. Quite frankly, except in steeper areas, contour banks do not need to be used until after the horse has bolted, as it were. Regrettably, that is the situation.

If a strip-cropping system can be integrated into an initial farming program before the country becomes eroded, better results can be achieved without contour banks. All that contour banks do is congregate water and put pressure on the whole drainage system.

I have always been a great advocate of the key-line system. Many honourable members would have read the various Yeoman books. The whole theory behind it is to get the water away from the pressure points and to try to spread it. The situation can be likened to a bank account. The land-holder has only a certain quantity of moisture

in his soil. As he uses it and depletes his supplies, he lessens his ability to grow crops. Like a bank account, the more water the land-holder puts into his soil, the more money he will make from his land.

Mr Casey: One of the problems——

Mr ELLIOTT: I am sorry, but I do not have time to answer the honourable member's interjections.

Mr Casey: One of the problems in central Queensland is slopes.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, slopes, too, are a problem.

The important message that I am trying to get across is that, obviously, tremendous pressure must be brought to bear on the Federal Government to get it to come to the party and to spend realistic amounts of money in supporting the States in their various conservation programs throughout Australia. Those programs are designed to combat soil erosion. The Queensland Government, however, must do its bit. Unfortunately, it does not have enough staff. Regardless of the staff ceilings set by the Public Service Board, the Department of Primary Industries must be given more field officers to do the planning at office level. Not one person who is keen to do the work should be denied that opportunity.

Finally, I wish to touch on the Queensland Grain Handling Act 1983. I am concerned that within that legislation lies the potential for overstepping the mark. Recently I attended a meeting chaired by Don McKechnie, who is chairman of the Grain Handling Board and chairman of the State Wheat Board. His attitude has been softened somewhat by recent meetings of that type. It has been brought home to him very forcefully that grain-growers are not prepared to sit back and see anyone come in with a dictatorial attitude, saying, "This is what will happen. You can like it or lump it." I was impressed by the way in which Don McKechnie handled some of those meetings.

I attended one at Oakey, where I put forward the point of view that was being expressed in my area. People were deeply concerned that the authority was trying to force all deliveries through the central system. Obviously, the rail system and the central handling system have to be utilised, otherwise costs will rise. However, those systems cannot handle all the production; that is physically impossible. The road system, too, must be utilised.

I am concerned that those people who manage the Maynegrain system are talking about banning all flat-tops. If Maynegrain banned all flat-tops, Queensland would lose a tremendous amount of the trade from New South Wales. Certainly, Maynegrain would not want too many producers coming in with flat-tops that take 25 to 30 minutes to unload. A solution would be to impose a time limit over the grid. Once a producer used all the time at his disposal, he should be prepared to get off the grid and let someone else have a go.

I am concerned about the whole Act. It should be looked at with a view to having it reviewed by Parliament. Like other members who are interested in the welfare of grain areas, I believe that the Act could be abused.

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr Borbidge)—agreed to.

SUPPLY

Constitution of Committee

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Constitution of Committee

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Presentation

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to inform the House that I propose to present to His Excellency the Governor, at Government House, on Thursday morning, 20 September, at 9.30 o'clock, the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech agreed to on 18 September, and I shall be glad to be accompanied by the mover and the seconder and any such other honourable members as care to be present.

RAILWAY PROPOSAL

North Coast Line

Initiation

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport): I move—

“That Mr Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution—

‘That the House approves of working plans, sections and book of reference for construction of a railway deviation between 49.432 km and 50.330 km North Coast Line.’”

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (10.2 p.m.): I move—

“That the House approves of working plans, sections and book of reference for construction of a railway deviation between 49.432 km and 50.330 km North Coast Line.”

Electrification of the suburban railway is being extended from Petrie to Caboolture to service a rapidly growing area in the Burpengary, Morayfield and Caboolture areas. Patronage growth on that section of the suburban railway line has been substantial. The Railway Department, in the last issue of its timetable, introduced a regular off-peak service between Petrie and Caboolture with electric trains at Petrie as well as increased peak hour services to accommodate that growth. Introduction of electric train services in June 1986 is expected to see further rapid increases in patronage as travel times between Caboolture and the central business district will be reduced by approximately 26 per cent, that is, from 69 minutes to 51 minutes.

The existing bridges on this section of duplicated track were constructed when the line was duplicated in the 1913-1916 period. The existing structures are in an aged condition and can only accommodate the heavier axle loads imposed on the structures by modern rolling-stock, operating trains at reduced speeds. That impediment to free traffic flow introduces time delays to all passenger and freight services operating in that area. In addition, the alignment of the permanent way leading up to the existing bridges is such as to impose a further speed restriction on train travel.

The proposed new crossing of the Caboolture River to the west of the existing crossing will be of modern pre-stressed concrete design, capable of carrying existing traffic and heavier axle loads in the future. The alignment is such as to permit maximum operating speeds approaching the Caboolture Railway Station. Minimum inconvenience is being caused to land-owners in the area. Land not required after the reconstruction will be made available for other purposes.

The proposed route deviates from the existing North Coast Line at a point about 600 metres south of the Caboolture River. It then follows a curve to the west to the existing line crossing the Caboolture River by the new bridge, which is upstream of and almost parallel to the existing rail bridge. The route rejoins the North Coast Line immediately south of King Street in the town of Caboolture.

The country is mostly level, open, grassed river flat of a boggy nature. It is currently used for grazing. Proposals for residential subdivision have been prepared by the registered proprietors of the land on the southern side of the river. A small parcel of land occupied by the premises of the Caboolture Co-operative Association Limited on the northern side of the river will be affected. The maximum grade will be 1 in 181.06 against southbound trains. The minimum curve radius will be 820 metres.

The areas of land to be acquired for the deviation are detailed in the book of reference and on the working plan and section submitted herewith. The estimated cost of the new bridge and deviation, inclusive of engineering works, surveys and land acquisition, is \$2.4m. The bridge reconstruction is part of the Government's \$28m project to extend the electrified suburban area from Petrie to Caboolture.

The success of suburban electrification in this area has already been demonstrated by a 20 per cent increase in patronage on the Petrie line in the last 12 months. Patronage growth is continuing at this level. It can be expected that extension of electrification from Petrie to Caboolture will result in an even greater patronage growth and further add to the success of the overall Brisbane suburban electrification program introduced in 1979 with the Ferny Grove-to-Darra electrification.

Further benefits to flow from this scheme, being partly funded by the Commonwealth under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Act, will be the anticipated reduction of road traffic as regular commuters change from road travel to fast, clean, comfortable electric train travel.

With the introduction of the electric train service, it is proposed to significantly increase the number of peak-hour and off-peak services and to introduce a regular clock-face timetable, which has proved so popular in the existing suburban network.

The deviation project and the ongoing suburban electrification program provide another example of the Queensland Government's commitment to continuing rail development. That commitment has already promoted and will continue to promote employment opportunities and provide economic stimulus to local communities throughout this great State.

I commend the proposal to the Committee.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (10.7 p.m.): Debates such as this provide the Committee with an opportunity to examine the activities of the Queensland Railways Department and the way in which the Government's redevelopment program is proceeding. As the Minister has said, the Caboolture deviation is tied in with the State's electrification program. When such a matter is being discussed by the Parliament, no opportunity should pass without the Government's being reminded that it put the electrification program back 20 years. The project was ready to proceed when the Government came to office in 1957. Owing to its procrastination and deliberate resolution, electrification was deferred. Consequently, we are now to pay through the nose for a project that would have been accomplished at a much lower figure in those days. Almost every day we hear about Queensland's \$600m main-line electrification program. What has it brought

with it? In the main, all it has really brought is a massive row over contracts for electric locomotives and some of the other contracts let for the work.

Quite honestly, I do not mind that the electric locomotive contracts went to Maryborough. However, the people of Queensland should know why Walkers and the Maryborough tenderers had a second bite of the cherry. In none of his comments on this matter has the Minister given a reason for that. I also ask at the same time whether that second bite of the cherry was given to Goninan in Townsville. That company set up a plant in north Queensland and created employment opportunities when it was building the diesel/electric locomotives for the Newlands to Abbot Point line. The Minister agrees that that company provided an excellent product and had good delivery rates, probably some of the best delivery rates for diesel/electric locomotives in Queensland. It provides jobs in Townsville and in other areas of north Queensland.

Twelve months ago I attended the opening of the company's workshop in Townsville and the Premier quite clearly gave an indication to the company that that was the first of quite a number of contracts that it could expect to receive from the Government. Now that the company has virtually completed its first contract, it has, like the proverbial dirty rag, been wiped by the Queensland Government. The company does not think it will be able to continue with any more work and, as a result, has laid off a number of workers. I am sure that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology is probably concerned about that because heavy engineering in Queensland is currently in the doldrums. That being the case, it behoves the State Government, when possible, to spread the work round to keep as many workshops going on tender work for as long as possible. That will help the long-term future of the State.

Exactly the same type of thing happened when a factory was established in Mackay to supply railway sleepers to the Railway Department. That factory is situated just across the border of my electorate in the electorate of Mirani. I know that you, Mr Randell, were at the opening of the factory, as I was, and heard the Premier give a clear indication that a number of Government contracts would flow to that company. But what happened? Within 15 months the factory was closed, the workers had been sacked and now there is talk of dismantling the plant and sending it to Adelaide for construction work there. That happened because the Queensland Government once more failed to continue to let contracts to keep that plant operating. That would have kept Queenslanders working to supply goods to the Queensland Railway Department, which is being paid for by Queenslanders through their taxes.

A great deal of scandal has surrounded the latest tenders let by the Railway Department. One related to a contract for a microwave system. One Queensland company that is highly skilled in that work was virtually told not to tender for the work because the department did not want to use its equipment, even though it was of a very high standard indeed.

Of course, it is not unusual for this Government to change its mind. I can remember reading the reports when a proposal for electrification was scrubbed by the Government 20 years ago. Part of the justification was a summation that diesel/electric locomotives were more efficient, cheaper and required less maintenance than electric locomotives. With the introduction of electric locomotives, the Government is saying exactly the opposite, that they will be more efficient, cheaper, require less maintenance and that fewer locomotives will be required. One thing that can be said for the Labor Party on this matter is that it has been consistent all the way along the line. It has always said that electric trains were what were needed in the State and that electric trains were what it would provide and continue to provide in areas where they were profitable. I am sure the Minister would agree that for electrification to be economically viable there must be a high volume of loadings and a large number of trains. For instance, nobody would ever expect to see the electrification of the line from Alpha through to Longreach and Winton because, with the small number of trains and the low loading volume, the line would not be economic.

Dual carriageways are most profitable for electric trains. It has been found throughout the world that the size of the wagons used depends on the size of the gauge. If Queensland had standard gauge, the electric railway system would be far more efficient.

One of the biggest mistakes made by the Government was its refusal to move to the standard gauge. It has had ample opportunity to do so. If it had adopted the policy that was being investigated in 1957, about half of the State's railway lines would now be standard gauge. The rehabilitation of the Townsville line could have been completed in standard gauge without interfering with other areas. The same locomotives and wagons could have been used to take coal from Collinsville to Mount Isa and to bring copper, silver, lead and zinc to Townsville. That line would have been very profitable. The new coal lines from Gladstone to Moura, from Hay Point to Goonyella, Blair Athol, and Oakey Creek, and from Abbott Point to Newlands could all have been built in standard gauge. All the locomotives and rolling stock had to be provided and if standard gauge had been used the system would have been far more efficient.

Even the main north coast line has been completely rehabilitated in recent years. A completely new line, with new sleepers, and ballast comprising crushed metal rather than the river material, would have been able to carry heavier trains and been a much more efficient line. But this line was built to the narrow gauge. Queensland would have been sitting really pretty if it had been rebuilt to the standard gauge. In the 1970s money was being made available by the Whitlam Federal Government and its policy was followed by the Fraser Government. South Australia and other States took advantage of the offer made to help with the standardisation of railway systems. Because of pigheadedness, the Government refused to enter into negotiations with the Federal Government. This generation of Queenslanders, and future generations, will pay dearly for that major mistake in the Government's railway policy.

The second biggest mistake made by the Government concerned the closure of the Gold Coast railway line. In the 1960s most of the land was sold very cheaply. The line was closed because of pressure from a certain Country Party member who was a partner in a freight transport company operating between the Gold Coast and Brisbane. The company's prospects were so good following the closure of the line that it sold out almost immediately to TNT.

Mr Davis: You are referring to Woods Transport.

Mr CASEY: I am.

The Gold Coast line was closed down so that someone in the Country Party could make a quid. The Railway Department is now conducting a survey into the cost of building a railway line to the Gold Coast. Only recently the department called tenders for a co-ordinated bus/rail service from Beenleigh to the Gold Coast.

Mr Price: Russ Hinze's son runs a truck there.

Mr CASEY: I am not certain about that but I do know that the late Cec Carey was very much involved with Woods Transport.

Members should be reminded that a few years ago, when Clem Jones was Lord Mayor, the Government was very critical of the Brisbane City Council's entering into a leasing deal to finance buses for Brisbane. The ginger group, as it was called——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Brisbane Central will well recall my brushes with members of the ginger group.

Mr Kruger: How their numbers have shrunk.

Mr CASEY: Most of them have been and gone.

Mr Davis: Mr Miller is still here.

Mr CASEY: The member for Ithaca has moved back on to the Government side. The member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss) has been through the washing machine with the Premier and his National Party Government and he is like a toothless tiger these days.

The Government criticised that leasing arrangement. It said that it was unholy. Government members raised the matter at election-time. I have heard them raise the same matter concerning the Federal Government. Yet last year the Auditor-General indicated that up to 180 suburban passenger electric rail cars constructed by Walkers-ASEA Pty Ltd are to be purchased at cost by Queensland Trustees Limited. That company will buy the cars and it will own them. Queensland Railways does not own the cars that are currently being used and will not own those that are presently being built by Walkers; Queensland Trustees will own them. The purchase is being financed by a consortium of bankers. The total purchase price will not exceed \$130m. The arrangement provides for the cars to be leased by the commissioner and for lease payments to be made. The initial lease payments, which include establishment fees and other charges due under the arrangement, total \$14.9m to this date. Surprisingly, the Auditor-General said—

“This expenditure has been charged as unforeseen expenditure of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in the Subdivision—Special Allocations, Treasury Department.” Yet, for 12 to 18 months previously, the Premier, the Minister for Transport and other Government members were saying what a great deal it was to get these rail cars. Their cost was not provided for properly and adequately in the State’s Budget and had to be charged as unforeseen expenditure.

I shall move on quickly and point out that one of the amazing aspects of the recent rail contract was the overseas trip that the Minister for Transport made in January this year, supposedly to talk to the tenderers. In some cases it was two months before tenders closed. How could the Minister imagine that he would be able to talk to the tenderers who would be able to provide the best deal for Queensland when he did not know who had tendered or what tenderers were likely to be in the running for the contract? Nonetheless, it was a good excuse for the Minister to go overseas. Is it any wonder that dispute after dispute has arisen since the contracts were announced?

There was a dispute over radio-controlled equipment. Because it hates the Labor Government in New South Wales, the Government is buying an American system rather than a system manufactured in New South Wales. I suppose it is the Premier’s love of Ronald Reagan that makes him go to America to obtain a system. However, it will cost the Queensland people an extra \$6m.

In recent years we have heard much talk about railway safety and road safety. Even today the Minister has issued another statement on this matter. We must look carefully at the problems that are created where the two systems meet, in other words, at level crossings. Every year more and more deaths occur at level crossings in Queensland. Obviously the department has to look at providing more funds for the installation of safety devices at level crossings.

I acknowledge that many people are killed at level crossings at which lights are installed; but many people are killed at crossings at which there are no lights, and no-one will ever know whether those people disobeyed the traffic rules or did not see the trains.

The Government must get its priorities right in that respect. Recently, I carried out a survey of level crossings in the provincial cities, particularly the northern cities on the North Coast Line. The further north the city is located, the worse the position is. The cities of Mackay, Townsville and Cairns are very poorly serviced with level crossings. There is in existence what is known as a sufficiency rating. It is based on accident probability, maximum train speed, road vehicles using the crossing every 24 hours, the angle of the crossing, and the clear-sighting distance. What also needs to be included are the accident history, the nature of the road traffic, the lighting, the background colours and the sightings of people moving into those crossings.

I am amazed at some of the actions of the Railway Department. Money has been allocated for the level crossing at Bridge Road in Mackay, but it is too late to help the two young boys who about a year ago rode their bicycles straight into a train. Mr Randell

it is too late to help those two school teachers from your electorate who were killed at a level crossing south of Mackay earlier this year. The crossings at Holland Street, Hume Street, Webberley Street, Boundary Street and Archibald Street are in the same category.

Each day 16 to 20 trains pass through the Roseneath crossing in Townsville and 500 trucks cross it to enter a quarry. The workers, shoppers and schoolchildren risk life and limb daily in crossing that line. On the Oonoonba Road, meat-workers and schoolchildren are faced with the same risk.

Quite recently a guard was killed at Woodstock when a semi-trailer ran into the back of a train at the crossing. No signalling devices or warning signs are at that crossing. The same situation exists at the cement works at the Townsville end of the Stuart yards. North of the Townsville station are Castling Street and Church Street, which are both very bad crossings. In the harbour and yards area, the Morey Street crossing poses a very big problem, as does the Pilkington Street crossing at which six serious accidents have happened in recent years.

At Bungalow in Cairns, the sugar trucks cross the main line at Aumuller Street. That is a very dangerous crossing and is at the main entrance to an industrial estate. Many workers live in that area, but as there are no schools on that side of the line, their children have to cross it to get to school.

At Lyons Street and Bunda Street, near the National Hotel, the situation is exactly the same. Three or four roads cross the northern line, and every crossing lacks warning signs. The turn-off to White Rock is in the fastest developing area in Cairns, but nothing has been done there. The situation is much the same on the main road to Edge Hill.

I will now head farther south and outline how the priorities are determined closer to Brisbane. Earlier this year, the Government approved lights at a cost of \$47,000 at Miva Road, which is on the Kingaroy branch line between Theebine and Dickabram. That is in the electorate of the honourable member for Gympie. Between Monday and Friday, there is only one train a day. Most of the road-users are local farmers and no real township exists at Dickabram. A couple of milk trucks a day use the crossing.

Mr Stephan: Do you know where Dickabram is?

Mr CASEY: Yes, I have been there. It is across a double bridge over the Mary River. I know the country, and I have seen the crossing. I do not speak about things in this Chamber unless I know what I am talking about.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I have been fairly tolerant with the member for Mackay. He should get back to the subject under discussion.

Mr CASEY: In his introduction, the Minister said that safety measures were being introduced on this new line and deviation. It is worth while comparing the new proposal with what is happening elsewhere. In Caboolture there is an overpass over King Street, and that is a safety measure. My point is that the priorities are wrong. I am making a comparison. There has been a set of lights for years on a crossing just south of Gungalda, and the road only goes to one farm. There is one standard for south Queensland and one for north Queensland.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Mackay to get back to the subject-matter.

Mr CASEY: Comparisons must be made. In your speech in the debate on the Address in Reply earlier this evening, Mr Randell, you made comparisons. If the Committee is to discuss rail safety and a rail deviation, comparisons must be made and the facts laid on the line.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (10.28 p.m.): This proposal will cover a great deal of the electorate of Murrumba. The Minister has been very sympathetic and very helpful in getting the alterations made to make way for the extension of the electrification

scheme from Petrie to Caboolture. I must agree with the member for Mackay that the electrification proposal was held up when the Country/Liberal Government came to power a number of years ago. It is only in recent times that consideration has been given to electrification, and at a much greater cost than that envisaged by the Labor Government which first developed the plan. I recall the day when the Minister stood with me on the platform at Petrie when he opened the extension to that station.

I must say that electrification has been well received by the people. Without having the figures before me, it would appear to me that electrification has been a great asset to people in my area. Certainly electrification offers a faster, cleaner and more comfortable ride. If electrification can be extended, greater usage will be made of the rail link and those people who use it will have a comfortable trip.

The area that is covered by this proposal is between Petrie and Caboolture. That area is a fast developing one. A great deal of development has occurred at Burpengary, Morayfield, on the southern side of Caboolture and even on the northern and western sides of Caboolture. This improvement to the rail service will be well received by people in those areas. The sooner that electrification is implemented in the area, the better. The greater the usage that is made of the rail link, the quicker the areas will develop. If the Government is looking for development, it cannot do without electrification. Later I shall speak about the proposed rail link to Redcliffe.

Mr Davis: When will that occur? We have been waiting for it for years.

Mr KRUGER: That is right; we certainly have. I hope that before I conclude my speech I will have convinced the Minister that that rail extension ought to go ahead.

Before I get too involved in that matter, I turn to a problem concerning which I have written to the Minister and have received responses. I refer to the Dakabin Railway Station. Really, it is non-existent. Certainly the platform was raised recently as part of the electrification to Caboolture. However, no cover is provided for people who use the station. The main users of the station are the students at the Dakabin State High School. As this link is developed, other persons will use that station. The Minister should be looking at the provision of some sort of cover over the railway station. An overhead bridge has overcome some of the dangers that have been experienced in recent times. However, no cover is provided for those people who will use the station and become commuters. As I say, at present the main users of the station are the Dakabin High School students. As the rail service is improved, it will be used by people who live in the area and come to Brisbane to work.

I ask the Minister to give consideration to the provision of a railway station between Petrie and Dakabin. I realise that it could not be provided immediately, even as part of the electrification program. In that area, which I regard as Kallangur North or Petrie North, the distance between the two stations is quite long. The area, particularly Frenchs Forest, is a fast developing one. Because the use of the park-and-ride facilities at Petrie Railway Station has reached saturation point, it might be more convenient for the Government to provide another railway station and parking facilities between Dakabin and Petrie. Parking facilities at Petrie are limited—unless, of course, a high-rise parking station is constructed.

The Minister will have to decide whether he will upgrade the parking facilities at Petrie or provide another station between Petrie and Dakabin. The development in the area is such as to warrant the provision of another station. Of course, the matter comes down to one of economics and of what is the best that can be done in the time available. If the Minister keeps my submission in mind, I will be much happier than I am at present. Perhaps he has even considered that aspect already. If not, I would ask him to take my submission on board now so that maximum benefits can be gained from any improvements made to that line.

As I say, the parking facilities at Petrie are used to the maximum extent. Many people who would otherwise drive to Petrie Railway Station and park there are going

to another station at which parking has not reached saturation point. I refer, of course, to Lawnton. Certainly the parking problem is worsening there, too.

I have written to the Minister about a proposal for a joint undertaking between the Railway Department, the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the local council to improve parking facilities at Lawnton. I have also discussed it with the Pine Rivers Shire Council.

Another aspect that has not been considered in great depth at this stage is that the area between Petrie and Caboolture contains a light-industry estate. Although electrification might not be a great advantage to occupants of that estate, they might use the railways as a service for the carriage of parcels. Electrification will provide a much faster service from Caboolture, so the occupants of the estate who wish to have parcels transported would, perhaps, gain some advantage from electrification.

I turn now to the rail for Redcliffe proposal. The Minister needs to look at the overall needs of the area. While this proposal is being examined, I ask the Minister to keep his options open on extensions to the Redcliffe area. Although I may stray slightly from the proposal before the Committee, it is certainly a matter that is worthy of consideration. It is important with such extensions to obtain the maximum input to make the railways pay for themselves. I am sure that the Minister is concerned about that.

Possibly one of the most profitable lines will be the extension from Petrie to Caboolture. At this stage, the service has created some problems for commuters to schools in the Caboolture area. I have received complaints about the link times. I have raised that matter with the Railway Department. I have been told that at this stage nothing can be done about it. When that line is electrified, the problems will be overcome if a better and more regular service, similar to that between Brisbane and Petrie, is provided. The extension from Petrie to Caboolture will be a worthwhile project.

As did the previous speaker from the Opposition, I mention the overhead railway bridge at King Street. Some overhead bridges—the one at Dakabin, for example—have to be proved to be advantageous and must be maintained. Apart from examining the possibilities of providing a station somewhere between Petrie and Dakabin, I request that some covered area be provided at the Dakabin Railway Station.

If the Minister is prepared to take my requests on board and consider them, that would certainly satisfy me. I would be pleased to hear some comments from him on those matters in his reply.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (10.36 p.m.): As the time is late, I shall be very brief. I do not want to labour the points.

The Opposition spokesman on Transport (Mr Casey) referred to some of the most important factors about the proposal before the Committee, particularly crossings. One of the worst railway crossings in Brisbane can be found at Campbell Street, in my electorate. If my memory serves me correctly, in 1954 the then Labor Government instituted an inquiry to have the Campbell Street crossing removed.

Mr Randell, as you are not a city-dweller, you would not be aware of the problem. Campbell Street has become a main thoroughfare. I estimate that every five minutes there is a traffic delay because the gates come down and cars and trucks must stop. Under the electrification of the railway system, the lines have been duplicated. The problem is even worse during the Brisbane Exhibition.

I ask the Minister what he is going to do about the Campbell Street crossing. There must be a plan to do something about it. I believe that the 1954 report would have been implemented had Queensland Newspapers not bought the building on the corner

and constructed its large complex there. O'Connell Street has been changed to a one-way street in certain sections, and Campbell Street is a main thoroughfare that passes through the Minister's electorate.

I wish to refer also to the fare structure. I am pleased that it is to be changed. The Minister will recall that when he first assumed responsibility for the Transport portfolio, I raised the matter of the fare structure between Morayfield, Dakabin—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I ask the member for Brisbane Central to confine his remarks to the subject-matter of the debate. The motion does not relate to fares.

Mr DAVIS: Dakabin, Morayfield and Caboolture are all on the line affected by the Minister's proposal. On other occasions, I have raised what I believe to be the illegal fare structure for those stations. I understand that that is to be changed. Commuters using those stations were paying up to 30c and 40c more than people travelling the same distance from, say, Beenleigh or Ipswich. That has occurred for four or five years. The fare structure ought to be changed; it is straight-out robbery.

Mr Casey: It is a penalty on the residents of those suburbs.

Mr DAVIS: Of course it is.

The honourable member for Murrumba mentioned the proposed rail link to Redcliffe, which has now become a complete farce because of the friction between the National Party and the Liberal Party. Obviously, that line will not be constructed while the present incumbent is the member for Redcliffe. That is unfair to the people in that area, which, I might add, is in the electorate of Murrumba.

Finally, I raise a matter about which railway employees have complained on a number of occasions. Why are six-man cars being produced at Walkers in preference to two three-man cars? I am told that they cannot be uncoupled and that Walkers won the contract because the six-man cars could be built there at a lower price than two three-man cars. I would like to know the cost of running six-man cars, particularly in off-peak periods.

Mr Casey: There has to be twice the wear and tear, for a start.

Mr DAVIS: Yes. To add to the comments of the shadow Minister for Transport—I understand that some peculiar dealings are involved in the tendering by Walkers. Therefore, I would like to know why there are six-man sets instead of two three-man sets. No announcement has been made. Not very many people know about it.

Mr NEWTON (Caboolture) (10.41 p.m.): My area will benefit most from the proposal advanced by the Minister. A constituent of mine south of the Caboolture River expressed some concern about the project. I hope that negotiations are held with people whose land is acquired and that satisfactory arrangements are made.

Concern has also been expressed about the bridge over the main street of Caboolture. That is a problem to be resolved between the Main Roads Department and the Railway Department. I trust that negotiations will be held between those departments and the residents of Caboolture. A new bridge has to be constructed.

The Caboolture Co-operative Association Ltd has lost part of its land. The co-operative said that it did not wish to lose any more land, if possible; but, in view of the benefits that will flow to the area in general, it is in favour of the acquisition.

Mr Casey: It had no option. The land would have been resumed anyway.

Mr NEWTON: That is true, too, but I presume that it occurred after negotiations were held.

Quite a number of rail bridges are in my area. Honourable members will appreciate that an exercise such as this is extremely costly. The project is costing the Government a considerable amount of money.

The electrification of the railway line will be of great benefit to the large number of workers who travel from Caboolture to Brisbane every day. The quicker the project is completed, the better it will be for everyone concerned. The spur line to Wamuran could bring people from the Woodford area to Caboolture.

Mr Casey: Wouldn't it be better to establish industries in that area and keep the people there?

Mr NEWTON: That will occur. I am fighting for industries to be established in the area and have made submissions for the establishment of an industrial estate.

The large number of people who travel from Caboolture to Brisbane must be provided with a proper service. They require a fast, efficient service. As well as the commuter aspect, the line has tourist potential. A bus service could be provided from Caboolture to Bribie Island and to the north coast. The electrification of the line will be an immense benefit to tourism in the area. I commend the Minister for his foresight in making the money available and getting the construction under way.

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (10.45 p.m.), in reply: The debate has been brief but enlightening, if only because for the first time members of the Australian Labor Party have stated their position with respect to the new electrified rail service from Petrie to Caboolture. I gather from what was rather a mishmash of speeches that the Opposition broadly supports the proposition, and who would not, because it will provide an excellent service to those who reside in the Caboolture and surrounding areas. One can envisage that people will come from as far away as Kilcoy and Bribie Island, park at Caboolture and be able to catch an excellent rail service to work in the city of Brisbane. In some cases they may pass through Brisbane and travel even further afield to their places of employment.

Prior to this debate, the only public record of the Australian Labor Party's attitude on this matter came from the mouth of the Lord Mayor of Brisbane—a rather senior spokesman of the party—who condemned the Government for committing ABRD funds to rail development and in particular to the extension of rail electrification from Kingston to Beenleigh in the south, and from Petrie to Caboolture in the north, which is the extension now being debated. On more than one occasion the Lord Mayor of Brisbane criticised me and said that the money should have been diverted from this task and used for the purchase of buses to prop up the Brisbane City Council bus system. I rather wisely convinced the Government that in its submission to the ABRD committees it should commit the money to something more lasting and more worthwhile, to permanent rail development of this kind.

The Committee has now been told that at least some Labor members seem to support the proposal, which brings them into conflict with the Lord Mayor of the city. I have no doubt they will resolve that internally within their own organisation in due course.

I was interested to hear the contribution of the Opposition spokesman, who took us on one of the great railway journeys of the world and touched only very briefly on the area that is under debate, to such an extent that you, Mr Randell, had cause to call him back to the point on more than one occasion. He seemed to wish to discuss everything but this Government's widely acclaimed initiative.

However, I wish to put to death once and for all that old chestnut that is regularly dragged out in the Chamber by those honourable members opposite who know no better, that is that electrification would have proceeded under a Labor Government in the 1950s and that at least Brisbane would have had an electrified system had that party stayed

in power. Quite possibly that may have been the case. However, it would have been only 1500 DC current which, in this day and age, is quite obsolete.

Mr Vaughan: What does DC stand for?

Mr LANE: Direct current. The honourable member's speciality in electronics is in causing strikes within the Electrical Trades Union. It is certainly not in any of the technical areas covered by that union. It lies in the area of causing strikes, closing down power stations and causing great inconvenience to the population.

His area of expertise as an electrician is as a stirrer, a rabble-rouser and a union official who causes strikes. He costs his comrades wages and causes great inconvenience to the public at large.

It was therefore much better to wait until the era of new technology so that Queensland could adopt the 25 kV AC system, which is acknowledged round the world as one of the best electric rail systems available.

Another honourable member referred to the covering of the Dakabin station platform, a quite reasonable and relevant request. The construction of a cover over that platform is not impossible, but it is not imminent. At this stage it is not considered that the traffic through that station warrants the expenditure. In due course, when required, the need will be met.

The honourable member for Caboolture asked whether the needs, wishes and desires of the rather famous Caboolture Co-operative Association Ltd—it is famous for its dairy and cheese products—will be accommodated in the design of the King Street overpass and works associated with the new station. I assure him that the matter is well under negotiation and that the desires and wishes of that very important institution will be accommodated in the program.

As to the matter of the new fares raised by the member for Brisbane Central, he was referring, I think, to the new zonal fare system. I invite him to go to Central Station. If he cares to look at the bright, new, automatic ticketing machines in the concourse, he will see the zonal system depicted on the face of the automatic ticketing machines that are being put to very good use every day by the patrons. The easiest way for him to get an early look at them is to join the other rail patrons who are using the automatic ticketing machines. I give the honourable member an assurance that the fares under that system will be equitable.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LANE: I appreciate the honourable member's support of those machines. I am not sure that Mr Garth Head agrees with him, but Mr Head is not very relevant to the whole system of railway administration. He is a very minor railway official leading a very small union with very little coverage. His only claim to fame is that he had a junior position on Bob Hawke's campaign committee some years ago and had to take over—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LANE: I note that the old guard members appreciate the joke.

He had to take over the chair so that Peter Beattie could move on to reorganise the party. I note that he reorganised it, but to no avail, although he did fulfil a useful purpose.

So that the public will not be misled by comments made by honourable members opposite, I inform the Committee that of the 84 units ordered from Walkers at Maryborough, 20 have a driving cab at one end only instead of one at each end. The reason for that is that some units are required only for peak-hour use, and there is a cost saving by doing that. No problems will occur. The units are interchangeable, and they are all in use. That is the official and precise answer to the rather clumsy question

that the honourable member asked. It shows that he should do better research before he asks questions in this place.

Tonight, we are talking about a very popular subject for which there is unanimous support, that is, the electrification of the Petrie to Caboolture rail line and the small deviation required to achieve better traffic operations in that area. Little more needs to be said. I will resume my seat and watch all honourable members support the motion.

Motion (Mr Lane) agreed to.

Resolution reported and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Queensland Pork Producers Organisation

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (10.58 p.m.): Tonight, I wish to bring to the attention of honourable members a problem that has been plaguing this State for some time. Over the past few years, several incidents have occurred within the Primary Industries portfolio that have created grave doubts about the future of many producer and marketing organisations.

One of the first incidents to raise its ugly head was the peanut industry scandal. The Government's performance in handling that problem was negative, with no real results being obtained.

Then followed the problems associated with the Queensland Graingrowers Association. Although that association was not a statutory organisation, problems arose that created great financial difficulties for producers.

The most recent incident was the problem associated with the Queensland Pork Producers Organisation. In that case, the executive officer, Mr David Collins, and State councillors Mr Robert Wild of Dalby and Mr John Bryant of Goombungee resigned after allegations of misconduct in that they used the offices and staff of the organisation to perform the duties of their private company business.

No real explanation was given relative to the extent of the investigation of the allegations against the men concerned. If it had not been for my calls for clarification, I believe that the Minister would not have made his statement to the House this morning.

I have been advised that the State branches of the QPPO have been meeting and are extremely dissatisfied because no action has been taken. They have given no support to the three men concerned. I have received telephone calls from various branches throughout the State, which have indicated quite clearly that in some cases there has been no support at all.

There was a very large meeting in Dalby of the branch connected with the three people concerned, particularly Mr Wild. I believe that Mr Wild is a close associate of Sir Robert Sparkes. At that meeting, 13 out of a possible 50 people who were entitled to vote voted on the particular question. Of those 13 who voted, eight were in favour of the proposal and five were against it. The rest did not make any comment. That shows that the three men did not have any support.

It has come to my notice that a Mr David Gowen, who now resides at The Gap, was once an associate of the company Asian Pacific Exports Pty Ltd and worked for the Queensland Pork Producers Organisation while he was employed by the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation. He was connected with the business being transacted by the three people who have just resigned their positions with the QPPO.

I advise the House that David Gowen and a Bevan Whip of 14 Cloghan Crescent, The Gap, are the directors of a company registered as Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd.

That company was registered in 1983. Its address is care of Gilshenan and Luton, 27 Turbot Street, Brisbane, which is a firm of solicitors. Mr Whip is the secretary of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation, and Mr Gowen is an executive officer of the same organisation.

The telephone number of Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd is not shown in the directory. However, if honourable members wish to buy stock feed from that company, they need only ring the switchboard at the dairymen's organisation and they will be connected to the company. One might be bold enough to suggest that the stock feed sales are to the advantage of dairy farmers. However, I am told on good authority that this company sells to pig-farmers and others at discounted prices.

The Minister for Primary Industries should investigate fully all quangos to determine whether similar situations exist elsewhere. I say that because it appears to me that Mr Gowen and Mr Whip are operating from the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation in exactly the same way as the people in the Queensland Pork Producers Organisation were working. Bevan Whip and David Gowen are using the good offices of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation to sell, through their own company, stock feed to people outside of that organisation.

It is time that the Minister looked into the QDO and other organisations, particularly statutory organisations, to find out what is going on. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to put pressure on the Government to undertake such investigations to make sure that the people who are running the Queensland Farm Feeds company through the QDO are stopped.

The statement delivered by the Minister this morning indicates that, quite clearly, there has been a cover-up relative to the Queensland Pork Producers Organisation. If I bring this to the Minister's attention, there will be a cover-up relative to the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation and the activities of the company registered as Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd.

Time expired.

Pornographic Video Movies

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (11.3 p.m.): I rise to discuss a matter that has been brought to my attention on numerous occasions, namely, pornographic video cassettes, which are readily available in Queensland.

Mr Davis: Mickey Mouse.

Mr STEPHAN: Mickey Mouse is about my standard, too. Unfortunately, that is not the standard of many other cassettes.

Mr Davis: Do you know that Mr McKechnie wanted to ban "Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs" because he said Snow White was living with seven men?

Mr STEPHAN: I think that the member for Brisbane Central is in the wrong era.

It is time that notice was taken of what is going on in the video industry, especially with the increasing popularity of video cassette recorders. Many parents are concerned about leaving their children at home, because although they hope that the children will be watching a particular video movie, it may not be accurately described by its title.

I would like to read one of the many letters that I have received which highlights the concern of parents in that regard. The letter reads—

"You are aware of the great concern that the relaxation of the video censorship law has aroused.

I think that until the Federal government revises its censorship, our state Censorship Board should exercise stricter surveillance in this area. People have told me that even under the classification of 'M' & 'R' much of the material is of a shocking nature, even innocent sounding titles are very misleading."

The fact that many of the titles are misleading is one of the major concerns.

I have been informed on a couple of occasions that films shown at drive-in theatres are not the same films as those available under the same title on video film. In both instances, the parents told me that they had gone out leaving their young children at home to watch a video film and that when they arrived home they found that the children were watching a program that they would not have understood and one that the parents did not want their children to watch, anyway.

That raises the point that what is needed is classification of video films. Although I do not own a video cassette recorder, I am well aware of the dubious content of some of the video films that are readily available to children of all ages. It is the parents' responsibility to determine the nature of the films that their children are watching. I regret to say that many parents themselves do not share this opinion and do not shoulder their responsibility.

Mr Davis: You have to blame the parents a little bit.

Mr STEPHAN: I am blaming the parents a little bit, but unless they go through the films in the first instance, they do not know what is on them.

As I said earlier, perhaps the problem could be overcome by the classification of video films. That would allow parents to determine what is being shown. However, even if Queensland were to take action to classify video films, the problem would not be overcome completely. The free flow of video films across the State by mail order would not be stopped, nor would people be prevented from driving across the border and buying video films or cassettes in Tweed Heads or elsewhere. However, I am pleased to note that the Queensland Government is looking at the problem very closely. The Minister has taken the matter to heart and realises that a decision must be made.

Mr De Lacy: Wouldn't a national system be better?

Mr STEPHAN: Certainly a national system would be better. As I pointed out when I was quoting from the letter, it would be very encouraging to the Queensland Government if the Federal Government was to face up to its responsibilities.

Mr Alison: And be fair dinkum.

Mr STEPHAN: And be realistic and fair dinkum, as the honourable member for Maryborough said. However, the Commonwealth Government has not shown any real inclination or desire to support the Queensland Government and the Minister in what they are trying to do. The Minister has said what he will do not if he gets the opportunity but when he gets the opportunity. One matter that calls for close examination is the total prohibition on R-rated material that is available. The classification of video films would provide a complete defence against obscenity on video films.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is still talking about Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck.

Redevelopment of Kangaroo Point Shipyard

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (11.8 p.m.): I express my concern at the Government's action concerning the Evans Deakin site at Kangaroo Point in my electorate. Approximately three years ago, I asked the Minister for Lands (Mr Glasson) on two occasions whether a feasibility study that was then carried out for the Government would be made public, so that I could be informed of the potential land usages for that site and so that the people of Kangaroo Point could participate in any meaningful debate that might occur and put forward their interests. On each occasion I was told that the land usage studies were privy to Cabinet and would not be made known to the media or anybody else.

Since then, the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) and the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) have gone out in public to bat for the QIT,

which wants to use that site as a second campus. They said that the site was ideal for that purpose. The director of the QIT, Dennis Gibson, said quite clearly that it was absolutely essential for the QIT to get a second campus and that the shipyard site was ideal for that purpose. Both Ministers were very optimistic that the land would be passed over. Mr Ahern said that there was every chance that it would be handed over. Through all that, of course, the Minister for Lands remained silent. There was no way in the world that he would be a party to the QIT's acquisition of the site.

It is interesting to note that on 17 March 1983, under the provisions of the Acquisition of Land Act, an area was declared for consolidation of the area. It was taken under subsection (c) of the second Schedule to the Acquisition of Land Act. My legal advice is that it was totally illegal in theory to take land just to enhance the capital value of land already in the possession of the Government. That is private enterprise gone crazy. It is ridiculous that it happened.

In answer to a question that I directed to the Minister on 28 August, I was told that five properties had been acquired by the Crown by voluntary agreement with the owners. It is interesting that it was suggested that it was acquired by voluntary agreement when the Government brought down an Order in Council and held a gun at the heads of the property-owners so that it could acquire extra land for the sole purpose of enhancing the capital value of the land. When Cabinet refused the pleas by the two Ministers and the QIT, we were told that world-wide tenders had been called for the redevelopment of that land. It appears that it is more important for the Government to have a high-rise monstrosity on that site. However, it is against the interests of the people living in the area. The Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) said that the site was totally unsuitable for high-rise residential development. The Minister for Education (Mr Powell) said that it was an ideal site for a second campus.

Mr Ahern has been telling the people of this State that Queensland has the worst situation in Australia with regard to tertiary education and that Queensland has fewer students going on to technical and further education than any other State. It makes a myth of the idea of developing a second campus. More people are entering the technology area. However, what would be constructed on that site? The only criterion will be the amount of profit that can be made from it.

The Government is riding roughshod over the needs of the tertiary students in this State and the needs of the people of Kangaroo Point. The people have not been told what is happening. Orders in Council have been used wrongfully. Property has been acquired. The capital value of that land has been enhanced. Somebody will benefit from that. We do not know what price will be obtained for it. We do not know whether it will be developed to make a profit. Nobody can tell me that more work would be created by developing a site like that so somebody can make a profit than by developing the site so that QIT students could attend a campus there, which would benefit this State. There is no way in the world that the people of Kangaroo Point want that 2-ha site, as well as the five other blocks of land that have been acquired, used for the construction of an international hotel or even a casino, as has been suggested by some people.

It is time that there was more open government. As the local member, I ought to be told what the consultants have said about the use of the site. The people of the area should be told what is happening on their doorstep. It is abysmal that the Government rides roughshod over Ministers who have the responsibility to make sure that our children are educated and to make sure that technical skills are passed on. The Queensland Government is a pro-development Government that only wants to give property to developers, and greedy ones at that, so that they can make a very quick quid out of the resources of this State. Queensland has the best Government that money can buy. There is no doubt about that; its decision on this matter proves it.

Education System

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (11.13 p.m.): In the "Daily Sun" on Tuesday, 4 September 1984, Allan Yates, under the headline "PM casts doubt on education", reported in the lead paragraph—

"Prime Minister Mr Hawke yesterday cast doubt on the ability of the education system to provide students with adequate skills to enter the work force."

I agree in principle that the Prime Minister has recognised a need in our society. The Queensland Government recognises the same need. The Honourable Lin Powell is at present trying to restructure the education system in Queensland so that it will meet that need.

The article contains this passage to which I take exception—

"... with increasing competition for jobs there was a need for the education system to provide students with the right skills to move out into the world, Mr Hawke said.

'In a hard, competitive world we do no service to our young people by throwing them to the wolves ...'"

I take exception to the words "throwing them to the wolves."

Earlier tonight, in the Address in Reply debate, the member for Redcliffe spoke at length about the problem of youth unemployment. He sheeted home the blame to uncompetitiveness of our young people on the labour market. The Prime Minister is a very astute politician and a very intelligent man. It would not have been an unintentional omission on his part to speak only about the failure of the education system throwing our young people to the wolves. I put it to the House that the Prime Minister would have been much more of a statesman if he had recognised that, while he was president of the ACTU not so many years ago, he presided over wages claims that bore no relationship to productivity and over the abolition of junior rates of pay in many industries in Australia. Junior rates are almost non-existent. Mr Hawke presided over a series of campaigns that resulted in our young people being uncompetitive on the labour market. They are just not good value. Now, because he is Prime Minister, he recognises the problem.

The Prime Minister has an accord. He is in charge of the political arm of the ACTU.

An Opposition Member: You hate it working, don't you?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Let me continue. Let me take it further. He recognises the need, but he refuses to have anyone do anything about it. He will not allow the unions to take any action.

Two weeks ago I spoke in the House about a letter I wrote to Mr Harry Hauenschild, President of the Queensland Trades and Labor Council. I asked him if he would study the wage rates of juniors with a view to restructuring them so that young people had a chance to obtain jobs. Mr Hauenschild still has not replied to that letter.

Let me go back a few more years, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) was connected with the Electrical Trades Union. He was working within the Queensland scene in support of campaigns presided over by Mr Hawke.

Mr De Lacy: Do you think that 17-year-olds get too much?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: They are uncompetitive. That is the reality.

Other members of the House also have a background in the trade union movement. They were part of campaigns that resulted in the present plight of our young people. I am not bashing the unions. I am fighting for our young people. I have spoken on the subject at least four or five times already. The member for Redcliffe spoke about it very well today. I issue a challenge to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition in this place, Mr Hauenschild and the union movement. I admit that the education system can take some of the blame—we are attempting to do something about that—but let us

see the union movement share the blame and be prepared to realise that, on present wage rates, our young people are uncompetitive.

Mr De Lacy: What do you mean some of them? They are all to blame.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Labor has not given one inch on wages. It has not given one inch on awards for young people. It has stuck to its stance and has said, "Someone else can pay." It will not look after our young people in any way. I issue that challenge.

Fitness and Aerobics Industry

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (11.17 p.m.): In recent weeks the community has witnessed the collapse of a number of private enterprises in the fitness and aerobics industry. Two main groups, Vigor and Inshape, have gone to the wall. I suppose that to many people that was an unexpected occurrence, but I have claimed before and I say again that the collapse was premeditated. It was skilfully orchestrated by a group of men who should be behind bars. I refer to Richard Augustine McDonald, Brian McDonald, Barry McCowan and John Collins. I suggest that they are crooks of the first order and I call upon the Government to investigate the following companies: Clinton Dale Pty Ltd, Macedraw Pty Ltd and Excidal Pty Ltd.

During the past 12 months or so the people behind those companies—and particularly the four men I have named—conspired to relieve dozens of small business entrepreneurs and thousands of individual Queenslanders and other Australians of what could total between \$3m and \$5m. They took advantage of a get-fit craze that has engulfed the nation. They took advantage of the trust of staff and thousands upon thousands of people who joined the clubs. They took advantage of the inadequacy of the laws controlling franchises. They took advantage of the desire of small business proprietors to invest in the fitness industry. They took advantage of the financial institutions that were willing to finance private enterprise that had potential. I am amazed that the only action of the Government to date is the meeting called by the Minister responsible for consumer affairs (Mr Lester) of those in the fitness industry who are still financially afloat.

The Attorneys-General of the eastern States should now combine their resources and forces to bring to justice the mastermind Dick McDonald and his crooked cohorts who, I suggest to the Assembly, are all guilty of fraudulent misrepresentation. They have used two strategies to dupe and rip off the people of Queensland and Australia. The first involved franchises in, for instance, the Vigor name. The second was by the outright purchase of fitness centres that were going concerns.

Franchises were sold for between \$30,000 and \$50,000 plus 5 per cent of gross turnover for administration costs and another 10 per cent of gross turnover for advertising. One Vigor operator was left with a little less than \$10,000 gross profit out of an initial \$100,000 income.

McDonald and his cohorts did not deliver. They did not back up the centres with administration, and the promised advertising and promotion did not materialise. One estimate is that the McDonald gang took at least \$2m from the sale of franchises throughout Australia. At one stage, over 40 Vigor centres were operating on the east coast. Right across the State and the nation, centre after centre has closed. In fact, on one day in Melbourne seven Inshape centres closed. That group is just as bad as the Vigor group.

Because it is a clear case of fraud, in the time that I have left to me I want to get to the fact that McDonald and his crowd approached the existing centres to buy the operations lock, stock and barrel. They offered market prices ranging from \$600,000 to \$1.25m. They cunningly gave owners unconditional deposits of up to \$50,000 and signed unconditional contracts to purchase, but with an agreed settlement date six to nine months hence. They then entered into rental agreements for \$6,000 to \$10,000 per month during the contract period. They immediately took possession and began to sell memberships and, in many instances, sold in excess of 600 memberships at up to \$600 each. In most centres, they took more than \$300,000. After two months, and in some

cases three months, they stopped paying the rent and a little later they stopped paying the staff.

They then advised the original owners that they did not intend to proceed with the contracts, yet they still continued to sell memberships. That is where the fraudulent misrepresentation comes in. They never had any intention of settling the contracts, regardless of the money that was paid, and they committed a confidence trick by selling memberships to hundreds of thousands of people right across the nation. Over and over again, they sold memberships without any intention of providing the promised fitness services for periods of from three to five years. They ripped off up to \$3m for an outlay of a few hundred thousand dollars.

I call upon the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to act immediately and to order the Fraud Squad and investigators from the Corporate Affairs Office to move on the companies and the people I have named.

Australian Flag

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (11.22 p.m.): I raise a matter that has been of great concern to many Queenslanders and has been spoken about a great deal in the Chamber during the Address in Reply debate. Because so many members wished to speak in that debate, I did not have the opportunity to do so. I wish to speak about the national flag.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: The moment the matter of the Australian flag is raised, one hears great cries of derision from members of the ALP. The changing of the national anthem was a pretty poor show.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: I am not speaking about whether I am in favour of it or not; I am speaking about the manner in which it was changed.

A few years ago, a referendum was held for a national song, not a national anthem, and I want to make that quite clear. Simply by legislation, Mr Hawke imposed upon the nation a new national anthem, and that is the thing that people have objected to and that is why they are very concerned about the national flag. They believe that the Prime Minister is going to ring one in, just as he did with the national anthem.

The Governor quite rightly expressed the concern of the Queensland Government and a great number of the people in this State and the nation in relation to the national flag. Honourable members should bear in mind that for a host of people throughout the State and the nation the national flag has a tremendous amount of meaning. I wish to detail the composition of the Australian national flag, which features the five stars of the Southern Cross, the Commonwealth Star and the combined crosses of St George, St Andrew and St Patrick. The union of crosses represents Australia's early settlers. The Southern Cross indicates Australia's geographical position in the southern hemisphere. The Commonwealth Star with its seven points represents the unity of the six Australian States and the seventh point stands for all Australian territories. That is the meaning behind the flag, but it goes even further than that. I have in mind the meaning of the flag to our returned servicemen and all those who were closely involved with the war.

I will now read an outline on the flag given at the Anzac Day service this year at the Yuleba Memorial Hall. Unfortunately I do not know the author of the outline, but it is very much to the point.

Mr Davis: Yuleba? Where is that?

Mr NEAL: The honourable member will baa if I get hold of him. The outline relative to the flag is in these terms—

“Today we march behind the flag (two) one the Union Jack and the other the Australian National Flag. With the one we showed our original parentage, with the

other we aligned our own identity gained at Federation in 1901—as the strong moves are being made to change our flag it is appropriate to relate briefly how our flag was devised.

Until Australia became recognised as a nation, at Federation we flew the Union Jack, but our new identity demanded one more significant and descriptive so a national competition was held to offer designs from which a selection could be made. Over 30,000 entries were received featuring a wide variety of ideas and designs, one even featured an emu playing with a cricket ball.”

The member for Brisbane Central would probably want the boxing kangaroo. The outline continues—

“The competition judges in their wisdom selected our present flag except for one change made in 1903 when an extra point on the star was added to represent Australian Territories.

The prominent blue reminds us of our beautiful sky, of which we can be jealous, for the Northern Hemisphere cannot boast such; also the blue refers to the blue seas which surround Australia.

The constellation which we call the Southern Cross cannot be seen in the Northern Hemisphere and can be seen most clearly from Australia. The 7 points of the large star on the flag represent the States and Territories of Australia.

The Union Jack in the upper corner is not there to represent England but rather is a composite unit of flags representing the three Saints—St Patrick, St George, St Andrew and this composite unit represents three Kingdoms of old from which we have inherited the old basics of constitutional, legal and religious order, freedoms and traditions.

The Southern Cross also had a place in Aboriginal legends for thousands of years. What then could be more appropriate to represent Australia than the flag we have today?”

I think that says it all.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! The time allotted for the Adjournment debate has now expired.

The House adjourned at 11.28 p.m.