

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 2 OCTOBER 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 2 OCTOBER 1984

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

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Mortgages (Secondary Market) Bill reported by Mr Speaker.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**Resignation of Mr K. W. Wright**

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that a vacancy exists on the Standing Orders Committee consequent upon the resignation of Mr Keith Webb Wright, member for the electoral district of Rockhampton, from that committee.

Appointment of Mr T. J. Burns

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

“That Mr Thomas James Burns, member for the electoral district of Lytton, be appointed a member of the Standing Orders Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Keith Webb Wright.”

Motion agreed to.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Water Quality Council of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984

State Electricity Commission of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984

Literature Board of Review for the year ended 30 June 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1984

Forestry Act 1959-1982

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Orders in Council under—

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

Racing and Betting Act 1980-1984

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

Forestry Act 1959-1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959-1981

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

Justices Act 1886-1982

Magistrates Courts Act 1921-1982

Real Property Act 1861-1981

Supreme Court Act of 1921

District Courts Act 1967-1982

Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act 1967-1980

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1979

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1984

Regulations under—

Racing and Betting Act 1980-1984

Main Roads Act 1920-1983

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979

Farm Produce Marketing Act 1964-1982

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1984

Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936-1973

Wheat Pool Act 1920-1983

Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act 1955-1981

Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1981

Business Names Act 1962-1979

The Cash Orders Regulation Acts, 1946 to 1959

Money Lenders Act 1916-1979

Invasion of Privacy Act 1971-1981

Co-operative and Other Societies Act 1967-1978

Building Societies Act 1886-1976

Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958-1974

Friendly Societies Act 1913-1982

Liquor Act 1912-1984

Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act 1962-1982

Recording of Evidence Acts, 1962 to 1968

Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980-1984

Property Law Act 1974-1982

Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976-1984

Collections Act 1966-1981

Associations Incorporation Act 1981

Justices of the Peace Act 1975

Elections Act 1983

By-law under the Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976-1982

Rule under the Coroners Act 1958-1982

Reports—

Queensland Milk Board for the year ended 30 June 1984

Pyramid Selling Scheme Elimination Committee for the year ended 30 June 1984

North Queensland Racing Association for the ended 30 June 1984

Rockhampton Jockey Club for the year ended 30 June 1984

Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984

National Trust of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984

Report and Statement of Receipts and Payments of the Disaster Appeals Trust Fund Committee for the year ended 30 June 1984.

DAYS ALLOTTED TO SUPPLY

Sessional Order

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“(1) That for this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, not more than fifteen days shall be allotted for the consideration of the Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates, the Vote on Account and the Resolutions of Supply.

(2) That for this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House may, on the days allotted for Supply, continue to sit until 10 o'clock p.m. Each of the periods between 12 o'clock noon and 5 o'clock p.m. and between 5 o'clock p.m. and 10 o'clock p.m. shall be accounted an allotted day under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307. Two allotted days shall be allowed for the discussion of the Estimates of a department. At the termination of the period so allowed the Chairman shall put every question necessary to decide the Vote under consideration and shall then proceed to put the question for the balance of the Estimates for that department; all such questions to be decided without amendment or debate: Provided that, if the discussion of the Estimates of a department be concluded before the expiry of the two days so allowed, the period remaining shall be allocated to the discussion of the Estimates next brought before the Committee.

(3) That all other provisions of Standing Order No. 307 shall, mutatis mutandis, continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Rationalisation of Railway Workshops

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: I wish to announce that a further rationalisation of railway workshops in Queensland has taken place. Honourable members would be aware that a report on the most far-reaching investigation ever undertaken into the Queensland Railways was tabled in Parliament in August last year. Consultants involved in the investigation and report, when dealing specifically with mechanical maintenance, found that, on average, workshops employees were spending 45 per cent of their time on productive work.

One of the recommendations contained in that report was that staffing levels at Cairns, Toowoomba and Maryborough workshops should be set to eventually match resources with local work-load. Rationalisation of the Cairns workshops began in April this year, when 34 positions were declared surplus and redundancy notices were issued. In Maryborough, after an exhaustive review of the operation of workshop and locomotive-servicing facilities, today 43 employees have been advised in writing that their positions will become redundant. At Gympie, it is proposed to eliminate the wagon-repair facility, and 15 employees have been served redundancy notices. The annual savings resulting from the changes will be \$730,000 at Maryborough and \$270,000 at Gympie.

As usual, the tight redundancy agreement between the unions and the Railway Department will see the employees given six months' notice and extensive assistance by Queensland Railways to find new positions or to be relocated. In a further move to lessen the impact of redundancies, two weeks ago Cabinet approved a selective voluntary early retirement scheme. In essence, this provides that, where there is a surplus of employees in a particular grade and that surplus cannot be effectively employed without relocation to another part of the State, employees who are over 55 and not superannuated may be offered the opportunity of early retirement at the discretion of the commissioner. Such early retirees will receive the full benefits to which they would have been entitled had they continued in employment to the age of 65. This scheme will be available to

railway employees in relevant grades affected by rationalisation in Maryborough and Gympie.

I must stress that no employee has lost, or will lose, his or her job as a result of the implementation of the recommendations resulting from the PA Australia report. Implementation of the report so far has seen savings to the Queensland tax-payer of \$30m in the first full year. Although this factor, together with increased traffic, has initiated a remarkable reversal of the pattern of increasing railway deficits over the previous 10 years, last year's net operating deficit being \$68m lower than the deficit in 1982-83, the total cash deficit for 1983-84 was still substantial at \$81m.

The Queensland Government will continue to accept its responsibility to do what it can to further reduce and eventually eliminate the burden on the tax-payer while remaining committed to its long-standing policy of railway development. Honourable members would realise that Queensland Railways ability to remain as one of the State's biggest single employers will depend on how quickly it can become more efficient and cost effective. The best method we have of retaining employment for railway employees is to give the public an efficient service on which they can rely totally. The corporate image of Queensland Railways has been upgraded and its managerial initiatives sharpened with exactly that aim in mind.

PRIVILEGE

Pamphlet "The Parliament of Queensland"

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (11.14 a.m.): This morning, a class of students from the Tingalpa State School, which is in my electorate, visited Parliament House. When I asked for a pamphlet on the Parliament for each of the students, I was told that, because of a shortage of pamphlets, only 10 were available for each class. The pamphlet "The Parliament of Queensland" explains the way in which Parliament is organised and how it operates. It is of great assistance to school students.

Mr Speaker, it is a scandal that such material is not available for students, particularly when, every day of the week, photographs of Ministers appear in advertisements in the press. I ask that you take the steps necessary to ensure that students receive copies of the pamphlet to which they are entitled for a description of Parliament and the way in which it operates.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will look into the matter and see that it is corrected.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Police Raid on Gaming House, Sunshine Beach

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

With reference to the recent massive police raid on a suspected gaming-house at Duke St, Sunshine Beach—

(1) Were the roulette tables and other instruments of gaming that were seized largely identified with the instruments seized and forfeited in a previous raid?

(2) Were these instruments sold back to the previous operator for \$10,000?

(3) Was this sale arranged by local police staff?

(4) Was this sale authorised by the commissioner's office, by the local inspector's office, or by other police officers and, if the last-mentioned, by whom?

(5) With the \$10,000 repurchase, how much of this money went to (a) consolidated revenue (b) the Police Reward Fund and/or (c) other recipients, enumerating names and amounts?

(6) What were the total costs of the recent raid, including use of bus, police cars, police personnel and attendances at the Pomona Court House?

(7) Does he regard the fixing of watch house bail at \$100 for most of those arrested as a proper protection of Crown interests after such an expensive raid?

(8) Is he satisfied with continuing the easy way out of bail forfeiture for such offences, providing both a cheap alternative to conviction as well as no conviction on record?

(9) How does he account for the warning tip given during the day of the raid to a number of local detectives, which meant that a number of regulars, including a local medical practitioner and his wife, who rarely miss a game, were able to avoid the embarrassment of arrest on this occasion?

(10) Is the sorry pattern of this disgraceful episode to be repeated and will the forfeited instruments of gaming again be offered to the offending operator at a figure which, although seemingly high, is still a favourable price for what can be described as very sophisticated equipment, worthy of any casino in the world?

(11) Will the police again be used to negotiate such a resale?

Answer—

(1 to 5) Cases resulting from the Duke Street, Sunshine Beach, raid are still before the court. Any allegations about seizure of exhibits will be canvassed there. It is not for me to usurp the function of the court and to answer this matter at this time. However, if the information is required by the honourable member, at a later date it will be provided to him.

(6) The estimate of the total costs cannot be given as the matter has not been finalised. That information may be given to the honourable member at a later date, also.

(7) Bail was granted under the authority of legislation. The expense of an operation is not a criterion for granting bail.

(8) Persons arrested for the offences have been remanded to appear at court on 10 October 1984. Bail has not been forfeited at this time. Therefore, the aspect of providing a cheap alternative to a conviction and no conviction being recorded is not an appropriate matter for comment.

(9) It is inappropriate to comment on this matter in view of the aspects raised in (1 to 5). However, if the honourable member has information regarding any police impropriety in this matter, I call upon him to report it when the appropriate action will be taken to investigate it.

(10 & 11) It is inappropriate to comment on this matter in view of the aspects raised in (1 to 5).

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked for some consideration. There is far too much audible conversation and I ask honourable members to desist. I cannot hear the questions being asked or the answers given.

2.

Drought Relief

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to his answer to my question of 19 September on the subject of drought relief in which he stated, *inter alia*, that—

“To be eligible for drought relief, a farmer must be drought declared, be in necessitous circumstances owing to drought, unable to finance his essential carry-on requirements in whole or part from his own resources and be unable to obtain assistance through normal commercial channels.”

and to his admission that drought relief has been invested temporarily in the short-term money market by some farmers—

(1) How many farmers have invested drought relief on the short-term money market in (a) 1981-82, (b) 1982-83 and (c) 1983-84?

(2) What was the total amount of money invested in each year?

(3) What amount of drought relief money will be affected by the problems experienced within the Queensland Graingrowers Association?

(4) What meaning does he attach to the word “temporary”?

(5) What is the longest period that drought relief funds have been invested temporarily by participants in necessitous circumstances?

(6) As the Government is the custodian of the tax-payers' money, what checks are carried out to see that this short-term investment is caused by the need to wait to plant crops and not just to gain from the substantial difference in interest, thus reducing funds that would be available to farmers facing serious difficult circumstances because of drought?

Answer—

(1 to 6) It is not possible to furnish the detailed information sought by the honourable member. The Agricultural Bank does not conduct a full-scale investigation into how its clients spend their money. As advised in the answer to the honourable member's question of 19 September 1984, the bank, having been satisfied as to an applicant's eligibility for drought relief assistance, pays the approved amount direct to the borrower when security documentation has been completed. No farmer who could establish eligibility and satisfy security requirements was denied access to drought relief assistance.

The Federal Minister for Primary Industry (the Honourable John Kerin) was apprised of the manner in which the bank disbursed drought relief assistance to its borrowers.

3. Overseas Trips by Quango Personnel

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to his answer to my question of 19 September in which he detailed the names of 41 members or officers of quangos who had made overseas trips since May 1983—

(1) What was the cost of these trips and the total cost to the State's primary producers?

(2) Were any of those listed accompanied by their wives or other non-quango personnel and, if so, what are the details?

Answer—

(1) I am not able to provide the information which the honourable member for Lytton seeks. I do not keep running totals of individual items of expenditure by marketing boards. However, I advise that, pursuant to amendments to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act which were enacted earlier this year, I require that, in future, marketing boards include in their annual reports as much information on their expenditure, including overseas travel, as may safely be disclosed publicly without detriment to their commercial operations.

I further advise that in the last accounting year the export marketing effort brought in approximately \$950m in export revenue. I expect that this year the figure will exceed \$1,000m. Export markets are not gained, and will not be retained, much less expanded, unless board members and their officers go out and look for business. To sell successfully overseas it is necessary to travel overseas.

(2) No wives or other non-quango personnel accompanied the officers concerned overseas.

4. Miles Platting Road/Padstow Road/Pacific Highway Intersection

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

With reference to lengthy traffic jams reported as occurring at the intersection of Padstow Road and Miles Platting Road, Eight Mile Plains—

Will he investigate the green light timing at that intersection, with a view to enabling drivers turning right from Miles Platting Road into Logan Road to proceed more frequently?

Answer—

An investigation will be undertaken in accordance with the honourable member's request. However, it must be borne in mind that an increase in the green time on Miles Platting Road will reduce the available green time on Logan Road and Padstow Road. The effects of any reduction in the available green time on traffic flows on these roads has to be assessed.

I will arrange for departmental officers to advise the honourable member of the outcome of the investigation when completed.

5. Bus Services, Eight Mile Plains

Mr KAUS asked the Minister for Transport—

Are there any plans to provide bus services such as daily services to railway stations for residents of Eight Mile Plains, either through public bus transport or by extending the routes of private bus companies?

Answer—

A private bus operator, trading as Rochedale Bus Service, services the area of Eight Mile Plains, providing both worker and shopper services on timetables that allow for interchanging to Brisbane City Council cityxpress services at Garden City. In addition, services are provided that pass the Fruitgrove Railway Station.

Officers of the Transport Department are presently assisting this proprietor in examining his routes and timetables with a view to formulating an improved public transport system that could include bus services meeting trains at a suitable rail interchange. This would be in addition to the present bus/bus connection at Garden City.

6. Northern Visits by Mr P. J. Killoran

Mr SCOTT asked the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs—

With reference to the travel history of Mr P. J. Killoran, the Director of the then Department of Aboriginal and Islander Advancement prior to 1983, when he used to make regular but comparatively infrequent visits to Cairns and points north of that city—

(1) How many times has Mr Killoran, who is now under secretary of his department, flown to or through Cairns at departmental expense since the date of the 1983 State election?

(2) Is the under secretary either currently planning or about to undertake a voyage on the "Melbidir" to Raine Island and then on to the Torres Strait in company with a junior departmental public relations officer based in Cairns?

(3) Is the frequent and continued absence of the under secretary in Cairns the reason why there is a two to three month delay in obtaining a reply from the department in correspondence to the Minister?

Answer—

(1) During the period from 13 November 1983 until 19 September 1984, the Under Secretary of the Department of Community Services has travelled through Cairns at departmental expense some 20 times.

(2) No.

(3) Correspondence addressed to me is my responsibility. Because I travel extensively in north and far-north Queensland and am absent for extended periods from my secretariat, delays may occur in the answering of some letters. I assure the honourable member, however, that this is not intentional, and if he advises me of any particular correspondence about which he is concerned, I will make inquiries.

7. Wheat Stocks

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) What are the comparisons between the wheat carry-over stocks held by the New South Wales Wheat Board and the Queensland Wheat Board?

(2) What are the respective ship-loading elevator rates of both the New South Wales and Queensland shipping terminals?

(3) What are the respective storage capacities at the above terminals?

Answer—

(1) Carry-over stocks are held on behalf of the Australian Wheat Board by the board's authorised receiver in each State. The authorised receiver in Queensland is the State Wheat Board, which has appointed the Queensland Grain Handling Authority (Bulk Grains Queensland) as its storage agent. The authorised receiver in New South Wales is the Grain Handling Authority of New South Wales. The Australian Wheat Board has estimated that carry-over stocks as at 30 November 1984 (the normal time at which such carry-over is calculated) will be—

Queensland	10 000 tonnes
New South Wales	3.1 million tonnes

(2) The most relevant measure of a terminal's ship-loading capacity is the average monthly out-turn rate on a two-shifts-per-day basis. Using this measure, the ship-loading capacity of the Queensland and New South Wales terminals is—

Brisbane (Pinkenba)	350 000 tones per month
Gladstone	140 000 tones per month
Sydney	250 000 tones per month
Newcastle	240 000 tones per month.

Mackay has not yet been declared by the Australian Wheat Board as a wheat-export port.

(3) The storage capacities at each terminal are—

Brisbane	
Pinkenba No. 1	68 300 tonnes
Pinkenba No. 2	45 000 tonnes
(ex-Maynegrain)	
Total	113 300 tonnes
Gladstone	83 000 tonnes
Sydney	151 600 tonnes
Newcastle	157 000 tonnes

I would also advise the honourable member that new export terminals are under construction in both States, namely, at Fisherman Islands (Brisbane) and Port Kembla. It is noteworthy that the Commonwealth Government is providing a considerable portion

of the funding for the Port Kembla terminal but has so far refused to provide similar funding for the Fisherman Islands terminal.

I can only reach the conclusion that the Commonwealth Government's attitude is based on the fact that there is a Labor Government in New South Wales but not in Queensland. It is deplorable, but perhaps not unexpected, that the Commonwealth Government has adopted this double standard.

8. **Suttons/Kemp Foundries**

Mr INNES asked the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology—

With reference to his answer to my question of 28 August concerning Suttons/Kemp Foundries in which he failed to give any details concerning the financial position of that company—

(1) How many shares does the Queensland Government own in the company which runs the foundries, and at what purchase price?

(2) Who are the other share-holders and how many shares does each own?

(3) Is not there a Queensland Government guarantee still in force and to what extent?

(4) Who were the directors of the company from the time of the acquisition of shares by the Queensland Government, what were their ordinary occupations and, if they were appointed in the interests of particular share-holders, which share-holders?

(5) If any of these directors were appointed in the interests of the Government's share-holding, did they report to him about the financial position of the company?

(6) Would he agree that there is an obligation on directors to inform share-holders about the financial position of their company?

(7) Would he agree that there is no legal bar to the disclosure of information by the directors?

(8) Are not the people of Queensland entitled to information concerning a company in which they have such a substantial investment?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Each share in Suttons Foundry Pty Ltd has a par value of \$1 and all have been issued at par.

The share position is—

Authorised Capital	
A Class shares	2 500 000 shares
B Class shares	10 shares
C Class shares	999 990 shares
Issued Capital	
A Class shares	
Treasurer of Queensland	1 250 000 shares
Wormald International Ltd	1 250 000 shares
B Class shares	
Treasurer of Queensland	2 shares
Wormald International Ltd	2 shares
C Class shares	
P. J. Falvey	89 022
J. F. Lubke	48 022
N. P. Cuthbert	13 523
J. H. Shillito	47 569
S. J. Cooper	39 035
D. H. Lindsay	20 908
S. A. & V. J. Mellish	3 356

K. J. Jenvey	104 000
D. C. Hamilton	25 000
R. Hellewell	1 000
P. Boisen	1 000
S. McCloy	1 000
C. Wood	350
W. Spence	1 101
C. H. Lowe	1 101
G. Stubbs	21 459
J. W. & F. I. Davies	1 202
M. J. Kendrick	2 777
V. J. Rail	2 435
G. J. Cooper	5 500
L. Lindsay	750
F. D. Hall	5 000
C. K. Skippington	500
P. J. McMorrine	500
L. H. Saxon	1 000.

(3) No. The secured creditor called up the guarantees of the Government and Wormald International Limited after the secured creditor placed the company in receivership. The Government loan guarantees amounted to \$1.6m.

(4) Donald George Young, public servant; Robert Frank Rathgeber, consultant; Roy Charles Cooper, retired; Geoffrey Ernest Pallister, company executive; and Graham Sturt, company executive. Messrs Donald George Young and Roy Charles Cooper were appointed by the Queensland Government, and Geoffrey Ernest Pallister and Graham Sturt were appointed by Wormald International Limited.

(5) Yes, by providing broad financial information as was available in meetings of the board of directors of the company to the Government nominated directors. I was kept informed of the general progress of the company.

(6) The matter of the obligations of directors in a company is a legal matter and not a matter on which I can give an opinion.

(7) The answer to the question would amount to the expression of a legal opinion and the member for Sherwood should seek the answer elsewhere.

(8) The company is at present in the hands of a receiver/manager who has issued statements from time to time on the progress of the receivership. Any statements by me about the company at present could prejudice the negotiations being undertaken by the receiver/manager. I have under consideration the making to the House shortly of a statement on the matter.

9. Charges against Police Officers

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

(1) How many police officers of the Queensland Police Force have been charged before any court in Queensland in 1982, 1983 and to date in 1984?

(2) In respect of each (a) what was the court, (b) what was the charge, (c) what was the result, (d) what was the rank and length of service of the defendant or accused and (e) what was the branch and station of the defendant or accused?

Answer—

(1) For the year ended 30 June 1982: 9 police officers; For the year ended 30 June 1983: 12 police officers; For the year ended 30 June 1984: 10 police officers.

(2) (a) For 1982: Magistrates Court and District Court; For 1983: Magistrates Court; and For 1984: Magistrates Court and District Court.

(b) For 1982: Deprivation of liberty; driving motor vehicle without due care and attention; conspiracy to cultivate prohibited plant; conspiracy to obstruct justice; driving motor vehicle under the influence of liquor; false pretences; attempt to procure another to kill; stealing; attempt to procure to steal; attempting to procure conspiracy to kill; conspiracy to pervert course of justice; attempt to procure witness to swear false testimony; and attempt to induce witness to give false evidence.

For 1983: Supply of dangerous drugs; swearing false evidence under oath; unlawful assault; aggravated assault; fail to provide specimen of breath for analysis; driving motor vehicle whilst under influence of liquor.

For 1984: Armed robbery; unlawful assault; unlawful and indecently dealing with male under 14 years of age; breaking, entering and stealing; receiving; possession of prohibited plant; stealing; indecent assault; false complaint; possession of an unlicensed concealable firearm; and conspiracy to pervert course of justice.

(c) For 1982: Charge dismissed, 6; nolle prosequi entered, 8; not guilty, 5; conviction, 5. For 1983: Charge dismissed, 1; nolle prosequi entered, 13; conviction, 5. For 1984: Charge dismissed, 4; nolle prosequi entered, 1; convictions, 2; not finalised, 9.

(d) For 1982: From a constable with two years' service to a sergeant 2/c with 16 years nine months' service.

For 1983: From a constable with four years eight months' service to a sergeant 1/c with 17 years and 10 months' service.

For 1984: From a constable with two years 10 months' service to an inspector of police with 33 years and one months' service.

(e) For 1982: Rockhampton, Townsville, Administration Branch, Boonah, Task Force, Brisbane, and Clayfield Uniform.

For 1983: Bundaberg, Mount Isa, Toowoomba, Gladstone and Fortitude Valley Uniform, Criminal Investigation Branch, Brisbane, and Juvenile Aid Bureau.

For 1984: Cairns, Gatton, Gold Coast mobile patrols, Southport, Bundaberg, Stanthorpe, Police Operations Centre, Queensland Police Academy, and Brisbane mobile patrols uniform.

10. Student Allowances

Mr SMITH asked the Minister for Education—

(1) How many student allowances were paid to low-income parents by his department for 1981-82 and 1983-84?

(2) How many of these allowances were for students living away from home?

(3) For the same periods, how many remote area allowances were granted and what was the average value of the allowance?

(4) For 1981-82 and 1983-84, how many senior remote area scholarship allowances were paid out?

Answer—

(1) Student allowances were approved for 3 391 students in 1981, 3 095 in 1982 and 3 554 in 1983. Allowances have been granted for 3 466 students in 1984.

(2) Living away from home rates applied to these allowances as follows: 1981, 13; 1982, 258; 1983, 253; 1984, 259.

(3) Remote area allowances approved during these years were: 1981, 2 838; 1982, 2 912; 1983, 3 334; 1984, 3 440. The average values of the allowances approved were: 1981, \$428; 1982, \$482; 1983, \$535; 1984, \$587.

(4) For these years, senior remote area scholarship payments were made or will be made as follows: 1981, 344; 1982, 393; 1983 399; 1984, 432.

11. Three-tier Preferred Option in Schools

Mr SMITH asked the Minister for Education—

(1) With reference to the obvious underspending on education by the Queensland Government and the expanding list of unfunded or underfunded projects throughout the State, how will costs associated with the implementation of the three-tier so-called preferred option be met without further reducing services and standards in other already hard-pressed areas?

(2) What are the educational benefits for students in the so-called middle school?

(3) Is he concerned about the possibility of increased social and emotional problems including those of discipline in the proposed middle school where student age range could be between 8 and 15 years?

Answer—

(1) I deny that there is any underspending on education. No expanded list of unfunded or underfunded projects throughout this State exists. The question is foolish, as was the grandstanding of the member for Townsville West when he gave notice of it on 20 September.

The preferred option presently being considered by my department is concerned with the spans of curriculum continuity and particular curriculum emphases that are generally considered to be educationally appropriate. It is not concerned with the wholesale reorganisation of schools and colleges into a three-tier structure. Consequently, it does not involve major expenditure above running costs that would be required for other curriculum options. Indeed, it may well involve some significant savings that will be achieved through more flexible use of resources.

(2) The continuity of children's learning can be greatly enhanced by developing curriculum for the pre-school to Year 10 span within a common framework rather than in separate pre-school, primary and secondary frameworks. Although the preferred option envisages greater flexibility in the use of resources across the upper primary and lower secondary spans of education as a result of the proposed curriculum option, it does not follow that children aged 8 to 15 years need to be grouped physically into middle or intermediate schools to achieve curriculum continuity.

(3) As I have already indicated, the preferred option is concerned with continuous spans for curriculum development. The Department of Education has 66 primary schools with secondary departments.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, the question was asked by a member of the Opposition, in an extremely small-minded fashion. With your indulgence, and for the benefit of those honourable members who are listening, I shall continue with my answer.

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Salisbury.

Mr POWELL: It is a shame that he did not learn a few manners.

In 15 of the 66 secondary departments in the State, provision is made for students beyond Year 10. Apart from those schools that have P-10 or P-12 spans on single campuses, situations in which it is possible to build schools specifically for the age range from 8 to 15 years are limited.

However, I do not have any evidence—there is no evidence—that social, emotional and disciplinary problems are accentuated in existing P-10 and P-12 schools.

It is a pity that those people with very small minds cannot look at the preferred option in the light in which it is presented.

12. Gates, Leslie Dam

Mr BOOTH asked the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services—

With reference to the installation of gates on Leslie Dam—

What is the present program regarding this installation and, in particular, when can it be expected that the gates will be in position?

Answer—

ANI-Sargeants has virtually completed shop fabrication of the seven radial gates to be installed on the Leslie Dam. On-site installation of the gate seals has begun.

Although the contractor has suggested that he will complete the installation of the gates before the end of 1984, it is felt that his program is unduly optimistic, and that April 1985 is a more likely completion date. Even this latter date is some six months ahead of the contractual requirement.

Other contracts on site, on which the operation of the gates is dependent, are also well advanced and should be completed by the end of November.

The State Government's Budget initiative of providing \$100m from the Special Major Capital Works Program Fund for water conservation will ensure that the overall Leslie Dam Stage II project should be able to be completed by the end of 1986, despite the failure of the Hawke Government in Canberra to make any grant for same in the 1984-85 year.

13. Townsville Sports Reserve Trust

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

With reference to the Townsville Sports Reserve Trust—

(1) Who are the present trustees of the Townsville Sports Reserve?

(2) How many meetings of the trust were held in the period 1 July 1983 to 30 June 1984?

(3) How many of those meetings did each trustee attend?

(4) What are the circumstances under which the membership of the trust could be changed?

(5) What responsibilities do the trustees have to report their activities (a) to the Minister, (b) to the Parliament and (c) to the community?

Answer—

(1) Roderick Douglas Clive Cusack, Owen Kelvin Griffiths, the land commissioner for the time being for the land agent district of Townsville, Claude Rawnsley and Reid Anderson.

(2) Seven formal meetings were held during the period. In addition, a subcommittee comprising the chairman, Mr Rawnsley, the honorary secretary and often the honorary treasurer, meet every weekend during the football season, and during the off-season when there is use of the ground or some emergency requiring them to meet.

(3) Messrs Anderson and Rawnsley attended all seven meetings; the land commissioner attended five meetings and Mr Cusack attended four meetings. Mr Owen Kelvin Griffiths lives in Brisbane and, although he did not attend formal meetings, he performs valuable services for the trustees by being available in Brisbane to deal personally with matters of concern to the trust. He also visits Townsville regularly and is in contact with the other trustees by telephone as necessary. He is actively and effectively interested in the trust. Mr Angus Smith, who resigned from his position on the trust on 30 May 1984, attended two meetings, and the honorary secretary attended all meetings.

- (4) Such circumstances are:
- (a) Death of trustee;
 - (b) Resignation of trustee;
 - (c) Refusal by trustee to act;
 - (d) Trustee becoming incapable of acting;
 - (e) Trustee being absent for more than 12 months from the electoral district, unless in the opinion of the Governor in Council he is actively or effectively interested in the trust; and
 - (f) Trustee becoming disqualified from holding office. In any of such cases the Governor in Council may appoint a new trustee.
- (5) (a) Trustees are required by law to furnish the Minister with all such information and returns in respect of the trust as he may from time to time require. In this present case, the trustees annually produce an annual report and an audited financial statement.
- (b) None.
 - (c) None.

14. International Visitors, Cairns District

Mr MENZEL asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts—

Will he give details relating to the increase in the numbers of international visitors to the Cairns district in recent years?

Answer—

An international visitor survey carried out by the Australian Tourist Commission shows that the number of international visitors to the Cairns tableland region increased from 56 200 in 1981 to 77 400 in 1983. These figures represent a growth of 37.7 per cent over the two-year period, or 17.25 per cent per annum. These figures are based on calendar years—that is, 1982 and 1983—and, obviously, do not take into account the further increase that most certainly would have taken place since the opening of the new international airport at Cairns in late 1983.

I take this opportunity to thank the honourable members for Mulgrave and Barron River for their personal and keen interest in tourism in north Queensland. There can be no doubt about the benefits associated with the new airport at Cairns, and I am sure that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and local authorities share my enthusiasm for the future of the industry. I assure all honourable members that our joint promotional efforts will be aimed at further visitor growth.

I am convinced also that a substantial increase in employment in the tourist industry would eventuate if the tourist industry could operate on a five-day-week award spread over any seven days. I commend the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs for offering to convene an urgent meeting between the QTTC, employer and employee representatives and me. I have consistently called for a review of penalty rates. The meeting will have my total support.

15. QUF Industries Ltd Application for Brisbane Franchise

Mr KRUGER asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

- (1) Has QUF applied for a franchise to supply divisional areas 1 and 2 (the total Brisbane area) with fresh milk?
- (2) If so, when was the application received?
- (3) If a franchise is to be, or has recently been, approved, on what terms has QUF been operating in the past, for example, by Order in Council?
- (4) Can a franchise over both areas be seen as yet another combine take-over of an industry?

Answer—

(1) No. QUF Industries Ltd has applied through its subsidiary Pauls Ice Cream and Milk Ltd for an authority under section 108 of the Milk Supply Act in respect of area 1 only.

(2) The application was received on 27 September 1984.

(3) No franchise has been approved recently, and since the application under section 108 of the Milk Supply Act has only just been lodged, the matter has not yet been considered.

(4) No.

16. Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd

Mr KRUGER asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the facts I raised on 18 September regarding the company trading as Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd and operating through the offices of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation—

(1) Will he undertake to set up a full-scale inquiry into the company's affairs as they relate to the use of the QDO offices for personal gain?

(2) Will he also investigate all statutory organisations in his area of responsibility to see whether similar situations exist elsewhere in contravention of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act?

(3) Have milk-suppliers received favoured treatment and benefits regarding quotas, etc., as purchasers of stock feed from Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd?

Answer—

(1) No. I am fully aware of arrangements relating to the operations of Queensland Farm Feeds Pty Ltd and the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation. The arrangements are for the benefit of the Queensland Dairymen's organisation and the dairy farmers generally, and there is no question of personal gain to any officer or member of the Queensland Dairymen's State council.

(2) No. Existing arrangements coupled with audit provisions are adequate.

(3) No. The Queensland Dairymen's State council is not involved in the setting of quotas.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Budget Speech; Coal Freight

Mr **WARBURTON**: As the Premier and Treasurer is absent, I shall direct a question without notice to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. I refer to the statement made by the executive director of Queensland Chamber of Mines Ltd on the day on which the Budget was introduced that the recent Queensland Budget statement of revenue was misleading to the public and unfair to mining companies. I now ask: Can he explain why, as Queensland Chamber of Mines Ltd pointed out, the Queensland Government did not include in its statement of revenue the amount received by way of tax on coal freight paid to the Government, which totalled an estimated \$264m in the year ended 30 June 1984?

Mr **GUNN**: I was not aware that that information was not included in the Budget documents. Had it been included, I do not know what effect it would have had. Many matters could have been mentioned. Amongst other things, it was not mentioned that the coal mine-owners of Queensland save approximately \$6m a year in workers' compensation payments and pay-roll tax. If the honourable member so desires, I will have the matter examined and provide him with an answer tomorrow. He will have ample opportunity to mention it during his contribution to the Budget debate this afternoon.

Private Hospital Categorisation and Funding

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Health: Has his attention been drawn to an article in yesterday's "Courier-Mail" alleging that some Queensland private hospitals are in serious trouble because of a shortage of Federal funding? Can he inform the House who is responsible for the difficulties created in the private hospital system following the introduction of Medicare?

Mr AUSTIN: Yes, my attention has been drawn to the article, which quite correctly points out that there is a shortage of Federal funding in some instances as a result of the categorisation of private hospitals.

Mr Underwood: What about your part in it?

Mr AUSTIN: I am happy that the member for Ipswich West said that. One could be excused for thinking that a Federal election is in the offing. One of Queensland's Labor senators, Senator Coulston, made a statement yesterday about the categorisation of private hospitals. It was one of many made by members of the Labor Party. I do not recall ever bringing before the House any piece of legislation requiring private hospitals to be categorised. I stand to be corrected, if members of the Opposition were able to correct me. However, I do not recall any action of mine being responsible for the passage through the Queensland Parliament of any piece of legislation suggesting that private hospitals be categorised. Consequently, I am disturbed that Senator Coulston should make public statements suggesting that private hospitals are not being categorised simply because of the inaction, if that is what is suggested, of the State Government or me.

So that there can be no misunderstanding by honourable members about where the legislative responsibility for categorisation lies, I shall read—

An Opposition Member: Make it short.

Mr AUSTIN: No, I will not make it short. I venture to say, Mr Speaker, that this is an extremely important subject, so I will not shorten my answer. A number of this State's private hospitals are being severely affected by the categorisation required under Medicare.

I refer to the Commonwealth Health Legislation Amendment Act 1983, dealing with section 29A of the principal Act, under the heading "Variation of categorisation of particular private hospitals"—

"(1) Subject to this section, upon application made in accordance with the approved form by the proprietor of a private hospital for a variation in the category to which the private hospital belongs, the Minister may—"

that is, the Commonwealth Minister for Health—

" in his discretion, vary the determination under Section 24 of that category, with effect from such date as he thinks fit, by substituting for that category such other category as he thinks appropriate, and shall, by notice in writing, served either personally or by post, notify the applicant of his decision on the application.

(2) Subject to this section, the Minister—"

again, the Federal Minister for Health—

"may, of his own motion, vary the determination under Section 24 of the category of private hospital to which a private hospital belongs, with effect from such date as he thinks fit, by substituting for that category such other category as he determines to be appropriate and, where he does so, he shall, by notice in writing served personally or by post, notify the proprietor of the hospital accordingly.

(3) The Minister—"

again, the Commonwealth Minister for Health—

"in exercising his powers under sub-sections (1) or (2) shall comply with any relevant principles in force under section 23H.

(4) The Minister shall not vary a determination of the category to which a private hospital situated in a State belongs unless he has consulted the Minister for Health of that State and has had regard to any views of that other Minister expressed in the course of that consultation."

I point out to all honourable members and to the general public that, on each occasion when the Federal Minister for Health has sought to vary the category of private hospitals, he has telexed me in these terms—

"I intend to recategorise (a certain) private hospital. Do you have any objections?"

Within one or two days I have responded to the Federal Minister that we have no objection to the recategorisation of the specific private hospital, provided no costs are incurred by the State Government.

Quite clearly, if the future of private hospitals in Queensland is threatened, the entire blame rests with the Labor Government and its Medicare scheme. Senator Colston is either ignorant of the facts and the terms of the relevant Federal legislation—which I may say is most surprising for someone who purports to be an academic—or has set out deliberately to deceive the people of Queensland on the issue. Like the rest of his ALP colleagues in Canberra, he has set out deliberately to distort the truth about what Medicare is doing to patients and private hospitals in Queensland because of the massive blunders of its architect, Dr Blewett.

Pornographic and Violent Video Movies

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Will Queensland's decision to take a hard line on pornographic and violent video movies be affected as a result of last Friday's special meeting of Ministers responsible for censorship?

Mr McKECHNIE: No, last week's meeting will not make any difference to the stand taken by Queensland. The Government is seriously concerned about the attitude adopted by many of the other States and the Commonwealth to violent and pornographic video movies. I have been told by the Queensland representative who attended the meeting that there might now be another censorship category—E for erotica. Because the Commonwealth Government and the Labor State Governments are continually making excuses about this matter, it should be E for excuses.

All honourable members would have witnessed the recent breakdown of the Prime Minister on television when he cried for his family. Because of the lack of action, particularly by the Federal Government, in trying to do something to help family life in this country, I suggest that it is about time that the Prime Minister of Australia started crying for Australia. The Federal Government could act today to amend regulations under the Customs Act.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You are sick!

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

An Opposition Member: You should be X rated.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton.

Mr McKECHNIE: By amending regulations under the Customs Act, the Federal Government could act today to cut out the worst of the pornographic video movies. However, it will not. As evidenced by his recent breakdown, the Prime Minister, more than anyone else, should know that drugs and violent and pornographic video movies are going a long way towards breaking down the Australian society, particularly family life, as we know it. Because of the Prime Minister's personal experience, I call upon him to do something positive to try to preserve family life in this country.

Opposition Members interjected.

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

Mr McKECHNIE: The Prime Minister should direct his Cabinet colleagues to take seriously the need to attack the problem of pornography. I call upon the churches and other decent people to get in touch with the Prime Minister and urge him to act. He has proved that he is amenable to pressure and I suggest that decent family people all over Australia pressure the Prime Minister to get his colleagues to amend the regulations under the Customs Act.

Eton Irrigation Scheme

Mr RANDELL: I ask the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services: In the 1984-85 State Budget what funds have been specifically allocated to the Queensland Water Resources Commission for the Eton Irrigation Scheme? When is completion of the scheme expected?

Mr GOLEBY: As all honourable members would be aware, an additional \$100m has been provided for water resources development in this State over the next two and a half years. The desire is to expedite as many as possible of the major schemes presently under construction.

Presently the wall of the Kinchant Dam is being raised. The Budget has provided sufficient funding to complete that work. I am hopeful that the Eton Irrigation Scheme, as well as the other irrigation schemes in the State, will be completed years ahead of schedule.

Closure of Massey-Ferguson (Aust) Ltd Factory in Bundaberg

Mr CAMPBELL: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer: In view of the closure of the Massey-Ferguson cane-harvester manufacturing plant at Bundaberg and representations made to him on 5 September, what action has the State Government taken to help provide jobs for those trade workers who have been retrenched? Have other manufacturing firms been interested in establishing a manufacturing plant utilising the Massey-Ferguson facilities?

Mr GUNN: The question should have been directed to my colleague the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology. However, when I was Minister for Commerce and Industry, I visited that plant and suggested to its owners that the company diversify.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr GUNN: I would not expect the honourable member for Wolston to understand that there is an opening in Queensland for Massey-Ferguson farm implements. For many years Massey-Ferguson has manufactured superior farm equipment, and I think that the honourable member would agree with that statement. He might recall that the company manufactures that type of equipment in Victoria. I do not imagine that the company would have faced any great problems in tooling up its wonderful Bundaberg plant for the manufacture of that equipment, although the plant is presently used exclusively to manufacture sugar-harvesting machinery.

I do not know whether the honourable member for Bundaberg has made any representations along those lines to the company, but I have done so on numerous occasions. It surprises me that the company is closing its doors when a market exists for farm equipment—for instance, the Napier company has an establishment in Dalby—and there is plenty of demand for equipment in the horticultural area. The future is entirely up to the company, but it has preferred to let its work-force run down from 400 to 120. I blame the company for not doing something because other companies in the area, such as Evans Deakin and Walkers in Maryborough, were prepared to do something. I condemn Massey-Ferguson for that reason.

Rural Adjustment Fund

Mr CAMPBELL: In asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the 1984-85 Estimates of Receipts and Expenditures, which show that repayments from the Rural Adjustment Fund to the State and Commonwealth Governments are estimated at \$4.16m. Will the Minister advise why a further \$3m is to be credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund from the Rural Adjustment Fund?

Mr TURNER: I would have thought that the honourable member would not be inclined to bring up anything in relation to rural adjustment funding in the Budget, because the Commonwealth Government cut its contribution to such funding from \$45m to \$26m. That Government has failed to honour its commitments to any area of rural adjustment funding. The honourable member comes from a sugar area and would be well aware of the Federal Government's lack of commitment and failure to assist the Queensland Government by matching its \$5m contribution to the industry with RAS funding. So the honourable member should not be questioning me on that subject; instead he should direct his question to the Federal Government.

Report on Retail Marketing of Petroleum

Mr VEIVERS: In asking a question of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, I refer to his ministerial statement of 20 September 1984, which followed my speech the previous day, in relation to a report on the retail marketing of petroleum. The Minister made no reference to my assertion that the average net profit of Brisbane service stations in 1982-83 was \$6,842, which is below the unemployment benefit payable to a married person. In view of that, I now ask him: How can he claim, as he is reported as saying on 19 September 1984, that the industry is on a generally sound footing?

Mr LESTER: My comments were made in an across-the-board context. The report showed that many service station operators make annual net profits of more than \$40,000, after allowing for wages and other outgoings. I have invited representatives of service station proprietors to come and talk to me when they are ready, and I suggest that, instead of mouthing unintelligent statements, the honourable member get his facts straight.

Application of Door to Door (Sales) Act

Mr VEIVERS: I now direct to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs a question about something with which he is familiar, that is, doors—not the swinging variety, but the ones that people knock on.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VEIVERS: I refer to the Door to Door (Sales) Act, section 4 (2) (c), and the seven days' cooling-off period relative to the termination of agreements under that Act. I ask the Minister: Why is it that some companies, such as Permanent Pantry, which supply bulk frozen foods and sell other products ranging from freezers to video equipment and kitchen-ware—and, I might add, charge a substantial membership fee—are allowed to get around the terms of the Act by claiming that the consumer has invited them into the home or responded to a telephone canvass, because contracts made under those conditions do not come under the Door to Door (Sales) Act?

Mr LESTER: In relation to the reference to doors swinging outwards—very clearly the honourable member is not concerned about handicapped persons in Queensland. I stand behind my statements. I challenge anyone in the Labor Party to do likewise. Such comments from Labor members prove to me that they have a total contempt for the disabled people of this State. If the honourable member has any specific examples to bring to me, let him bring them forward.

Government Research and Development Information for Private Industry

Mr McPHIE: I ask the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology: In relation to his recent proposal for Government educational establishments such as the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and the Queensland University to make

research and development information and results available to private industry under certain agreed conditions—what progress has been made in developing and implementing that progressive proposal?

Mr AHERN: The success of the technology initiative depends greatly on the co-operation between the researchers, wherever they are, and the innovators in industry. It is just not possible for a Government alone to develop the technology initiative that will be successful. The success will come from generating that co-operation and in facilitating the co-operation between the researcher, on the one hand, and the progressive businessman, on the other hand.

The resources in the State that will develop the technology initiative are in the universities, the research institutions and the colleges of advanced education. It will be a major challenge to my ministry to make sure that the co-operation takes place. I have initiated some discussions with my colleague the Minister for Education. Those discussions will take place shortly. I have had some initial, informal discussions with the Minister for Education. He has the right attitude towards developing closer co-operative mechanisms. I am quite confident that, in the very near future, changes will ensure that the goal to which the honourable member referred is achieved.

Brisbane International Airport

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer: Are reports that the Federal Government has delayed the completion date for the new Brisbane International Airport until 1988 correct? What action can the Queensland Government take to ensure that the promised earlier completion date is adhered to? What effect will any further delay have on this State's tourist industry and Expo 88?

Mr GUNN: Unfortunately, what the member for Surfers Paradise said is correct. The completion date for the new international airport has been put back another 12 months. This will be a disaster for Expo 88.

I am surprised that no murmurs have been heard from Opposition members about this matter. The present Brisbane International Airport is a disgrace to a city of the calibre of Brisbane, and the Commonwealth Government should be ashamed of that fact. Like my colleagues, I am dismayed every time I pass the airport. Opposition members evidently close their eyes when they go past it. The Brisbane International Airport can handle only one 747 jet at a time.

I doubt that the new airport will be completed before Expo.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr GUNN: I think that the Federal Government is doing it on purpose.

When two or three 747 jets arrive at the airport together, it takes four hours or longer for the passengers to pass through customs. That is a disaster, and it is not in keeping with what should happen in a city such as Brisbane. However, the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Wolston have made no response to the Federal Government's decision to delay completion of the airport. I cannot condemn strongly enough the attitude of the Federal Government.

Penalty Rates

Mr JENNINGS: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Is he aware of considerable concern in a number of industries about the high cost of penalty rates and the adverse effect that they have on long-term employment opportunities? Because of penalty rates, casuals are employed, and that precludes many young people from obtaining apprenticeships. If he is aware of this problem, can he advise the House of the Government's approach?

Mr LESTER: A tourist boom is starting in Queensland. For every 20 international tourists who visit Queensland, one job is created in the tourist industry. Queensland has the ball at its feet.

The Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts and I, along with other members of the National Party, believe that Queensland's employment potential is being eroded by penalty rates. People will not be encouraged to visit Queensland, and the industry will not be able to encourage those who do visit Queensland to return. Penalty rates play a bigger part in Australian industry than they do in other parts of the world. Because of that, the Minister for Tourism and I are calling interested unions and employers to a meeting to be held at 4 p.m. on Wednesday week at Parliament House. It will be Queensland's first penalty rates summit. The Labor Party should be counted in because employment generation is involved in this issue and, if the Labor Party does not support the Government and condemns it for its attempt to work out a mutually satisfactory solution, the Labor Party is not interested in expanding employment opportunities in Queensland.

Penalty Rates

Mr JENNINGS: I direct a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts. As he is aware of concern in the tourist industry about the high cost of penalty rates for week-end and other shift work, which have resulted in the uneconomical operations of some businesses on week-ends and a reduction in the services offered, will he take steps to encourage employer and employee organisations to get together to draw up a draft proposal for a seven day week wages schedule, which should benefit thousands of employees, employers and tourists?

Mr McKECHNIE: I confirm the statement made by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs that the tourist industry is on the verge of a boom. It is actually happening. Millions of dollars is being spent on the development of tourism all over Queensland. As the Minister said, it is true that for every 20 overseas tourists who visit Queensland another job is created.

It is time that everybody sat down in a spirit of co-operation to try to ascertain what can be done to maximise tourist opportunities in this State.

The Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) talks about consensus. He had a consensus conference, which was a fraud and a flop. I can assure honourable members, however, that the meeting that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs and I will convene will be called with goodwill in an endeavour to reach agreement between the unions and the private enterprise operators in the industry.

Mr Borbidge: The Federal Minister agrees with you.

Mr McKECHNIE: That is right. The parrots on the Opposition benches do not like what my Cabinet colleague and I are saying. However, as was said by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise, the Federal Minister agrees with us. It is time that all parties sat down and addressed themselves to this problem.

Some people claim that penalty rates do not bring about the loss of jobs. What has happened is that at present the jobs simply are not there on the week-ends to be lost. Many more restaurants and other places would open on week-ends if it was not for penalty rates. It is time that people who have sons, daughters, nephews, nieces, grandsons or granddaughters who are looking for jobs realised that the creation of jobs lies within the tourist industry but that penalty rates are killing the tourist industry. So let everybody get together in a spirit of co-operation in an endeavour to solve the problem.

Quality Kitchens Design

Mr R. J. GIBBS: In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to a company known as Quality Kitchens Design, which has its registered office at 101 Lutwyche Road, Windsor. I also refer to the fact that on 30 August 1984

I brought certain matters concerning that company to the attention of this House. I now ask: Is he aware that in April of this year the company premises were raided by Commonwealth police on the basis that a principal of the company (Mr John Kelly, alias John Keller, alias John Kaller) was using the business house as a passing point for drugs? Is he aware that company records were confiscated on the basis of tax evasion? Is he aware that the company was being operated illegally by a previously discharged bankrupt?

Further, is the Minister aware that an advertisement for this company states that deposit moneys put up by clients are placed in the Security Permanent Building Society trust account until the product is completed, but that in fact no such account exists, and that deposit moneys are being used personally by Kelly and his business associate (Mr Peter Anderson, alias Dieter Wolfgang)?

Further, is the Minister aware that this kitchen company is still setting up display units in shopping centres and is continuing to rob the Queensland public under false pretences? What action has the Corporate Affairs Office taken to investigate this company, and, if no action has been taken, will he give an undertaking to have immediate inquiries made to protect the interests of the Queensland public?

Mr HARPER: This question involves a serious matter, one that was raised in this Chamber by the honourable member. I immediately had investigations instituted, and they are still under way. The name of the kitchen company to which the honourable member referred is not the registered name of the company; the registered name is similar to the name mentioned by the honourable member. Investigations are continuing. I ask that the honourable member place his question on notice so that I can give a detailed answer to that section of his question. In debate, the honourable member referred to two different companies.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I place the question on notice, Mr Speaker.

Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations

Mr R. J. GIBBS: In directing a question to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, I refer to his media statement in which he accused the federal consumer body, the Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations (AFCO) of being a communist-controlled body. I now ask: Is it true that he made such a statement? Will he now name these alleged communists, particularly those in the Queensland movement? Is he aware that, of the past 10 years—which is the period that AFCO has been receiving Federal funding—eight of those years have been under Liberal-National Party Governments? Is he also aware that the national secretary of AFCO stood as a Liberal Party candidate in Tasmania?

In view of the harm that the Minister's statements have done to the voluntary consumer movement in Australia and in Queensland through his unwarranted and unnecessary attack, will he now substantiate his allegations or retract them publicly and apologise to the 55 member organisations throughout Australia that constitute AFCO?

Mr LESTER: I make it very clear that I have no intention of apologising. I also make it very clear that I said, "The left wing of the Labor Party." I did not use the word "communist".

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

SUPPLY

Committee—Financial Statement—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 20 September (see p. 779) on Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1984-85, a sum not exceeding \$588,000 to defray Contingencies—His Excellency the Governor."

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (12.17 p.m.): The 1984-85 State Budget was presented in this Chamber on Thursday, 20 September, to the acclamation of National Party Cabinet Ministers and back-benchers alike. It was hailed by the Premier and Treasurer as a truly remarkable Budget—the Government's "greatest Budget ever" It was presented as one of the National Party State Government's finest achievements.

Today I intend to outline to the Committee precisely why the 1984-85 State Budget can properly be regarded as a document of deception. This assessment is confirmed by the dishonest way in which the Budget was framed and presented, and also by the full-page newspaper advertisements that appeared in every newspaper throughout the State to reinforce its most deceitful presentation. Those newspaper advertisements, costing tens of thousands of dollars, have been paid for by the people of Queensland. It is an unprecedented campaign undertaken to try and sell what is a bogus Budget.

Public reaction to the Queensland Budget was negative, to say the least. The National Party must have been somewhat stunned when the newspaper "Queensland Country Life", which is often referred to as the bushman's Bible, evidently decided that the Budget offered so little for the rural sector that it should make no references to it in its latest edition.

I place on record the Opposition's considered opinion that this Budget, far from being the greatest ever, represents an admission of the National Party State Government's failure to competently manage the State's economic and financial affairs. The Government would have the public believe that it has excelled itself with the Budget it brought down on 20 September. The Opposition views the Budget as presented by the Premier and Treasurer as a fraud—a fraud about which the Government obviously is very proud. It is a deliberate exercise to con the public into believing that the State Government is making a spectacular effort to serve the best interests of this State.

The Budget is grossly deficient in the information it contains on the Queensland economy and major aspects of the Government's financial administration. But from the information that can be gleaned, the Budget fully supports what the Opposition has been saying about the State's economic performance—that the Queensland economy is lagging. This information torpedoes the Government's loud and repeated claims about the Queensland economy being more buoyant than the economy in the rest of Australia.

If there is one honest feature of this Budget, it is the information that confirms that Queensland is not making as strong a recovery as the rest of the nation. This is established conclusively by an analysis of anticipated pay-roll tax receipts, which hinge on a crucial economic indicator—employment growth. The pay-roll tax figures—the Treasury's own figures—prove that employment growth in Queensland in the current financial year will be substantially less than the national average. This highlights a serious conflict of opinion between the Treasurer and the Treasury.

Before I refer to the performance of the Queensland Government in managing the economy, I will deal with what the Premier describes as the key feature of the Budget this year—the so-called Special Major Capital Works Program, which the Premier maintains will "indeed be noted as one of the great accomplishments of this Government". He goes on to say—

"I know of no other decision taken in recent times that has had the impact that this will have on the economy, employment and standards of community facilities."

This special program deserves special scrutiny. In short, it fails to measure up to the extravagant boasts of the Premier and his Government. To begin with, the program must be viewed in the context of the Budget for the current financial year.

Queensland operates on the basis of an annual Budget—not a 3-year, a 5-year or a 10-year program—but the entire thrust of this special package is to roll an illusory 3-year program into a one-year Budget.

The Budget has been packaged and marketed on the strength of this so-called special \$600m program. That is its corner-stone; that is its dominating feature. That is what has so far captured all the publicity. That is what the full-page advertisements highlight—“\$600 million boost for more jobs and growth”.

The Government's calculated intention is to give the impression that the program amounts to an exceptional effort on its part—over and above what could be regarded as its normal capital works program. We are of course aware that the program is scheduled to extend through to the conclusion of 1986-87. But in the context of this year's Budget, honesty and credibility have been sacrificed to the cause of this mirage type of program. There it lies—the vast bulk of it shimmering in the distance.

Listening to the Queensland Government, one could be forgiven for thinking it is all in hand—ready to roll immediately. Just once in his Budget Speech does the Premier advise that only \$90m has been set aside in the current year towards the special program. Nowhere in his Budget Speech does the Premier disclose that in fact a sum less than that amount will actually be spent in 1984-85. Nowhere in the full-page newspaper advertisements is the public told that less than one-eighth of the \$600m splashed across the headlines will be spent in the current year, 1984-85. Nowhere in the three-page media release summary of the Budget is it revealed that only \$72.1m, not \$90m, will be outlayed this year. This information is buried away in the fine print of the Budget documents—far removed from the public gaze.

Page 99 of the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure sets out that the \$72.1m will be required for—

	\$
Education	14,900,000
Water Resources	15,400,000
Crown Employee Housing	4,000,000
Public Buildings and Other Special Works	27,800,000
Roads	10,000,000.”

On closer scrutiny, however, it will be seen that not even that \$72.1m is to be spent this year. In his Budget Speech, the Premier advised the Parliament that full details of the Special Major Capital Works Program and the Government's capital works proposals generally are set out in the separate Budget document entitled “The State Capital Works Programs”. An analysis of that document reveals a \$17.5m discrepancy in the amount of money the Government claims to be spending this year on the special program. It states at the bottom of page 8—

“Anticipated 1984-85 expenditures in the various segments of the Program are included in the total projected expenditures shown under the relevant headings that follow.”

In other words, \$14.9m from the special program fund is to be spent on education, \$10m is to be spent on roads, \$15.35m is to be spent on water resources and \$14.3m is to be spent on public buildings and Crown employee housing.

I draw to the attention of honourable members the amount of \$14.3m to be spent on public buildings and Crown employee housing. That is the amount contained on page 60 of the capital works document. However, according to the Estimates, \$31.8m has been allocated to those categories. There is a \$17.5m shortfall not accounted for in the figures available to the Opposition and the public through the Budget documents.

So what does the State have—a supposedly marvellous Special Major Capital Works Program which, for the purposes of this year's Budget, bears no resemblance to the \$600m wonder deal which the Government is trumpeting about. It is nothing like \$600m. It is not even \$100m. It is not even the \$90m that the Premier claims—very much in passing—has been allocated to the program this year. It also appears that it is not even

the \$72m that lies buried away in the fine print of the Budget papers. For this year's Budget, the \$600m program is worth only \$55m, which is less than 10 per cent of the total.

But that is only the beginning of the hoax that the National Party Government is attempting to perpetrate. It goes much deeper. Page 12 of "The State Capital Works Programs 1984-85" presents a typical example. It states—

"As part of the special \$600 million capital effort the capital upgrading program for hospital and health facilities will attain an all time high level during 1984-85."

Not 1985-86 or 1986-87—but 1984-85! However, in another part of the Budget—that is, the Estimates to which I have already referred—I find that not one solitary cent will be spent on capital works for hospitals as part of the so-called Special Major Capital Works Program. Once again, the Budget seriously contradicts itself. Judging by the confusion and contradiction inherent in the Budget papers, I wonder whether the Treasury itself knows what is going on.

Several points made by the Premier and Treasurer in his Budget Speech are worth noting. Firstly, the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program is claimed to be a substantial addition to the so-called normal program of \$348.1m. Secondly, the Special Major Capital Works Program will create 12 000 man-years of additional employment directly and about 40 000 man-years of employment in total. Thirdly, funding for the special program will be \$90m from consolidated revenue with the balance of \$510m being future loan-raising.

I will now outline to the Committee the totally bogus nature of this so-called special program. To comment on the first point, it is ridiculous to claim that the normal Capital Works Program for 1984-85 is \$348.1m, the implication being that the special program is an exceptional and above-normal effort. Last financial year, the co-ordinated plan of works of the State Government, semi-Government and local authority bodies amounted to \$2,966.47m, of which the State Government's share was \$1,515.4m. Are the people of the State to take the Government seriously in its claim that its normal Capital Works Program this year will be \$348.1m when last year the Capital Works Program of the State Government alone was \$1,515m?

What the Government means to say, of course, is that the on-Budget financing of capital works this year amounts to \$348.1m, with the balance being off-Budget financing, largely through borrowings. So to equate on-Budget capital works with the word "normal" is ridiculous and it is done purely for public relations purposes. That is the first con-trick of this supposedly special program. The \$348.1m represents the contribution to capital works from the loan fund. It represents only one portion of the funding arrangements for the overall program. However, it is selectively highlighted to present the Special Major Capital Works Program in a more favourable light. A big noise about a special \$600m works package compared with a normal \$348.1m program sounds vastly more impressive than the actual case—a modest \$72m worth of projects compared with a yearly program of more than \$1,500m. That is another glaring contradiction.

In his Budget Speech and elsewhere, the Premier and Treasurer repeatedly emphasises that the \$600m program is over and above what the Government would usually be doing. The Opposition challenges that claim and believes that it is incorrect.

If the Premier's claim was true, the Government should be ashamed of itself, because many of the works detailed as part of the special program could more properly be considered as being either of an urgent or priority nature. These works are no more than we would expect the Government to carry out to meet some of the State's urgent needs over the next three years. The Opposition contends that the projects in this supposedly special program are not over and above what the Government would normally be doing—despite its claims to the contrary.

The Opposition challenges the Government to verify its claims by immediately releasing full details of this special program. Some information is provided in the capital

works Budget paper, but it is insufficient to establish whether the Government is being honest in its claims that the projects are above and beyond what it would normally be doing over the next three years. The Government must surely justify its boast that all the projects contemplated are in addition to what might properly be regarded as its usual scope of activity.

As I have already said, this Budget is grossly deficient in the information it presents.

It is impossible to examine properly the Capital Works Program for the current financial year, let alone find any reasonable details about the supposedly major special program about which the Government is making such a hullabaloo.

And what is the likelihood of the Government's honouring the commitments it has made in this Budget in respect of the special works program? It is difficult to say. But I draw honourable members' attention to the Premier's comments on page 4 of his Budget speech, where he said—

“A successful outcome of the State's case to the (Grants) Commission will help to maintain the present favourable budget position that exists. An unfavourable outcome would necessitate a close review of our financing structure.”

Is that the Government's escape clause? Is it going to turn around next year and claim that it has been badly done by in the Grants Commission review of the State's tax sharing relativities? Is it then going to announce that the special program requires review—to the extent that it becomes the normal program—and, of course, once again blame the Federal Government for the Queensland Government's mismanagement of the State's economy? Who knows what will become of this so-called special major program? As I have outlined already, its 1984-85 component is hardly special, or hardly major, and the implementation of the remainder of the program in the context of special budgetary arrangements remains very much in doubt.

Now to the second point emphasised in the Premier's speech—the jobs this program will supposedly create.

The claim that the special program will provide 12 000 man-years of work directly and 40 000 man-years in total over three years borders on the fanciful. These figures indicate expenditures of \$50,000 per direct job and an employment multiplier of 3.3.

Let me make two comments about this so-called job-creation program. Firstly, it is yet to be proven by the Government that this program is additional. The Opposition maintains that it is an internal rearrangement within the total capital works program of the State Government, and that no additional employment will be created through these so-called special capital works.

The second point is that even if we were to accept the argument that this employment is additional to that which would have been provided by other public and private sector activity in Queensland, the figures and multipliers used are remarkably generous by comparison with most assessments of projects of this type. An overall employment multiplier of 2.5 would have been much more realistic. To use a multiplier of 3.3 shows that either the Treasury was getting carried away with itself or a political decision was made to boost the calculations for public relations purposes. Whatever the reason, the outcome is that these projections are totally unrealistic and provide further evidence that this Government is not only living in a dream world but also doctoring figures to substantiate its misbeliefs.

I intend to show conclusively that the contribution to the so-called special works program is not over and above the contribution made in previous Budgets. In fact, it is less. So much for the Premier's statement on page 5 of his Budget speech, boasting—

“The budget strategy has as one of the principal objectives, the maximisation of employment opportunities in Queensland.”

What we have is one capital works program simply replacing another. In other words, it is difficult to see how a replacement program will create any additional jobs.

I now wish to deal with the funding arrangements for this program. They give the total lie to its so-called special character. I say categorically that there is nothing special about this financing. We have been told that an allocation of \$90m has been made from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in 1984-85. I might ask what is so special about that. Last year, \$134.5m was allocated from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for capital works and channelled through the Special Projects Fund, special capital assistance to local authorities and the Cultural Capital Development Fund. This year that practice continues, with \$90m being transferred from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the new category of Special Major Capital Works Program. As I have already said, what is not clearly indicated is that although \$90m is to be transferred this year, only \$72.1m is allocated to be spent in 1984-85. Presumably the balance of \$18m will sit in the Government's cash balances.

I ask the Premier and Treasurer to explain why the full program for 1984-85 is not detailed in "The State Capital Works Programs", as is claimed on page 8 of that document. I also ask the Premier and Treasurer to explain why the additional \$18m allocated as part of the \$90m transferred from the Consolidated Revenue Fund has not been programmed for expenditure.

I will explain how the so-called Special Major Capital Works Program fraud has been perpetrated—this double shuffle of the capital works component of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. If the identified capital works are taken from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the recurrent Budget is looked at alone, it is found that, in 1983-84—last financial year—a surplus of \$135.4m was recorded on the recurrent Budget. That surplus was allocated to capital works by providing the Special Projects Fund with \$102.5m, special capital assistance to local authorities with \$5m and the Cultural Capital Development Fund with \$27m. In all, that represents a total of \$134.5m, leaving a surplus of \$900,000 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund last financial year. The \$900,000 to which I have referred is arrived at by subtracting the \$134.5m from the \$135.4m that I referred to previously.

This year, the surplus on the recurrent Budget is estimated at \$128.3m. That surplus is allocated in the following way. Firstly, the new Special Major Capital Works Program has been given \$90m. The Special Projects Fund, which has exactly the same purpose as the Special Major Capital Works Program, has been given only \$24.4m this year. Its allocation is well down from the \$102.5m that it received last year. Special capital assistance to local authorities has received \$15m and the Cultural Capital Development Fund has received nothing this financial year. The three amounts I have referred to total \$129.4m, leaving an overall deficit of \$1,073,000 in the Consolidated Revenue Fund this financial year. The announced deficit of \$1,073,000 for 1984-85 is arrived at by subtracting the \$128.3m from the \$129.4m. In other words, a reduction from \$134.5m in 1983-84 to \$129.4m this year has occurred in the amount allocated from consolidated revenue to capital works. To add fuel to the fire, this new category of a Special Major Capital Works Program has been dreamt up and funded to the tune of \$90m by squeezing some of the funds available for special projects and wiping out altogether payments to the Cultural Capital Development Fund.

The result of the hoax is that there is no additional expenditure on capital works. In fact, there is to be less spending and there is no functional difference between the Special Major Capital Works Program and the Special Projects Fund. The Special Major Capital Works Program was created purely and solely as a public relations exercise.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: It is a total misrepresentation of spending outlays and, as my deputy leader said, a fraud on the Queensland public.

I turn now to the financing of the balance of the Special Major Capital Works Program. A figure of \$510m needs to be financed off-Budget through borrowings. The Budget states that \$100m will be raised by hospitals boards, \$100m will be raised on

behalf of the Main Roads Department and \$310m will be raised in the market-place. In other words, \$510m will be raised through loans, which will be repaid eventually, with interest, by the Queensland public. The impression is created that the raising of this \$510m is additional to the State's so-called normal borrowings. That is a completely false impression.

The State borrowing program, like that of every other State, needs to be approved by the Loan Council which decides Queensland's Loan Council borrowing program and the total borrowing program of semi-Government and local authorities and Government-owned companies under the new global borrowing arrangements. Under these arrangements, Queensland is permitted this year to raise \$207.4m under the State Government loan program and a further \$1,306m for statutory authorities and Government-owned companies, excluding local authorities, making a total of \$1,513.4m. This borrowing program is \$146m less than the approved program for 1983-84, which was \$1,659.4m.

In regard to Queensland's loan-raising program, it needs to be understood that the Loan Council determines the aggregate borrowing program for the States and allocates the amount among the States. How each State applies the proceeds of its share is a matter for self-determination. In other words, the Queensland Government has an upper limit for borrowings set firmly by the Loan Council. Neither the Premier and Treasurer, the Queensland Treasury nor I have any information on what the upper limits may be in future years. One thing is certain; loan-raising by the Queensland Government cannot exceed the limit set by the Loan Council, and the \$510m for this so-called special program will be a part of the normal borrowing program as approved.

There is nothing special about the \$510m in any way, shape or form. It is purely a shift of loan money from one construction program to another. To be more precise, all this special program does is to give an idea of the future projections for capital works spending, but it is packaged in such a way as to give the impression that it is additional and above normal.

Let me make a few further observations on the State's Capital Works Program as presented in the Budget papers. One only has to compare the precise information presented in the New South Wales and Victorian capital works Budgets to see just how shoddy and incomplete the Queensland Budget papers are. The New South Wales Budget paper, "Capital Works Program 1984-85", gives more than 150 pages of detailed information concerning the very large range of projects undertaken by departments and authorities within the State's overall capital works program. The supplementary Budget information document shows in detail the total capital works program in each department, the type of work, including annual provisions and whether it is new or continuing, and, most importantly, the source of funding.

The Queensland Government seems to be more concerned with presenting pretty pictures—no doubt for the benefit of the National party back-benchers—than with presenting accurate and detailed information.

No estimate of the total Capital Works Program of either the State Government or the public sector is provided. Even though we are one-quarter of the way through the financial year, one wonders whether even Treasury has the information at hand that is required for proper planning purposes.

We are told that last year the State's total Capital Works Program was estimated at \$2,966.5m, although we are not told whether all that money was actually spent. In the previous financial year, the capital works budget was underspent by \$272m; this financial year we are not even given an estimate.

The identifiable estimated expenditure on capital works in the Queensland public sector for 1984-85 amounts to only \$2,068.5m, which, being several hundred millions of dollars down on last year, obviously is not the total.

Why is it that New South Wales and Victoria are able to indicate very precisely in their Budget papers the total Capital Works Program and the source of funding, whereas Queensland is apparently incapable of doing so?

Why is it impossible to know from the Queensland Budget papers the total estimated public sector Capital Works Program? Again I ask: Does the Government itself know? Consequently, until we are told what the total Capital Works Program is, we are unable to do a precise interstate comparison in terms of effort expended.

To sum up—this whole exercise of the Special Major Capital Works Program is nothing more than a political stunt, designed as a hoax and perpetrated as a hoax on the people of Queensland. To make matters worse, this Government has spent tens of thousands of dollars of public money to publicise the deception in full-page newspaper advertisements over the length and breadth of the State.

Frankly, I am amazed that the Treasury has allowed itself to be part of this hoax. Any other State Government could have done what the Queensland Government has done in this Budget—that is, identify and highlight selected capital works expenditure planned for the next three years, single it out, and put it under a grandiose heading which sounds important and label it “additional” or “special” rather than “normal”. All we are given is a partial indication of the Government’s future Capital Works Program to extend over the next 2½ years, and nothing more than that.

In summary, then—

The concept that this \$600m expenditure is over and above a so-called “normal” program is demonstrably false.

The Government has, as with last year, budgeted for capital expenditure within the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Last year, this capital expenditure amounted to \$134.5m and this year \$128.3m. A new category, called a Special Major Capital Works Program, has been created, with the existing trust funds being squeezed to accommodate it.

The employment multiplier and projections used are fanciful and, indeed, it is highly unlikely that any additional employment will be created through this so-called special project.

The funding of the program has nothing special about it. The funding arrangements are exactly the same as those for the State’s usual Capital Works Program, requiring a combination of on-Budget and off-Budget financing.

The sloppy presentation and inadequate information of the Budget papers prevent any overall assessment of the State’s Capital Works Program. I call on the Premier and Treasurer to provide this information immediately so that the Parliament and the people of Queensland may know what really is planned for this financial year.

I ask: Just how well is the Queensland economy performing compared with that of the rest of Australia, and what are the projections for growth in 1984-85? If someone tried to find answers to these questions in the Budget papers, he would be sadly disappointed.

The section entitled “Prospects for 1984-85” comprises nothing but generalities and assertions. Where are the parameters that the Government uses for its calculations? Presumably it has some. What is the estimate for inflation in Queensland? By what amount are average weekly earnings expected to grow? What are employment and unemployment expected to be? What is Treasury’s assessment of non-farm gross domestic products for Queensland?

In Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 1, six full pages are devoted to detailed economic forecasts. Similar projections are presented in the New South Wales and Victorian Budget papers. Why is that not so in Queensland? Are the projections too

embarrassing for the Government? Do they torpedo the Government's media claims? The Opposition believes that they do.

If one looks at the economic indicators provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, one sees clearly that Queensland has been dragging the chain in the national economic recovery and that it has been lagging behind the other States.

Economic recovery in Queensland has been patchy, to say the least. The only sectors to show positive growth have been the rural industries, with the exception of sugar, mineral production and the tourist sector. However, practically all other economic indicators show the lagging performance of the Queensland economy.

Retail sales grew by 6.9 per cent in 1983-84, compared with a national increase of 8.3 per cent.

New motor vehicle registrations fell by 3.2 per cent last year, compared with an increase of 2.3 per cent for Australia as a whole.

Building approvals rose by 23.5 per cent in 1983-84, compared with 29.5 per cent for Australia.

Housing finance by major lenders increased 27.9 per cent last financial year—considerably below the national rise of 35.8 per cent.

Non-residential investment declined by 24.8 per cent last financial year, compared with a national fall of 13.7 per cent.

New fixed capital expenditure by private enterprises showed a decline of 13 per cent in 1983-84, compared with a national decline of 8 per cent. This financial year the decline in Queensland is expected to be a further 20 per cent, compared with a 5 per cent drop nationally.

The Australian Federation of Construction Contractors estimated a drop of 31 per cent in activity last year for Queensland, with a further drop of 5 per cent in real terms expected this year.

Queensland's present unemployment rate of 9.7 per cent is the highest of any mainland State.

The ANZ bank's series on advertised vacancies show that Queensland is lagging and even going against the national trend. Over the past 12 months, advertised vacancies in Queensland rose by 36.9 per cent compared with a 64.7 per cent rise nationally. In August, Queensland's advertised vacancies recorded a fall of 2.3 per cent, compared with rises in every other State.

In 1983-84 Queensland's inflation rate of 5.3 per cent was considerably higher than the national average of 3.9 per cent, and average weekly earnings in Queensland grew more slowly than those in the other States.

The only conclusion possible from those statistics is that, compared with the rest of Australia, Queensland performed badly. Public comments by the Queensland Confederation of Industry, the Metal Trades Industry Association, the ANZ bank and other banks, and the Brisbane CAE's forecast of the Queensland economy, all support the conclusion that Queensland is dragging the chain. Hidden away in the Budget papers, Treasury's own calculations for pay-roll tax indicates that Treasury expects little growth in employment this year. It is clear from the calculations that Treasury does not share the Premier's false optimism.

Pay-roll tax estimates for this financial year are calculated by adjusting last year's collections by the expected rise in average weekly earnings of 7.1 per cent and the expected growth in employment. If we use the Commonwealth projection of a 3.25 per cent employment growth for Australia, pay-roll tax collections this year should have approximated \$453m. However, Treasury estimates receipts to grow by only 6.65 per cent to \$437m. There is only one explanation for that. As Treasury admits that it expects a 7.1 per cent increase in average weekly earnings, it is clear that the Treasury is expecting an employment growth rate considerably lower than the national average.

Even if allowances are made for the \$2m worth of pay-roll concessions announced this year and provision is made for the carry-over effects of last year's concessions, the inescapable conclusion is reached that, depending on the parameters used, the Queensland Treasury expects employment growth to be somewhere between nil and 1½ per cent at best, less than half the national average. These Queensland Treasury estimates prove conclusively that the Premier and Treasurer is talking through his hat and, if the Government disputes my assessment, I challenge it to release the Treasury calculations and projections for 1984-85.

I now wish to comment on the Consolidated Revenue Fund specifically. The first question which needs to be asked is: Why does not the Queensland Government provide a break-down of the Consolidated Revenue Fund into recurrent and capital receipts and expenditures? Has the Queensland Government something to hide?

In response to this unwillingness to break down the Consolidated Revenue Fund into its recurrent and capital components, the Opposition has carried out this task and the results are very interesting indeed. Without this break-down of the Consolidated Revenue Fund into its recurrent and capital parts, it is impossible to get a clear picture of the Government's financial plans.

In the Budget papers we are told that in 1983-84 the Consolidated Revenue Fund finished the year with a surplus of \$900,000. However, when identified capital transactions are excluded, there was a recurrent Budget surplus of \$135m, which is itself \$30m more than the planned Budget surplus of \$105.5m, which more than offsets the below-Budget revenue collections of approximately \$24m. This blatant underspending completely supports the claims earlier this year that departments had been ordered to curtail expenditure.

For 1984-85, the Budget provides for a cash deficit of \$1.1m. However, after adjustments, the planned surplus of the recurrent Budget for this year is \$128m. In other words, there is planned underspending in this year's recurrent Budget of \$128m, from which \$90m is allocated to the so-called Special Major Capital Works Program, \$24.4m to the Special Projects Fund, which has exactly the same function as the Special Major Capital Works Program, and \$15m to special capital assistance to local authorities, giving an overall deficit, as announced, of \$1,073,000. This practice of deliberate underspending in the recurrent Budget has resulted in the low level of services provided in Queensland in spheres such as education, health and welfare. Commonwealth moneys as well as State funds are diverted from the areas of social services to be either spent on capital works or salted away in the Treasurer's cash balances.

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr WARBUTON: The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer may give me the answers. I have made the claims. Let him give the answers.

Mr Gunn: You haven't understood the Budget.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chamber will come to order. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WARBURTON: I thank you, Mr Row.

It is an appalling deception when Queensland goes cap in hand to the Grants Commission and the Commonwealth Government pleading for additional funds for schools, hospitals, police, welfare and the like and then diverts part of the funds elsewhere. No wonder the Premier can splash out and buy a non-budgeted \$7.5m jet. He knows that deliberate underspending is built into the current Budget, which provides a kitty for the Government. This year most of that kitty is being put into the Special Major Capital Works Program. No wonder the most recent Grants Commission comparisons

show that Queensland spent only 82.8 per cent of the national average on education, only 74.4 per cent of the average on health and for total social services Queensland came in at 80.6 per cent of the national average.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr WARBURTON: The Opposition now knows that the substandard level of expenditure on social services can be put down to deliberate budgeted underspending. No wonder the Government has not broken down the Consolidated Revenue Fund into its recurrent and capital components!

I will look now at the revenue side of the State Budget. Clearly, the increased revenues of the State Government are coming largely from two sources. The total Commonwealth payments have been increased by \$160.7m, or by 7.7 per cent, to \$2,235.9m, or approximately half of the State's revenue. Over the past two years, Commonwealth payments to Queensland have increased by 25.1 per cent, or by over 9 per cent in real terms.

The second large increase has come from the mining industry. This year mining royalties are expected to increase by 31.9 per cent, which represents a 58.4 per cent increase since 1982-83. Railway fares, freight, etc., have increased by another \$174.92m, or by 25.35 per cent, making a 54.2 per cent increase since 1982-83. The Queensland Chamber of Mines estimates that this year total mining industry payments to the Queensland Government will be \$477m. In comparison, State taxation is planned to increase by 5.3 per cent, making a 16.8 per cent increase since 1982-83.

From those comparisons, it is clear that Queensland is riding on the back of the Federal Government and the mining industry. This financial year, Commonwealth general revenue assistance to Queensland is \$787 per head, compared with \$592 for New South Wales and \$583 for Victoria. If Queensland was paid at the same per capita rate as Victoria, it would have received \$494m less than it will receive. The contribution of the mining industry to the Queensland Government coffers is increasing at more than ten times the rate of increase of State taxation. No wonder many mines are unprofitable and development in the mining sector is stifled! Those calculations, which show massive increases in revenues from the mining industry, do not even take into account the increased freight rates announced just after the Budget.

In contrast to those hikes in revenue, the tax concessions announced in the Budget are minimal. The pay-roll tax exemption level increases from \$252,000 to \$270,000. However, I stress that that represents no increased concession in real terms; it simply reflects the expected growth of 7.1 per cent in wages. The cost of that concession in this year's Budget is estimated to be just more than \$2m; but, despite that concession, pay-roll tax receipts will increase by 6.65 per cent.

In regard to expenditure in 1984-85, total recurrent expenditure is estimated to increase by 10.8 per cent, or by about 4 per cent in real terms, which is slightly less than the 4.5 per cent real increase in 1983-84. Education, health, welfare, transport, works and housing and primary industries all receive increased expenditure in real terms, and those increases are welcome.

I come now to the hoary old claim of the Government that its Budget is balanced. That, as a prominent political commentator said recently, is absolute nonsense. What the Government has done, as every State Government must do, is draw up the Consolidated Revenue Fund so that it balances. However, as I pointed out before, the recurrent Budget contains an estimated Budget surplus of \$128m.

When the Opposition disputes that the Budget is balanced, it is not disputing that the Consolidated Revenue Fund has been drawn up to balance. The Opposition is talking about the overall result of the total Budget, which includes the operations of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Funds. When one looks at the complete picture, one finds that a large proportion of Government

activity has to be funded through borrowings. It is that gap between outlays and receipts that is called the deficit. Last year the Australian Bureau of Statistics calculated Queensland's public sector deficit at \$1,741,000. For the State Budget sector alone, Queensland had to borrow \$835m to balance the books in 1983-84. When they refer to Queensland's deficit, the ABS, the Federal Government and the Opposition use the national accounting term "deficit", not the book-keeping term which the Queensland Government persists in using. Queensland is reluctant to adopt national accounting conventions because they would explode the myth about its balanced Budgets.

It is appropriate that the people of Queensland should be apprised of how the Opposition would handle things differently in the delivery and presentation of the State Budget. To begin with, we in the Labor Party would not indulge in hoaxes. We would be open and honest about the content and intentions of the Budget, instead of trying to pull a huge confidence trick on the public. We would present a Budget in full and proper detail. Information about crucial matters such as the projected growth in the State's labour force would be included. Details of economic strategy would be given prominence rather than being ignored. Details about revenue-raising operations, including fees and charges, would be presented prominently in the Budget instead of being hidden elsewhere. Details of capital works projects and their sources of funding would be properly outlined.

What else would we in the Labor Party do differently? We would make a genuine effort to create additional jobs and, to do this, there would be a total reappraisal of Government finances. For instance, some of the hundreds of millions of dollars now held in cash reserves could be applied to job-creation programs. Why should the Treasury be allowed to act like a merchant bank? Why should it be allowed to invest public moneys on the short-term money market when those public funds could be used in part to directly help the very Queenslanders who make the contribution? We would initiate specific programs to alleviate youth unemployment.

The Labor Party would move quickly to deal with waste and inefficiency in the operations of quangos, something that this Government has not done. It was found recently in Victoria, following a year-long investigation, that savings in the vicinity of \$600m a year could be made. There is no doubt that Queensland could save many millions of dollars by cutting away the dead wood, and by eliminating waste and inefficiency in those statutory bodies that remained.

The Labor Party would, in the interests of Queensland, co-operate and work in harmony with the Federal Government. The Labor Party would not confront Canberra at every turn on every issue that arose—a feature of the present State Government that is harmful to Queensland.

The Labor Party would appoint additional authorised inspectors to the Stamp Duties Office to counter what is known to be the widespread pay-roll tax evasion problem. It is estimated that pay-roll tax evasion and avoidance is costing the Queensland Treasury tens of millions of dollars each year. If that revenue was collected by appointing additional inspectors, it could be used constructively, for instance, to employ in the more disadvantaged areas additional teachers in planning and special programs, library and resource teachers and multieducation teachers. Under this Government's rationalisation plans, fewer teachers will be employed in those areas. The Opposition places a tremendous emphasis on education, and that emphasis would be reflected in a Labor Budget.

The Opposition places great emphasis on employment, and that emphasis, too, would be demonstrated in a Labor Budget.

We in the Opposition place great emphasis on relieving the cost-of-living burden on families. That emphasis would also be demonstrated in a Labor Budget. We would provide domestic electricity consumers with relief from the ever-spiralling increases in electricity tariffs. We would provide motorists with relief from the huge increases in motor vehicle registration fees and third-party insurance charges. We would ensure the most efficient administration of the dairying and bread industries with a view to reducing the prices of those essential, everyday food items. For house-holders we would boost

police force numbers further to combat the dramatic increase in the rate of burglaries, and we would initiate a concerted campaign against neighbourhood crime. Above all, our initiatives would be genuine, unlike the phoney programs of this Government. We would significantly upgrade Government services in education, health and community services. To cut costs, we would not bleed the State's emergency services of police, fire, ambulance or nursing services.

In any other Parliament operating under the Westminster system, a Government that is found to be dishonest or fraudulent in the presentation of its annual Budget would, no doubt, have to seriously consider its right to continue in government. The Queensland National Party Government has shown itself to be contemptuous of the standards that the Westminster system lays down. I have no doubt that the Government's attitude, and that of the Premier and Treasurer, is to cop the flak or to sit back and ride out the storm, which will abate if the public and the media allow it to do so. Honesty in government is paramount and, in this year's Budget, we have seen deception at its worst.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (2.27 p.m.): I am pleased to take part in this debate. Contrary to what was said by the Leader of the Opposition, without doubt this Budget is the best Budget to be brought down in the past 20 years. It is a Budget on which the Government could go to an election. Indeed, the effects of the Budget will flow through to the next election.

As predicted by the Premier and Treasurer, the Budget is balanced. It reflects the sound budgetary policies that have been the hallmark of successive National Party-led coalition Governments in the past, and of the National Party governing in its own right.

I was interested in the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. To my mind it was merely a rehash of Budget speeches made by former Labor leaders, with the figures updated.

Mr McPhie: They are not very well updated.

Mr NEAL: That is so.

I should like to know how the Leader of the Opposition explains the growth and expansion in this State over many years during which the two common denominators were the National Party, as the leader of the coalition Government and now in its own right, and the Under Treasurer. I should like to know how Opposition members explain that away.

The Leader of the Opposition said that a Labor Government would reduce taxes and charges and increase services. He said that the Budget presented by the Premier and Treasurer is a fraud, that the amounts of money allocated do not exist in the true sense. I should like to know how he would get extra money to allow him to reduce taxes and increase services.

It is obvious that the Budget is a serious embarrassment to the voices of doom and gloom in the Labor Party in this State. To be candid, I believe that Labor members have been stunned. Privately, if they are honest with themselves, I know they will admit that it is a good Budget. Publicly, they are trying desperately to discredit it in an attempt to save a little face, especially after all the talk by the former Leader of the Opposition in the past month or so. He said that the State was deeply in debt and that the Government would have to introduce a huge deficit Budget to overcome the problems.

Opposition members are the greatest knockers of this State. They are antidevelopment, antiprofit and anti-Queensland. Some of them seem more interested in promoting the cause of gays, greenies, druggies and drop-outs than in promoting the causes of the State. Even the immediate former Leader of the Opposition—and Opposition members change leaders as often as they change their socks—is presently facing censure from within his party because of his stand against the sexual preferences policy of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

The Budget is an embarrassment to other Labor Governments because, contrary to what they have done with their massive deficit Budgets, Queensland has balanced its Budget. As the Premier outlined in his Budget, the State does not have billions of dollars in unfunded superannuation liabilities and it is not borrowing money to fund such deficits.

It is only fair to quote Queensland's debt-servicing costs, especially after all of the gloomy figures bandied about by the Leader of the Opposition. The Budget paper outlines these figures. In 1979-80, public debt servicing costs represented 7.4 per cent of total Consolidated Revenue Fund outlays; in 1984-85, the percentage is estimated to be 5.6 per cent. Additional annual debt-servicing costs can be committed within the Consolidated Revenue Fund exceeding the relative costs to the Budget and, critically, the debt incurred is for capital works and not for funding Budget deficits, as happens in Canberra and the Labor States.

Members of the Opposition cry that the Government has been able to bring down such a good Budget only because of the benevolence of the ALP Federal Government. They claim also that Queensland receives more than its fair share of Commonwealth funds. Opposition members conveniently forget that, for years, Queensland was short-changed under the Commonwealth tax-sharing arrangements and that it was being duded on the population component.

Mr Campbell: Under the Anthony Government.

Mr NEAL: It is a fact that it happened under the Fraser administration, and I do not deny it. I have raised that in the Chamber before today.

It must not be forgotten that it was also under the Fraser Government that the guide-lines were changed, as a result of which Queensland benefits. Queensland now receives its just share. No credit can be given to the Federal ALP Government. Under Medicare funding arrangements, it is short-changing Queensland to the tune of about \$50m a year. What is the attitude of the State ALP in that argument? It is anti-Queensland yet again.

State ALP members have the strange idea that the Federal taxes collected in Queensland are the sole preserve of the Federal Government, that the people of this State have no right to expect a fair return of those taxes and that they should be extremely grateful to the all-powerful and benevolent Government in Canberra when it deigns to bestow upon them some of that money. Queensland is entitled to a just share, without any strings attached.

The Premier and Treasurer has introduced a Budget that will stimulate growth and employment opportunities. Economic conditions are improving as a direct result of the breaking of the drought, wage restraint and a general upturn in the economy of the Western World, in particular that of the United States of America.

Mr Davis: Thanks to Labor!

Mr NEAL: Mr Hawke had nothing to do with any of that. It is significant that provisional tax collections this year will be up by 45 per cent, and I will give the figures later. Mr Hawke did not do anything about that.

An Opposition Member: Give some credit.

Mr NEAL: The only credit that I will give Mr Hawke for these events is that he happened to be Prime Minister when they happened. That was just his good luck.

The boost of \$600m to the normal Capital Works Program over the next two and a half years will mean that an additional 16 000 jobs will be created each year. The Budget papers state that the allocation of \$348.1m for the normal program is an increase of just over 8 per cent and represents an increase in real terms, and that is without the additional \$600m in the special program.

The education Vote of \$1072.6m is something to be proud of. It is up 15.7 per cent on last year's allocation, which is a very significant increase. It will provide the wherewithal to cater for many of the demands of education. I am sure that the Queensland Teachers Union must be fairly pleased with the Vote. No doubt in some areas the union would like to see more work done, but I am sure its members are realistic enough to know that they would not get all that they wanted.

Of the \$600m special program funds, \$100m will provide 10 new high schools and major works at five others, 17 new or replacement primary schools, new pre-school facilities at 79 centres and major works for special education facilities at 22 centres. That will have a major impact. Because the works associated with this special program will be spread over two and a half years—that is clearly outlined—many projects that were only in the planning stage can be programmed to proceed.

The increase of 1 555 in teacher employment, which includes 400 full-time teachers employed on a temporary basis, will assist greatly in reducing class sizes.

The increase of 33½ per cent in grants for school equipment has been welcome news for p. and c. associations. I have spoken to a number of teachers, and they also are very pleased about that.

Mr Comben: Not high enough.

Mr NEAL: It is never high enough. If the honourable member were asked whether his salary was high enough, he would say that he was not paid enough. No-one is ever totally satisfied. However, as in all walks of life, the Government has to get its priorities right.

Parents will benefit from the increase in real terms by way of an increase in textbook allowances of 12 per cent and of conveyance assistance schemes.

The new remote area tuition, hostel and travel allowance schemes, which will replace the various other separate schemes, should streamline the process and save a good deal of paperwork for parents, schools and the Education Department.

All of those matters to which I have referred are of vital importance to people in country areas. Those improvements enable country parents to get their children to school.

I am pleased to see that the per capita grants to non-Government schools will be increased by an average of 12 per cent. In real money terms, that represents an increase of at least 6 per cent. The grants will be increased to \$384 per annum for primary pupils and to \$621 per annum for secondary students. The remote area schemes and the per capita grants are the very means by which children in remote areas are able to receive an education.

Non-Government schools and hostels play an important role in the education system of the State. It is pleasing to see the Government's continued support for those schools. I know that members of the ALP do not support private schools. Their Federal colleagues are putting the screws on the wealthier private schools by imposing means tests. The Australian Labor Party is hell-bent on reducing all schools to the one level. If the Labor Party believes that it will pull the wool over our Government's eyes, it has another trick coming.

Mr Comben: Not one school in Queensland.

Mr NEAL: It is as plain as the nose on the honourable member's face what the Federal ALP intends to do.

Mr Comben: Not one school in Queensland.

Mr NEAL: Of course not one school in Queensland will be affected this year; a Federal election is coming up.

It is difficult to follow the ALP's reasoning, as parents who send their children to private schools pay their taxes and thereby contribute to the public school system. If, after paying their taxes, they choose to send their children to private schools and pay those school fees, that is their business. They are paying for their own children, and their taxes are paying for someone else's children as well.

Let us not forget that many parents cannot send their children to public schools for the simple reason that no school is available to them. Those parents have to send their children to private schools and are therefore compelled to pay twice for their children's education.

I turn now to some education problems that arise in my own electorate. I hope that the additional funds that will be made available will allow a new manual arts block to be provided at the St George State High School and a manual arts and home economics block to be provided at the Miles State High School. The Education Department has recognised the need for both those amenities. The students at both those schools have to travel to primary schools to receive tuition in manual arts and home economics. In St George, the students have to travel one kilometre each day, and in Miles the students have to travel half a kilometre each day.

I hope that something can be done in relation to the school at Tara. In the near future, the Minister for Education will be visiting Tara to investigate the very real problems that have arisen in relation to school facilities at Tara. A good deal of subdivision has occurred round the town, and that is placing very heavy strains on the facilities that are provided at the Tara school. I hope that the Government can do something to alleviate the problem.

The Minister has indicated the need for an early education centre at the small town of Bungunya. That need has been clearly established. I hope that the provision of such a centre can be incorporated in the works program in the very near future.

It is particularly pleasing to see the introduction of a computer network throughout high schools. In this day and age, students must be given an opportunity to learn how to operate computers, as computers are playing an ever-increasing role in our daily lives. The teachers and principals to whom I have spoken are excited that the Government has seen fit to introduce computers into Queensland schools. As all high schools in my electorate have fewer than 1 000 students, they will use the one network system of 15 microcomputers compared with the two network system that will be used by schools with more than 1 000 students.

The Budget documents outline that, out of a total of \$7.5m to be spent over the next three years, \$3.5m is allocated for the provision of computer systems. Primary schools will be assisted to the tune of \$500 for the purchase of a computer. I am certain that a number of schools will take advantage of that offer. Some of the schools in my electorate have computers. That will enable students to receive some grounding in computer systems.

The \$11m allocation for Government departmental computer systems is very welcome news. It will streamline the keeping of records and will assist departments in filing operations.

The increase in hospital contributions of 16.2 per cent to \$691m from consolidated revenue is due to debt-servicing costs as a result of the massive rebuilding program. Unfortunately, as has been previously outlined effectively by the Minister for Health, Queensland is being shortchanged by \$52m per year under the Medicare agreement. Anyone who does his arithmetic can work out that Medicare reimbursements in Queensland amount to \$46 per head, compared with \$65 per head in other States.

Mr Comben: Queensland has not been spending enough on health over the past 10 years, that's why. That is the truth of the matter.

Mr NEAL: That is a load of old boots, and the honourable member knows it.

Prior to the introduction of Medibank and Medicare, Queensland had the best of both worlds. It is a shame that the Queensland system could not have been introduced in other States instead of Queensland having a system that hangs like an albatross round its neck. Wherever Medicare systems have been introduced in other countries, costs have escalated through the roof owing to the system being used and abused. The taxpayer will be the person who will continue to foot the bill. The only reason an increase in the 1 per cent Medicare levy has not already been imposed is that an election will be held in the not too distant future. It is a political fact of life that neither Mr Hawke nor Dr Blewett would want to impose a higher levy at the moment.

The Government's move to establish a liver transplant unit in Queensland is also welcome news. I hope that one can be established. The manner in which liver transplants are funded at present is totally unacceptable. I do not level any criticism at any charitable organisations that have implemented schemes to enable patients to be sent to the United States of America for transplants. A unit should be established in Queensland so that liver transplant operations can be carried out here. The unit would be available to those persons who need it and they would not have to depend upon the charitable qualities of others.

I am very pleased that funding has been included in the Budget for a new hospital at Dirranbandi. When the new Dirranbandi hospital is completed, all the hospitals in the Balonne electorate will be new or fairly new and up-to-date hospitals. At the beginning of this year I had the pleasure of accompanying the Minister for Health to Mungindi, where he opened the new hospital. It is typical of the standard of the hospitals in my electorate, and it is an example of the services that the Government is providing.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: It is a 24-bed hospital. It is quite adequate for that area.

I was disappointed that provision was not made in the Budget for the employment of more than 100 additional police officers. There is a need for more than that number. The increase may be in line with the population increase, as the Budget outlines, but crime in all forms is on the increase. Drugs, road accidents and road deaths are of particular concern. Police are to be commended for keeping down the number of people killed on roads but, no matter what is done, road deaths will occur. The reasons are many and varied. A simple lapse of concentration at the wrong moment can result in death. Nothing can ever be done to prevent such occurrences.

Greater resources are required to assist the fight against drugs. Drug-Arm is doing a very good job. However, greater effort is required to alert the public at large, and parents in particular, to the very real dangers of drugs and to educate people on that subject. Drugs in all forms are to be found throughout the length and breadth of our State, even in small communities. A State-wide education program should be instituted to assist people to identify drugs, particularly marijuana, and know what they look and smell like, as well as to recognise the symptoms exhibited by people who are under the influence of drugs. Many Queenslanders are totally ignorant about the matter.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr NEAL: I would not be bothered answering the member. He has answered himself.

Mr Comben: He is seeking an intelligent answer from you.

Mr NEAL: If he asks an intelligent question, he may receive an intelligent answer.

On the matter of police strength—I sincerely hope that the Minister will fulfil his undertaking to provide an extra police officer for the Tara Police District. The workload on the two officers there is unreasonable. I have it on very high authority within the police force that the Tara station warrants an additional two police officers.

I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General for providing temporary assistance, for one day a week, in doing clerk of the court paperwork at the Tara Police Station. However, in the very near future, the Minister ought to give very serious consideration to the provision of a separate office for a clerk of the court at Tara. The work-load there necessitates the establishment of a separate office. Such an appointment would relieve police officers of mountains of paperwork, much of which involves other departments, and enable them to carry out the duties which the public at large expect of them.

I turn now to primary industries. As a result of the excellent seasonal conditions, there is certainly an air of optimism in the rural sector. Most commodity prices are buoyant. The wheat crop for this year shows the promise of being above average, although it will not be quite as good as the crop last year. The wheat industry—indeed, rural industries in general—must face up to interference from the Federal Government. It is a matter of great concern that Mr Kerin is attempting to take control of the Australian Wheat Board out of the hands of growers. Industry organisations in all States have strongly objected to his proposals. He is now threatening that, if the Senate does not agree to his proposals, payments to wheat-growers will be delayed.

I wish to quote an article from “The Queensland Graingrower”

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: The honourable member may laugh, but I have a few other quotations, too.

The article reads—

“Pointing out that the states had ‘very real rights’ in the national wheat marketing scheme, Mr McLeod said the Q.G.G.A. was maintaining close contact with the State Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Turner, and his department.

‘I am hopeful that if the need arises, the Queensland Government will take the necessary steps to restrain the Commonwealth from walking roughshod over the growers and the states.’ ”

Mr McLeod said also that Australia’s overseas customers look to the Australian Wheat Board. The honourable member for Brisbane Central may laugh about the Graingrowers Association, but Mr McLeod is also a member of the Australian Wheat Board and is speaking on behalf of the Australian wheat industry.

The article continues—

“Mr McLeod said Australia’s overseas customers looked upon the A.W.B. as having a co-operative structure controlled by growers. They preferred to buy ‘direct’ from growers through the board, without any interferences from governments or traders.”

Another article reads—

“Thirdly, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Kerin, at the second reading of the Wheat Marketing Act in Canberra, released details of the new marketing system. However, he also said if it was rejected by the Senate, wheat growers would not be paid under the present system.

In my opinion Mr Kerin is forcing the industry to accept his decisions with no recourse, particularly the restructuring of the A.W.B. which has been rejected by all states. Mr Kerin is saying ‘take it or leave it’. Queensland’s position is that we require two grower members from each state and we are adhering to that policy.”

I refer also to an article by the chairman of Bulk Grains Queensland in “The Dalby Herald”. Under the heading, “Wheat scheme a ‘nightmare’ ”, it says—

“Referring to the 1983-84 premium payment, Mr. McKechnie said that no further advice had been received from Melbourne or Canberra which would allow the SWB to make this payment.

'I would urge growers who urgently require this money to contact their local Federal Member of Parliament.'

'There can be no good reason for the delay in giving permission for the payment to be made,' Mr. McKechnie said."

Recently in this Chamber, I was interested in listening to the member for Windsor place on record his total ignorance of the wheat industry. He referred to the Federal Budget, and, in particular, to the wheat finance scheme being wound up and said that the \$52m that had been collected was to be paid to the growers with interest of \$7.6m. He went on to say that that was not a bad state of affairs. For the personal information of the honourable member, that money happens to belong to wheat-growers, not to the Federal Government. In fact, the Federal Government does not contribute one red cent to the Wheat Board; all it does is give a guarantee to the board that enables the board to borrow moneys more favourably on the open market. That guarantee is certainly worth having, but the Federal Government gives no money to wheat-growers.

The honourable member for Windsor should get his facts straight and not get carried away. When the Government advanced money to the Wheat Board, it was only for the first payment so that growers could get their year's income. That money was lent to the Wheat Board, and it was repaid at the bond rate of interest. Before the honourable member for Windsor launches into tirades in this Chamber, he should learn a little about rural industries.

Furthermore, the Federal Government is not releasing that wheat finance money until July next year. Prior to Mr Kerin's announcement that he would release the money, a great deal of concern existed over the length and breadth of Australia that the Federal Government would siphon off that money into its Consolidated Revenue Fund and not return it to the growers.

The Labor members in this Chamber have trumpeted far and wide the good things the Federal Government is doing for rural industries. It is a great pity that Labor members do not read some of the papers published by rural industries. If they did, they might change their tune. The industries concerned are in the best position to know what effects are being felt by their members.

I wish to quote an article published in "Queensland Country Life"

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: Now I will get down to tin-tacks. The following article refers to the Federal Budget papers—

"According to the budget papers the amount of tax collected from provisional taxpayers is expected to rise by about 45 percent in 1984-85, compared with an 8.4 percent increase in 1983-84."

Mr Hawke did that. That was the great benefit Mr Hawke bestowed upon the rural people of Australia.

The article continues—

"Many primary producers did not pay provisional tax in March 1984 and thus will face double tax levels in March 1985 when the tax on the current year's income and the provisional tax for 1984-85 becomes payable.

Primary producers with incomes equal to the average taxable income of all primary producers will face a total tax bill of \$5,907, while wheat growers with incomes equal to the average for all wheat growers will face a tax liability of \$12,855. This would be equivalent to 56.8 per cent of their current year's income."

Perhaps Opposition members would like to hear what the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has to say on the subject. It estimates that the average annual taxable income

of Australian primary producers rose from \$295 to \$11,499 in 1983-84. The average income of wheat-farmers is expected to rise from a loss of \$2,918 to \$22,261—

Mr Davis: Why don't you tell the truth?

Mr NEAL: These are figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, so the honourable member should tell the bureau to tell the truth.

Having cited those figures, I draw attention to the fact that the Federal Government has completely emasculated income-equalising deposits. They are no longer worth having. Rural producers who have suffered many years of low or negative incomes and now have the prospect of some sort of high return will not be able to utilise their profitability of this year by purchasing income-equalising deposits and thus balancing out their losses. Instead, Mr Keating, who holds the record as being the highest-taxing Treasurer in Australia's history, is going to put his hands into the farmers' pockets to the tune of 50.8 per cent of their income this year.

The use of income-equalising deposits would put the average primary producer into a tax position similar to that of a PAYE tax-payer with a similar income.

I shall now read a letter written to the Prime Minister and to the Treasurer by the executive director of the National Farmers Federation, Mr John Whitelaw. He said—

“Over 50 per cent of primary producers have taxable incomes between \$400 and \$19,000 a year, I.E. taxable incomes in the vicinity of the most pronounced changes in tax brackets.

The example quoted involved taxable income over seven years of \$20,000, \$40,000, \$10,000, \$20,000, \$50,000, \$5,000 and \$10,000—an average of \$22,143 a year.”

Mr Davis: When was the last time you paid tax on your property?

Mr NEAL: The honourable member would have to be joking. He would not know the first thing about it.

Mr Davis: When did you last pay tax?

Mr NEAL: The honourable member would not know. The letter continues—

“Applying the new six-tier tax scale which will come into force on November 1, the tax-payer in question would have paid \$46,108 without averaging or I.E.D.S., \$41,234 with averaging but without I.E.D.S. and \$37,354 with strategic use of both. A P.A.Y.E. tax-payer on a stable income of \$22,143 would have paid \$37,044.”

Members should note that that is \$310 less.

Honourable members have heard a great deal about this benevolent Federal Government. However, for the edification of the member for Windsor, who fancies himself as something of a greenie, I point out that the Federal Government cut funding to the CSIRO by \$9.2m. That included forestry research being carried out by the New England University into dieback in trees, especially in eucalyptus trees, which is a very real problem. It is evident in many places.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr NEAL: The Federal Government, and Opposition members who are barking like fox terriers, should bear in mind that rural industries still provide the bulk of Australia's export income. It is from the rural industries that this nation derives its overall prosperity.

I will not delve into the sugar industry, because many Government members have a far greater knowledge of it than I do. As sugar producers, they have an intimate knowledge of the industry. They are different from some Opposition members, who advance many panaceas but never put up their own money or have a go themselves.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The honourable member for Bundaberg is not in the Chamber, but we continually hear from him on this subject. He takes the cake. He seems to think that he can read all about the problems in a book.

Mr Comben: It is a pity you didn't read a few books in your time, Donnie.

Mr NEAL: The honourable member for Bundaberg thinks that he can read all about them in books.

The honourable member for Windsor has a great deal to learn, too. It is not what a person learns from a book but the dry gulleys that he crosses that provide the best lesson. It is obvious that the honourable member has not crossed very many dry gulleys.

In speaking of the sugar industry, I must refer to the total lack of credibility of the Federal Government because of its election promises to underwrite the sugar industry and its refusal to commit a lousy \$5m in carry-on finance. It is significant that nice noises are now coming from the Federal Government. It is showing interest. Would it be because an election is just around the corner?

Mr Davis: We missed the point about the tax.

Mr NEAL: I assure honourable members opposite that rural producers are under no illusions about the benevolence of the Federal Government. That is especially so because of their knowledge that the Federal Government has increased its tax take by \$2.7 billion and is investigating a capital gains tax, death and gift duties and a wealth tax. The same Government imposed a 10 per cent tax on wine and cider. That was very good for the wine producers in Queensland! The Minister for Primary Industries referred to the reduction in rural reconstruction funding from \$45m last year to \$26m this year.

Mr Fouras: You have \$30m unspent.

Mr NEAL: I have referred to some of the matters about which Opposition members do not like to hear. They should go out into the rural areas and talk to some of the industry leaders and farmers to see how wealthy they are. I have a little more to say about that later.

The main thrust of the Budget is to create jobs. It will do just that. One of its most important aspects is that it will create many jobs through private enterprise. Private enterprise will benefit by being called on to carry out a great deal of the work. Such a program must assist employment greatly. Although Queensland's unemployment figures are higher than one would wish, and higher than the unemployment rate for Australia as a whole, one should look at the statistical figures in their correct perspective.

Employment figures are a far better indicator of economic performance than unemployment figures. For many years, Queensland has created many more jobs than have been created in other States. Over the past six years, Queensland has created 159 500 new jobs out of a total of 467 000 jobs for the whole of Australia. That represents 34.1 per cent of all jobs created. In the same period, New South Wales created 136 500, or 29.2 per cent of the total. Victoria created 76 700 jobs, or 16.4 per cent. Those figures are taken from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. When considered on a population basis, they show the huge contribution to overall employment made by Queensland.

Mr Davis: Why not quote the unemployment figures?

Mr NEAL: I am coming to them.

The Budget shows also that for the last year, to June 1984, the average unemployment rate was 9.7 per cent in Queensland, compared with 9.6 per cent for the rest of Australia. Queensland's unemployment figure was one-tenth of 1 per cent higher than that for the rest of Australia. However, the growth in Queensland's population, labour force and employment in the same period was above that for the remainder of Australia. That is the context in which these figures must be considered.

An analysis of the population increase of 14 640 net migration, as outlined in the Budget—that does not include natural increase—makes the picture even clearer. It is only reasonable to assume that some of those 14 640 people who came to Queensland took up jobs. As at June 1984, Queensland had 104 300 people or 9.2 per cent of the work-force unemployed, compared to 8.9 per cent for the whole of Australia.

Mr Davis: Are you proud of those figures?

Mr NEAL: No, I am certainly not proud of them.

In other words, Queensland had three-tenths of 1 per cent higher unemployment at the end of June than the rest of Australia. If the figure of 104 300 unemployed is reduced by three-tenths of 1 per cent to bring it into line with the national average, another 4 487 persons would have been employed in this State. It is only reasonable to assume that the 14 640 migrants took up some of those jobs. If 30 per cent of them got jobs in Queensland, they account for the three-tenths of 1 per cent. If that analysis is applied to the past 12 months, only 1 496 people needed to come up from the south and obtain jobs in Queensland to put Queensland's unemployment figure at one-tenth of 1 per cent higher than the average for Australia. So much for the Labor Opposition's criticism of the Government's performance. Opposition members cannot even work out the figures that are held in front of their noses on the end of a stick.

It is pleasing that the maximum loan eligible for interest subsidy under the Queensland Housing Commission subsidy scheme is to be increased from \$35,000 to \$37,500. It is also pleasing to note the additional loan by way of second mortgage at attractive interest rates. This will assist lower income families to obtain housing. The overall scheme of home-ownership is one of which the Government can be proud. The Government believes in giving people the incentive to own their own homes and encouraging home-ownership. Unlike members of the ALP, the Government has no desire to have a nation of rent-payers. I commend the Minister for Works and Housing, because he does a very good job in running his department, and he is very helpful and bends over backwards to help as many people as he can.

Pay-roll tax should be eliminated and I have long maintained my objection to it on the basis that it is a tax on employment and not on profitability. Regardless of the viability or otherwise of a company, tax must be paid when the pay-roll exceeds \$270,000. The increase from \$240,000 in the exemption raises the threshold, and the tapering arrangements will result in increased benefits for employers whose annual wage bill is in the range of \$270,000 to \$424,000. The relevant section in the Budget papers outlines the pay-roll situation. Unfortunately, it would be very difficult for the Government to vacate this field of taxation owing to the criticism already being levelled at it by Labor Premiers, who complain that Queensland does not deserve as much under the Commonwealth tax-sharing arrangements because Queenslanders are not taxed as heavily as they could be. That is an incredible attitude.

The Federal Labor Government spends money as if it is going out of fashion. It imposes high taxes and brings down deficit Budgets. Then it wants to penalise the Queensland Government because of its prudent budgetary measures, which allow the Queensland Government to maintain its taxes at a minimum.

I turn to the proposal to minimise stamp duty on property transfers from parents to children. That is certainly great news. A number of parent/child transfer situations should be considered. The proposal will be of tremendous benefit in the event of the introduction by the Federal Government of death or gift duties. The proposal will encourage the transfer of land from parents to children. I see no reason why such transfers should not be encouraged. If children work on a property and have an interest in it, it is only reasonable that they be given an opportunity to acquire it.

In the past, in many instances gift and death duties divested the children not only of their inheritance but also of their livelihood. Properties had to be sold so that those iniquitous taxes could be paid.

Many people seem to become confused about the difference between the value of a property and its earning capacity. To me, it is the earning capacity that counts. To those people who own and work their land, who have no other qualifications and who, because they have nowhere else to go, have no desire to sell their land, the value of their asset can be assessed only by its capacity to provide a yearly income. To those people, that is the true value of their land.

Anyone who reflects on the figures that I previously outlined will see what such annual incomes have been. They are a matter of record in the files of the Australian Bureau of Statistics and other places. The legislation that will implement the proposal will be good legislation indeed.

In conclusion—the Budget is a very exciting one. It will ensure the continued progress of the State. It will maintain and improve the services that people have come to expect from the Government. Above all, it will stimulate business and employment, and it will inspire confidence in the State in general. I congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on his Budget, and I pay a tribute to the Under Treasurer and Under Secretary and his officers for the manner in which they have handled the finances of this State.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (3.12 p.m.): I am pleased to join in the debate on the Financial Statement. Unfortunately, the problems arising from Queensland's narrow economic base are upon us. For too long, this Government has had a resource-boom mentality and adhered to the cargo cult. Its attitude has been that, for everything to be well, all someone has to do is grow something or dig a hole and take something out of the ground. When times were good and massive investments were made in Queensland's resources, the Queensland Government did nothing about broadening its economic base.

Whilst I have been member for South Brisbane, approximately 1 000 jobs have been lost at Malleys, which was a white goods industry that was rationalised and taken to Victoria and South Australia, and 300 jobs have been lost at Patterson, Reid and Bruce, which was a clothing factory that, too, was rationalised and taken to Melbourne. Other big employers, whether they be glass factories, United Packages, Pauls or some other company, have cut down their numbers of employees because of technological changes. Whilst all that was happening, this Government did nothing.

In May of this year Mr Bruce Watson, of MIM Holdings, said that he was concerned that the boom mentality, which had been responsible for many of the current economic problems in Queensland, was alive and well in this State. It is unfortunate that it is, and it is equally unfortunate that in the Premier and in the Deputy Premier this State has people who will accept only good news and not look realistically at what is happening.

It is unfortunate that the report on Queensland's economy that was prepared by the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development has not been released. That report paints the true picture. The poor old Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) was castigated for letting that sort of message go out to the people of Queensland. The release of that report would most certainly destroy the rosy picture that was painted by the Premier and Treasurer in his Budget speech.

The Queensland economy is at the crossroads. Resource development, much of which was based on decisions that were taken in good years, is now definitely over. The Queensland economy is now far more exposed to the vagaries of the real world than it has been for years. Later in my speech I will provide figures that will prove that Queensland is in the economic doldrums. Unfortunately, the Premier and his National Party colleagues have chosen to ignore the facts. That is bad news. As I said earlier, that is not wanted. The facts do not change simply because they are ignored. That will be brought home to the Government.

Rather than accept reality, the Premier and his faithful companion the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) have scathingly attacked anybody who has tried to push the facts. Anybody who has tried to tell the truth has been denigrated by those two persons. The stock reply of the Premier and his deputy is that

coal production has increased by 25 per cent from 36 million tonnes to 44 million tonnes. That increase has resulted only from the decisions made in the late '70s and the early '80s. It has nothing to do with the situation now. The National Party Government refuses to accept the reality that those investment decisions are not being repeated now and that no projects will replace them in the late '80s and early '90s.

I am very interested in the receipts section of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Some very interesting conclusions can be drawn from a look at the areas in which the increases occurred. Firstly, let us consider the money that is coming from the Commonwealth Government or the Feds, as one might term them. Substantial increases have occurred in two areas. The amount of funds provided by the Commonwealth under the tax-sharing grant has increased by \$174.1m. Furthermore, the allocation for health services and Medicare this year has increased by \$48.3m. Although Government members criticise Medicare, there is no doubt that the Queensland free hospital system would have ended but for the additional money provided by the Federal Government. However, although Commonwealth payments are increasing, a substandard service is still being provided. Two factors need to be considered in an examination of the total Commonwealth payment increases. In 1983-84, \$82.9m was paid in natural disaster relief. That compares with only \$15.5m this year. In 1983, \$10m was allocated to the sugar industry. The fairly massive increase of Commonwealth funds to Queensland will be a once-off increase. It is highly unlikely that the increased level of funds provided by the Commonwealth will be repeated in 1985-86. Because the Premier said that Queensland forwent increases during the Fraser era to help its poor cousins, Queensland received an increase of 11 per cent compared with 6 per cent increases received by the other States. I remember the Premier returning to Queensland from a Premiers Conference and saying, "We had to look after our poor cousins, so we did not take that money." Queensland is receiving that money now. That commitment has been met by the Hawke Government. However, it will be a one-off payment.

Everyone must be concerned about what will happen following the next Grants Commission report. The next Premiers Conference will be vital to the future Budgets of this State. It is highly unlikely that Queensland will again be granted such favourable per capita relativity. Under section 11A (i) of the States (Tax Sharing and Health Grants) Act Queensland has a relativity of 1.535, compared with 1.000 for Victoria, 1.018 for New South Wales, 1.373 for Western Australia, 1.455 for South Australia and 1.646 for Tasmania, which is the only State with a higher per capita relativity than Queensland. It is likely that the Grants Commission will come to the conclusion that the present tax-sharing formula is favouring Queensland. At this juncture I stress that, although I think that will happen, as a Queenslander I do not wish that result for some short-term political gain for the Labor Opposition in this State or for the people of this State. I suggest that Queenslanders ought to consider the prospects of that happening. The very narrow tax base in Queensland and the concern that there are shortfalls in pay-roll taxation through maladministration will militate against Queensland.

Contrary to what the previous honourable member said, Queensland has allowed itself to have a very narrow tax base. It has relied on a very favourable deal from the Commonwealth Government to allow that to happen. For example, from every \$100 that Victorians paid out in Federal taxation last year, they received \$29 out of the last Hawke Budget. On the other hand, Queenslanders received \$49. That is the sort of disparity that is occurring.

As I said before, it is unlikely that the Grants Commission will fail to take into consideration that the lower per capita payments from the Commonwealth to States such as New South Wales and Victoria have forced those States to broaden their tax base by imposing taxes such as the financial institutions duty. Those States have been forced to make such impositions to provide adequate services to their people.

In 1984-85, the estimated per capita general revenue assistance to Queensland is \$787.73. That should be compared with \$592.03 for New South Wales and \$583.07 for

Victoria. On a per capita basis, Queenslanders are receiving \$200 more than people in those States. Overall, \$500m more is coming to Queensland from the Commonwealth than would have been received if Queensland had been treated on the same basis as those States. Moreover, it is reasonable to argue that Queensland is forgoing taxation in areas such as land tax.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr FOURAS: The member for Surfers Paradise will be pleased to say in this Chamber that he has represented his people well by achieving reductions in land tax for them. That is fine for the people whom he represents; but that reduction in land tax does not help at all the people from South Brisbane who need welfare housing, community centres and other similar resources, because Queensland receives less as a result. On a per capita basis, land tax in this State raises about one-third of the amount being raised in New South Wales and Victoria. The Grants Commission will consider the fact that Queensland is forgoing such taxes and say, "Since you are making such big fellows of yourselves, you raise your own taxes. We will put you on a basis comparable with that in other States."

The narrowness of Queensland's tax base can be shown by the fact that, of the estimated total taxation of \$921.6m in 1984-85, \$769.9m, or a massive 83.3 per cent, is to be derived from pay-roll tax and stamp duty. Let me put aside for the moment, since I have developed my argument, the fact that this State receives 50 per cent of its financial resources from the Commonwealth. 83.3 per cent of the State-raised tax base comes from pay-roll tax and stamp duty—taxes which are regressive; taxes which attack companies; taxes which attack businesses; taxes which attack profitability; taxes which attack employment. They are the taxes on which the Government relies—regressive taxes.

The Government bases its Budget on taxes that, in my opinion, have no growth factor in them. Those taxes are being continued by the State through necessity. They are being continued because the State has no other choice. However, they are taxes of the wrong type. They provide a tax base that is far too narrow.

The other area from which the Queensland Treasury receives a bonanza is the mining industry. There is no doubt at all that increased royalties and railway freights have provided a massive boost to the Budget. They have made the job of the Premier and Treasurer very easy. For example, the increased revenue from those sources in 1984-85 is \$209.3m, made up of \$174.9m in additional railway freights and \$34.4m in additional mining royalties.

The stage is now being reached at which such massive increases cannot continue. The cost-cutting in the railways will be a one-off benefit. Because of a 25 per cent increase in coal mined, there has been an increase in coal haulage. Production has increased from 36 million tonnes to 44 million tonnes. Those production increases have had their genesis in decisions taken in the late '70s and early '80s. There will be no new mines until the late 1990s, if at all. No new contracts will be written. Consequently, the Government cannot expect such a bonanza from the mining industry to continue.

I believe that the Curragh coal mine, which the Premier and Treasurer opened in May this year, will be the last one to open for more than a decade. The completion of that project means that the massive round of resource development, the decisions for which were taken back in the good years of the late 1970s, is now over. I am sure that there will be a levelling-off in coal production.

The Opposition believes that consideration must be given to railway freight rates. If they are to continue to rise substantially in real terms, the Premier will be in danger of killing the goose that laid the golden egg. That sort of exercise is self-defeating. To provide for an increase of 9 per cent in freight rates is sheer economic stupidity. The difficulty is that rail freights in Queensland are more than four times those of the State's

competitors in places such as South Africa and Canada; yet Queensland companies are supposed to compete on the world market and sell more coal.

Mr Neal interjected.

Mr FOURAS: In answer to the honourable member—I do not believe that the Government can take any credit for resource or tourism development in this State. Not even the National Party would take credit for the sunshine and climate in this State. The Premier cannot take credit for the fact that Queensland has coal that is easily accessible and has other resources under the ground. Mining developments would have taken place under any administration.

The argument that I have been constructing is that it is highly unlikely that the State can have repeated in next year's Budget increases in revenue of the level of \$222.4m from the tax-sharing grant and health services funding and increases of \$209.3m from railway freights and mining royalties. In just these areas the increase amounts to \$431.7m, or 10.2 per cent of the 1983-84 Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$4.2 billion. With some degree of inevitability, the analysis predicts that in the very near future there will be a need for this State to have a more broadly based tax base. The Premier and Treasurer will not be able to make up such shortfalls by continuing to rely on pay-roll tax and stamp duties.

It is time that the Premier stopped saying that the Budget contains no increases in taxation. The Budget papers show quite clearly that Treasury estimates that State taxation will increase by \$46.2m; but, when compared with the \$431m that comes from the Commonwealth and through royalties and rail freights, that is still a small amount.

In his Budget speech, the Premier and Treasurer said, when speaking about the major thrust of his Budget—

“This Budget is about capital works and employment.”

He also said—

“The key feature of the Budget this year is the implementation of a \$600 million major boost to the normal Governmental capital works program over the next two and a half years.”

I will now put that statement into perspective. Of course, the Premier is speaking about three Budgets, so I do not know why he used the term “two and a half years”. The Premier said also that \$100m would be spent on education, \$100m on water resources, \$200m on public buildings and Crown employee housing, \$100m on roads and \$100m on hospitals. At a cost to tax-payers, the Government placed advertisements in major daily newspapers all over the State to tell the people of the State how good the Government was being to them. It is ludicrous that, with such a marvellous Budget, the Government had to take full-page advertisements to tell Queenslanders how lucky they were and how they would benefit from the Budget. The tax-payers have had to pay to have that rammed down their throats. The Budget really did not get its message across.

The Budget speaks about 40 000 man-years of work. To arrive at that figure, the Government used a multiplier effect of 3.3 on the direct increased level of employment of 12 000 man-years. The Budget under debate is for the 1984-85 financial year. Honourable members are not discussing the Budget for 1985-86 or for 1986-87.

I perused the Budget papers and found that \$14.9m would be spent on education capital works, \$15.35m on water resources, \$14.3m on public buildings and Crown employee housing and \$10m on roads. That is a total of almost \$54.55m. I presumed, until I listened to the speech of my leader this morning, that the rest of the \$90m would be spent on hospitals, although I was doubtful about the figure of \$35.45m when I saw that the total to be spent on hospitals would be \$27.4m. So there is a shortfall of \$35m-odd which is not explained, although the Leader of the Opposition said that there would be an extra \$14m-odd for hospitals. So we are assuming that \$70m has been allocated

under this program, but when that is put into the perspective of capital works projects of both public and statutory authorities in excess of \$2,000m, we are looking at an increase in capital works expenditure of a miserly 2 or 3 per cent. That is the greatest con trick that has ever been perpetrated in a Budget. It is a gimmick. This is a Budget of false pretences. It is appalling that this Government would try to sugar the Budget by talking about future projects, while giving so little for the present.

The extra funds allocated in 1984-85 will do little more than provide 1 000 man-years of work. It would be appreciated if the Premier would inform the Committee where the \$90m was allocated. The miserly capital contribution will do no more than find jobs for those people who will be made redundant by General Motors-Holden's in the next month or so. That is the perspective in which that capital allocation should be placed, particularly taking into account the businesses in the manufacturing and heavy engineering sectors that are shutting down all over the State.

Until last year Queensland had been shielded from the worst of the recession by a massive round of resource development. As I said earlier, the last mine opened by the Premier in May brought to an end the major investment in mining. Thus there is no doubt that resource development, the engine that provided most of Queensland's growth since the mid-1970s, has now moved out of top gear and, unfortunately, to neutral; it is going nowhere for this State.

According to ABS statistics, Queensland investment expenditure in 1984-85 is expected to fall 30 per cent below the 1983-84 figure. There has been a decline in resource investment. The benefits to this State from the mining boom were not derived just from the coal that was dug out of the ground. Those benefits were minor compared to the jobs that were created in the associated infrastructure. I will develop that theme shortly. A fall of 30 per cent in the investment expenditure in the next year in real terms is a massive fall, and shows just how insignificant is the \$90m extra in capital works. The impact of the slow-down had already devastated the Queensland heavy engineering sector.

The survey by the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia showed that national sales in 1984 are expected to jump by 9.1 per cent following a decline of 5.1 per cent nationally in 1983. Unfortunately, the Queensland metals sector declined by a further 9.1 per cent in 1984. The major reason for that, of course, was the collapse of resource investment and the knowledge that no more coal mines would be opened, that no more railway lines would be built and that even the construction of power stations would be slowed down because there is no longer any demand for electricity. The heady time that boosted Queensland to the top of growth indicators is well and truly over. But this Government will not accept the reality. It will not come clean with the facts and tell the people that we need a new perspective, a new direction, if I may use the slogan used by the Labor Party during the last election campaign, of which, unfortunately, the good people of Queensland did not take sufficient note. Now that the mines have been built and the infrastructure put into place, the private sector resources, which were once a torrent, have dried to a trickle.

I am concerned about the extent of the money allocated to electricity generation. Considering the basis on which the projections for electricity demand were made, there is grave doubt about the viability of the Stanwell Power Station. I note that the Budget papers merely provide money for clearing, so the project is not really going ahead.

The Metal Trades Industry Association has indicated solid growth in sales for industrial machinery, motor vehicle parts and accessories, electronic and light electrical products, die-casting and agricultural equipment. The same association has indicated very poor prospects for foundry work, pumps, heavy electrical plant and equipment, and heavy engineering plant and equipment. It is unfortunate that the industrial machinery, motor vehicle parts and accessories, electronic and light electrical products industries are to be found in the southern States. The real problem in Queensland relates to its narrow economic base. The industries manufacturing heavy engineering plant and

equipment, such as pumps and heavy electrical plant, are in a nosedive, and it is those industries that operate in Queensland. When they were running well, Queensland lived blithely on the resource boom. That is why Professor Coulsen, before the last election, in making what was not a political statement, said that the people of Queensland should vote either Labor or Liberal because the Nationals did not have the mental capacity to overcome their cargo-cult attitude, that they believed that all that had to be done to get economic growth was to plant something or dig it out of the ground. He was aware that the National Party members would not have enough brains to do what they should do. It is unfortunate that the southern States have the growth manufacturing industries and that Queensland is stuck with the lemons—and real lemons they are, too.

A report by the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors showed that after peaking in 1982-83, the value of engineering turnover in Queensland fell in 1983-84 by 54 per cent. A further fall of 50 per cent in orders is predicted in 1984-85. I emphasise that a 54 per cent fall took place in the last financial year and that order books reveal a further decline of 50 per cent. That is the economic story that the Premier and his very loyal friend, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, should understand.

Sometimes the Premier listens to the Deputy Premier. I have been told that, on one occasion, the Deputy Premier said something interesting to the Premier, and that the Premier said, "Good boy, Bill baby."

The gimmickry and false pretences of this Budget relative to capital works and employment are really laid to rest by an examination of the pay-roll figures. The argument was presented reasonably well by the Leader of the Opposition, but it bears repetition. Pay-roll tax is estimated to increase from \$409.7m in 1983-84 to \$437m in 1984-85. That is an estimated increase of 6.6 per cent.

The rather trivial concessions granted in the Budget in pay-roll tax will amount to about \$2.5m. With wages expected to increase by about 7 per cent, it is crystal clear that the Treasury is expecting little, if any, growth in employment.

Government members are always very happy to contrast what is happening in the boom State of Queensland with what is happening in the dreadful socialist States in the south. I will now examine the explicit estimates of growth in the southern States in the way of estimated pay-roll tax receipts for the coming year. The Budgets recently introduced in New South Wales and Victoria forecast increases in employment of 3¼ per cent, whereas Queensland's estimate is for little or no growth.

The Government says that those are the facts. However, the Budget papers are an attempt to fool the people with the false statement that the massive capital works program will provide jobs. The Government claims that the major thrust of the Budget is to create employment through capital works. If it was not so ludicrous, one could sit back and laugh at the ridiculous nature of the argument.

The expected increase in the Queensland work-force will be from 1.8 to 2 per cent. The Australian average increase is expected to be about 1.8 per cent. The Queensland figure is at a higher level, and I would think that it is factual. With an expected increase of almost 2 per cent in a work-force of 1.113 million, 25 000 jobs must be found annually to stay even. This Budget will not do anything to assist in achieving that; that is the sad part about it. More importantly, Treasury experts do not expect that the Budget will provide that number of jobs, and that can be seen if one looks at the estimated pay-roll tax collection. That estimate makes it crystal clear that Queensland's 1984 economic growth is expected to be minuscule compared with that of the States of New South Wales and Victoria.

Recently, I had lunch with a person from National Mutual Life Association of Australasia Ltd. The economic year of that company extends from 1 October until the end of September, and its annual figures are being released now. I asked him what the current figures of the company were. He said that the company had an Australia-wide

increase in business of 30-odd per cent, but that the increase in Queensland was less than 20 per cent. What is new? The figures for that company are typical of those of companies all over the State. Even insurance companies are witnessing that sort of change. It typifies the direction of all economic indicators in the State.

When I attended the Businessman of the Year Award dinner, I heard the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) give a very interesting statistic. He said that in 1974 people employed in the manufacturing sector in Australia represented 27 per cent of the work-force, but that in 1984 the participation Australia-wide had declined to 17 per cent of the work-force. Mr Ahern then said that Queensland was different from the other States because its manufacturing work-force had increased by 1 per cent. One could be excused for thinking, given those figures, that 28 per cent of Queensland's work-force participated in the manufacturing industry. I discovered that in May 1984 13 per cent of the Queensland work-force was involved in manufacturing industry, which was not even the Australian average of 17 per cent. The Queensland figure had declined from 14.7 per cent in May 1983, so, in fact, Queensland experienced a 1.7 per cent decrease in one year. For some reason, at a meeting of the cream of Brisbane's business community, the Minister had the gall to suggest that Queensland is doing better in manufacturing than the other States. To use a term coined by Mr Fraser, that is reprehensible. It is a shocking indictment of the Minister, and it is a pity that he is not in the Chamber.

A study of economic indicators such as the CPI, unemployment, retail sales, new motor vehicle registrations, wages and building approvals reinforces the argument that Queensland's growth is lagging behind that of the rest of Australia. Queensland's CPI figures for 1983-84 showed a 5.3 per cent increase, compared with that for Australia of 3.9 per cent. In July 1984, Queensland's unemployment was 9.2 per cent of the work-force and Australia's was 8.4 per cent. In 1983-84, retail sales in Queensland were 6.9 per cent higher than the 1982-83 figure. That compares with the Australian increase of 8.3 per cent. That is a good indicator of the level of economic activity. In 1983-84, Queensland suffered a 3.2 per cent decline in new motor vehicle registrations from the 1982-83 figure, but Australia had a 2.3 per cent increase. Need I go on? If I emphasise my point too much, I may lose my audience.

It is absolutely disgraceful that the Premier and Treasurer has told the people of Queensland that this State is doing better than others.

Opposition members represent working-class people. Frequently, people are told how lucky they are to live in Queensland. The real wage level of Queenslanders is far lower than that of people in other States. In 1983-84, wages in Queensland increased by an average of 6.9 per cent, whereas those in Western Australia, for example, rose by 8.7 per cent. Queensland workers, therefore, are confronted with an increase in the inflation rate and a decline in relative terms in their wages. As well, their buying power is reduced. That fact is showing through in retail sales and in new motor vehicle registrations; it is showing through in a deflated economy. That is a shocking indictment of this Government's mismanagement.

As I said before, Queensland's growth between 1978 and 1983 did not result simply from mineral production. A significant proportion of that growth came about because Queensland was embarking upon the construction of coal mines, aluminium smelters, power houses, railway lines, ports and their infrastructure.

Mr Hartwig: That is only happening in Callide.

Mr FOURAS: Let me deal with the area that the honourable member represents in this place.

Mr Hartwig: No unemployment in Callide.

Mr FOURAS: The honourable member should have more sense. He does not know what he is talking about.

In 1983, five new coal mines were under construction in central Queensland. Whereas from 2 500 to 5 000 workers are required to construct a coal mine, after the coal mine is completed only from 600 to 1 000 workers are needed to extract 4 million to 5 million tonnes of coal. That investment in coal mines has now died out completely.

During 1983, more than \$2 billion worth of major projects were under construction in central Queensland alone. The estimates are that in 1984-85 major projects under way throughout the whole of Queensland will be worth less than \$600m. Those projects include a mini-steel-mill, which might not even eventuate. Clearly, the figures demonstrate the massive drop in private sector capital investment on major projects in Queensland. They also show why the heavy construction and heavy engineering sectors face a 50 per cent drop in work and face a 50 per cent drop in orders over the next year.

I have demonstrated the dangers in the National Party Government's excessive reliance on resource development, and on coal in particular. I have also demonstrated the need for a broader economic base. It would be instructive to put into perspective this Government's rather grandiose aims to make Queensland the Silicon Valley of Australia.

This Government's philosophy has been to rely purely on a massive resource development boom. As a result of that, Queensland has gained massive power stations. However, they have not produced cheaper electricity. The Government told the people of Queensland that electricity would be so cheap that industries from all over the world would be attracted to this State. To the contrary, electricity in Queensland is very expensive.

In Queensland, a power station pays \$11 a tonne for coal. In Japan, a power station pays in excess of \$50 a tonne, yet it is able to provide cheaper electricity than Queensland can produce. So the Government's dream of having cheap electricity that will attract industry has gone. So, too, has the resource boom gone. What must the Government do? It has to come up with something else.

The Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) has gone on ad nauseam about "high tech, high tech". He sounds like a poor man's version of Barry Jones. With due deference to Mr Ahern, he does not do nearly as well as Barry Jones.

The people of Queensland have been told that their State will be the Silicon Valley of Australia. Let me deal with such grandiose statements. Through the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, the Government has talked about attracting overseas high technology to Brisbane and about setting up high-technology parks. Rather simplistically, it believes that the mere establishment of high-technology parks will induce overseas companies to come to Queensland and set up their operations here. What utter bunkum! Although I support the Minister's contention that sunrise industries are needed and that this State needs to be involved in high technology, which will promote growth in Queensland's wealth, I claim that such industries provide little employment.

I believe, and the Labor Party says quite clearly, that overseas companies will not invest in research and development and they will not come to Australia because Queensland has a high-technology park. Even if some sunrise industries are attracted to this State, that will not provide a solution to the problem. It is necessary to make sure that trade-competing industries—either those that have to compete with imports or those that wish to export their goods—must become more effective and efficient. If that is to happen, technology support programs are needed. They will facilitate technology transfer as well as identify the gaps in support for inventors and innovators.

Queensland has an abysmal record in technology transfer. Little constructive communication has taken place between scientists, engineers, businessmen and financiers concerning the practical use of technology in commerce or industry. That has contributed to relatively low take-up and commercialism by industry of innovations in technology or products developed from research.

Although Commonwealth funds have been provided for research, until recently there has been a dearth of funds for the development and commercialism of the outcome of that basic research. The recent initiatives by the Commonwealth Government should be matched by Queensland Government funds.

When no money is available for the sugar industry, the Queensland Government says, "What about the Commonwealth funding?" If the Queensland Government is fair dinkum about entering the technological era, it should do something about it. The provision of funds would provide an impetus for venture capital to fund commercialism of new products and processes based on innovative technology.

Moreover, the Government's other major responsibility should be that of an honest broker to bring together industrialists, financiers and innovators or inventors to commercialise the results of those endeavours. Unfortunately, a large gap still exists in the availability of finance for inventors, innovators and entrepreneurs seeking to produce a prototype or pilot program that can be used to attract risk capital for commercial development. I believe that the Victorian and South Australian Governments are attempting to do that. Queensland should be doing exactly the same.

If Queensland wants to become the Silicon Valley of Australia, it must find funds for prototype development and seed capital so that inventors and innovators can attract investment venture funds. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that a biotechnology industry approach will be applied to the high-technology park on the Gold Coast. The Victorian State Government has entered into a contract with private enterprise and put its resources into developing biotechnology. I think that the future of high-technology lies in biotechnology. It is important that the Government do something about that. The Queensland Government does not mind interfering at all levels of industry. The capitalist Government in Queensland should be able to find some money to support biotechnology.

During Budget debates, there are a couple of pet areas to which I like to refer, one of which is housing. I reside in an area in which the lack of housing is a serious problem. I am upset because the Government looks at the problem through ideological blinkers. The Government believes that ownership as a principle is more important than need. I know that any distressed person who comes to me with a housing problem would rather own his own home, but most cannot.

When one looks at the level of public housing in Australia, one finds South Australia at the top with 39 units of public housing for each 1 000 units in the community. Queensland is at the bottom with eight units of public housing for each 1 000 units in the community. There is a mammoth difference.

The Minister for Works and Housing defends his position by referring to waiting-times. After waiting for Housing Commission accommodation for two years, people shift round so much that they are taken from the waiting-list. Although there are 12 000 families waiting for Housing Commission rental accommodation, they never obtain it because they have to wait for such a long time.

In this year's Budget, \$105m is being allocated for home-ownership schemes and only \$55.5m for rental housing. That is disgraceful. The allocation of funds for pensioner housing is a further disgrace. This year, \$7.6m will be spent on 287 pensioner units, \$6.3m of which is to come from the Commonwealth as a direct grant. Pensioners are waiting for periods in excess of two years for units, but the response of this Government is to build 287 pensioner units. When more than 2 000 pensioners are on the waiting-list, that is absolutely ludicrous.

I turn now, very briefly, to welfare. Honourable members have been told that there is to be a new direction in welfare in Queensland. The department is to be called the Department of Community Development. In my opinion, "community development" constitutes putting resources out into the community to provide for the needs of people at the local community level—the needs of families. What has the Government done?

To further assist the department in its changing role, \$1m has been allocated. What a marvellous concept! I strongly believe that that is nothing more than a token—a pittance. How can it be suggested that resources are being transferred to the voluntary sector with such an allocation? How can people be expected to run such extra programs for that amount of money?

Another subject that is very dear to my heart—and, from conversations I have had with her, to the heart of the member for Kurilpa—is that of child care. For the first time since I have been in Parliament, \$0.4m of State funds has been allocated to child care—\$400,000! The Government claims that with that money land will be brought on which buildings will be constructed by the Commonwealth in 1984-85. How ridiculous! I have two such centres in my electorate. They are absolutely superb. However, the number of community-based child-care centres in Queensland can be counted on the fingers of two hands. Perhaps there may be a few more. For the last two or three years, New South Wales, out of its own funds, has been building 40 a year. I read in one of the so-called socialist publications, "Government in Focus", in an article headed, "Big Boost for Child Care in Victoria", that the Victorian State Government would contribute \$4.8m and the Commonwealth \$2.2m for 44 new child-care centres. For years, Victoria has been following that policy. That State and South Australia were at the forefront of the program. However, what does Queensland do? It makes a token gesture.

I know that other members wish to contribute to the debate, so I shall conclude by speaking very briefly on the topic of Expo 88. I make clear what I have said from the beginning: Expo will be an absolute sham and a financial disaster for Queensland. There is no doubt about that. It is part of the cargo-cult mentality of the Government. It believes that by razing a few hectares of my electorate we will all become rich. How ludicrous! In "The Economist", a highly respected and rather conservative publication, there is an article on the New Orleans World Fair, as it calls it. I will quote some of the article and allow members to form their own opinions on Expo—

"Some \$350m has been spent on the fair, but unpaid contractors' bills and the need to repay loans from the state government hang over it."

It continues—

"It is doubtful, however, whether such fairs can ever be good investments nowadays. The conventional view is that they are, if nothing else, a good way of redeveloping a dilapidated area, usually with grants from some non-local government."

It says, further, talking about the State Government—

"It is having both to go to the bond markets and to raise taxes in order to retire the fair's bequest of \$57m in debts. The New Orleans fair, it was revealed at a secret meeting some day ago, is now in debt to the trumpet-tune of \$150m."

Attendances at New Orleans are fewer than half the number estimated. The first time that Expo 88 was debated in this Chamber I predicted that attendances would be only half the estimate. If 3 million Queenslanders visit Expo 88 instead of the 8 million estimated, Expo will lose \$100m. The New Orleans fair cost \$350m. The Queensland Expo will be much smaller than that fair—it will be really small pie. People will not come from overseas or interstate to visit it. Expo 88 is an absolute joke. It will cause massive traffic problems and it has already caused trauma to people who have been immorally dispossessed of their property and livelihoods. They have been given no chance of relocating their businesses. The Expo authority practises immorality by taking over land so that the capital value can be enhanced and passing it on to a greedy developer. That is a fair dinkum statement. For honourable members opposite to speak about booms and how great this State is when it cons the people by saying that the State got Expo 88 when nobody else would take it on is not good enough. I will again say, and I will keep on saying, that Expo 88 will be an unmitigated disaster.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.1 p.m.): I am delighted to congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on the presentation of an excellent Budget.

An Opposition Member: You are latent National Party.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is still a good Budget and nothing has been said by the Opposition to suggest otherwise.

Unfortunately, the new style of presentation of the Budget, which mentions all the expenditure but none of the revenue, gives a distorted picture of what the Budget is all about. The Budget should contain an outline of where the revenue comes from as well as the expenditure. Insofar as the Premier and Treasurer did not refer to the increased charges necessary to raise the revenue to meet the commitments for the financial year, his speech was unusual. However, some of those increased charges have subsequently been published in the Government Gazette and still more have to come in order to meet the deadlines that are set down by the Budget. No doubt members will discuss them.

A matter that gives me considerable concern—I think it is a matter of concern to members generally—is the absence of the Auditor-General's report. It may well be that this is the first occasion on which that has occurred. Usually at this time of the debate on the Budget honourable members have presented to them a document of the size that I have in my hand which allows members to examine the accounts as presented to them in the Budget papers. The Auditor-General's report has always been regarded as one of the Budget papers.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, that is not the Auditor-General's report. I have in my hand the type of Auditor-General's report to which I am referring. The honourable member has the Auditor-General's Report on the Treasurer's Financial Statement. I have a copy of the Auditor-General's Report on the departments, statutory bodies and local authorities, which is the definitive document which in some cases duplicates the Auditor-General's Report on the Treasurer's Financial Statement.

In the past, honourable members have received two documents. On the occasion of this Budget, honourable members have received the one on the Treasurer's Financial Statement. That is a serious deficiency. I do not suggest anything sinister, but I would have thought that the Auditor-General's Report on the Miscellaneous Departmental Accounts and the Accounts of Statutory Bodies and Local Authorities, which is a monumental and definitive work that was finished some months ago, would be available to the Chamber at the time the Budget was presented. Without the commentary provided by the Auditor-General, it is not possible for members to analyse the figures in the Budget.

Mr Scott: You knew how to cook them up, didn't you?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: If the report is available, at least members are able to discover whether or not there is any cooking of figures. On this occasion honourable members do not have the benefit of that document, in spite of the fact that last year in the presentation of the Budget, which was produced under very extraordinary circumstances, the Auditor-General was able to provide honourable members with his report by 1 December. Indeed, it was available to honourable members during the course of the Budget debate, in spite of the difficulties facing the Auditor-General at that time. I and all experienced people know that these reports are finished within a matter of days, in some cases, or weeks from the end of the financial year, and it is only a matter of processing to have them available to members in time for this debate. That is because it is one of the vital documents associated with a debate such as this.

The Auditor-General's Report on the Treasurer's Annual Statement, which is the only document we have received so far, gives some explanation, but not why there has been a delay. Paragraph 4 of page 1 of this document states—

“The main reason given by the Treasury for contraction of the Statement is a change in the form of reporting required by the Treasury from accountable officers

of departments. Information to be provided with the departmental appropriation accounts has been expanded and will be furnished with those accounts to the Legislative Assembly at a later date. The Treasury sees it unnecessary to duplicate certain of that information by inclusion in the Treasurer's Annual Statement."

I agree with that last sentence. It is not necessary to have that information duplicated; but, that it is not duplicated, as on this occasion it is not, is all the more reason why the Auditor-General's annual report on the total Government expenditures and revenues should be available to members at this time. There is no information in this document which is clearly covered in the other document.

Mr Hartwig interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I would have thought that we should have had an explanation through Mr Speaker to the Assembly from the Auditor-General as to why there has been this inordinate delay. At the bottom of page 1 of his report, the Auditor-General says that he will be submitting additional reports to the Legislative Assembly with respect to the departmental accounts subsidiary to the Treasurer's public accounts, that is, the collective accounts of the departments, the miscellaneous accounts of the several departments that are required to be kept by the accountable officers and the accounts of statutory bodies. Those are the documents which we have received each year within a reasonable time; but this year, not so.

I bring to the attention of members and Mr Speaker the failure of the Auditor-General either to provide us with the Auditor-General's report before this debate or to provide the Committee with a satisfactory explanation so that we understand the circumstances. As I said earlier, I know of no sinister reason why this is so. It is a pity, because it means that the debate on the Financial Statement is deficient through our not having the documents available. I trust that that document will be available to us before the debate on the Estimates; otherwise it will be quite impossible to intelligently, and with some degree of accuracy, debate them.

I now deal specifically with one matter which concerns me. No doubt, it concerns members generally. I refer to pay-roll tax. Pay-roll tax was first introduced in this country in 1941 to compensate for the Commonwealth deciding to pay child endowment. In the first year, Queensland's share of pay-roll tax was just in excess of £1m. Australia is not the only country which imposes pay-roll tax, but I point out that, of all OECD countries, Australia levies the second highest rate of pay-roll tax. In fact, those OECD countries which do levy pay-roll tax impose it at a rate of only a fraction of a dollar per head of population, whereas ours ranges up to \$25 and \$26 per head of population. Of the OECD countries, we are second only to Austria in the rate at which we impose pay-roll tax. In most other countries the rate per head of population is infinitesimal, whereas ours is exorbitant.

At the June 1971 Premiers Conference it was agreed that as from 1 September of that year pay-roll tax would be levied by the States. That was because the tax had a growth element and would give the States an opportunity to participate in a growth tax. That was very much welcomed by the States. It was agreed by the States also that they would levy the tax uniformly. On several occasions I attended Premiers Conferences, assisting the Premier. When I learnt about the difficulties associated with pay-roll tax being levied uniformly, I decided in 1976, in my first Budget, to break ranks and not have pay-roll tax uniform across the nation. As at 30 June 1976, the exemption across the nation was \$41,600. The Queensland Government agreed, on my recommendation, that Queensland should break the ranks. Objections were lodged by other States to the breaking of the uniform agreement.

Frankly, I regard pay-roll tax as iniquitous. In my 1976 and 1977 Budget speeches, I said pay-roll tax was like a hearth tax or chimney tax, under which people in the UK were taxed on the number of chimneys. After that tax was levied, houses were built without chimneys. That led to people contracting diseases and to other problems—even to suffocation. I also liken pay-roll tax to the window tax, by which people were taxed

on the number of windows in a house. In order to avoid the tax, houses were built without windows. Pay-roll tax on employment achieves exactly the same results as the hearth tax and the window tax. To avoid paying it, employers contain the number of employees. That is iniquitous.

When it is considered that 80 per cent of the tax is collected from 20 per cent of the people who pay the tax, it is realised that a small proportion of those who are paying the tax are paying the major proportion of the tax. One of the most peculiar anomalies is that the highest contributors to pay-roll tax are Government agencies. The Railway Department last year paid in excess of \$23m in pay-roll tax. That is about one-sixteenth of the total pay-roll tax collected in the State. When the contribution of local authorities, quangos and the numerous other bodies not in private enterprise is added, it becomes obvious that it is a bit like Peter robbing Paul and a substantial part of the \$410m, or whatever it will be by the end of the year, will be merely a cross-entry between the various major departments.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You never used to worry about this.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I did. If the honourable member cares to consult my Budget speech for 1976, he will see that I then expressed similar remarks about the philosophy of this tax.

I make the very important observation that pay-roll tax should be abolished. It would be difficult to abolish it in one go, but it should certainly be abolished over a period. For the Government departments, quangos and local authorities, it represents a notional, deceptive figure that is being counted in one place and taken off at the other. The huge number of small businesses that pay a minimal amount of the total amount collected, however, are very much hampered and hindered by its existence.

Pay-roll tax should be abolished, firstly, because it is a disincentive to business and private enterprise. If it were abolished, more businesses would be established. In most instances, the cost of opening the doors of a business has to take into account pay-roll tax. People are so terrified by the prospect of having to meet that cost amongst many others, that they do not open a business at all.

The abolition of pay-roll tax would result in more employment. Between 2 000 and 3 000 people would be employed if there was generous relief from pay-roll tax, particularly if the relief was offered to those employing juniors. Many employers who do not pay pay-roll tax are discouraged from employing one more person simply because, if they did, they would move into the pay-roll tax bracket or into a higher level. Junior wages are probably too high anyway for employers to keep juniors in employment. The fact that employers must pay pay-roll tax on top of high wages is the last straw that breaks the camel's back.

If pay-roll tax was abolished, Australia could compete on world markets. In the marketing of primary products and raw materials, Australia has to compete on world markets and, of course, Australian industries have no control over the prices on such markets. It would be much easier for Australia's exporters to compete if they did not have to pay pay-roll tax which, in some cases, runs into millions of dollars per annum.

Pay-roll tax must be paid whether a company makes a profit or a loss. Even in bad times pay-roll tax must be paid and it is accountable on total wages and allowances. Even though there is not much business to be had, a business must remain open, and pay-roll tax is a disincentive. Its abolition would be of great benefit to businesses and industries with seasonal fluctuations. It would be a relief to rate-payers if pay-roll tax was abolished, because local authorities would have more revenue available.

Mr HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. Mr Davis, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I mentioned the disincentive to business of pay-roll tax and I said that if the tax was abolished, more businesses would be established in Queensland. That would result in more employment, particularly for juniors, and it would give many of Australia's export industries involved in the processing of raw materials and primary products an opportunity to be more competitive on world markets. The abolition of the tax would also result in lower costs because businesses are kept open.

The relief for rate-payers and local authorities with the abolition of pay-roll tax is quite considerable. Local authorities—the biggest is the Brisbane City Council—pay substantial pay-roll tax, which comes out of the rate-payers' pockets. In fact, local authorities are second only to the State Government in pay-roll tax payments.

At present, the imposition of pay-roll tax favours importers over exporters. A good example can be found in the printing industry. Australian printers pay pay-roll tax but compete for business which should be available and processed in Australia against overseas printing companies that do not pay pay-roll tax.

There are many other examples. Pay-roll tax is payable whether the business is making a profit or incurring a loss. Pay-roll tax hits labour-intensive industries. One such industry is tourism. Already, complaints have been made about penalty rates in the tourist industry. When pay-roll tax is added to penalty rates, the tourist industry particularly is very hard hit. Pay-roll tax is levied on penalty rates, allowances, sick leave, long service leave and bonuses. Everything that is regarded as a wage attracts pay-roll tax.

In Australia, pay-roll-tax is passed on ultimately to the consumer. To that extent, it is inflationary. Pay-roll tax is not efficient, nor is the method of its collection. The cost of its collection has to be met by those people who are paying it, and the cost is quite substantial. Records have to be kept, and variations to records have to be kept. The whole process is quite complicated for many small businesses. As I have said, pay-roll tax is inflationary. It is also sectional.

Let me trace the history of pay-roll tax since 1976. In that year, it was agreed right across the nation that the exemption level should be \$41,600. In 1977, at my instigation, Queensland raised the exemption level to \$62,400, whereas the rest of Australia stayed on an exemption level of \$48,000. In 1978, Queensland raised the exemption level to \$100,000 while the rest of Australia had an exemption level of \$60,000. So the process went on. In 1979, Queensland's exemption level stood at \$125,000 whereas that for the rest of Australia stood at \$66,000.

Queensland has been very generous in granting pay-roll tax exemptions. Its generosity has continued until the present time, when, as the Treasurer outlined in his Budget speech, Queensland's exemption level will be raised to \$270,000, whereas the rest of Australia lags far behind.

I might add that offsets in regard to pay-roll tax, such as accommodation allowances and travelling allowances—which are not subject to pay-roll tax—are far more generous than those in other States. So Queensland certainly has nothing to be ashamed of in the history of pay-roll tax concessions.

The present alteration, however, will do nothing to relieve the people who pay pay-roll tax. As the Treasurer pointed out in his Budget speech, the alteration covers only the increase in wages that has occurred over the past 12 months. In other words, no further concession will be given to small business by way of the change that will be made to the pay-roll tax exemption level. I had hoped that a more generous concession would be given.

Mr Borbidge: There is a recent restructuring to move the level further up, though, isn't there?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It does not help people to know that, because once they get on the roundabout of pay-roll tax they do not know quite where they are.

Would it not be better to raise the exemption level to a level that excluded nearly all the small businesses in Queensland? That level would be approximately \$500,000. Such an increase in the exemption level would be consistent with the move that I made in 1976 in the hope that eventually pay-roll tax would be abolished.

Over the past two years, Queensland has actually gone backwards in real terms in giving pay-roll tax relief to small business. In this financial year, because of the increase in wages, many more employers in Queensland will pay pay-roll tax. Last year, a large number of those employers were exempt from pay-roll tax. In this financial year, employers who, up to a few months ago, were exempt from pay-roll tax will find that, although no increase has occurred in the number of their employees, they will pay pay-roll tax.

This financial year there has been a step backwards with pay-roll tax. In real terms, no pay-roll tax concession has been granted to small business. Short of abolishing pay-roll tax altogether, I would strongly recommend that the pay-roll tax exemption level be raised to \$500,000. I know that somebody will say, "What about the revenue that the State will go without?"

Mr Vaughan: That's right.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I knew that the honourable member was going to say that.

In the Treasurer's Financial Statement it was announced that the cost of providing that alleged concession is \$5m. That is a notional figure. Although last year's accounts contain a concession level—the figure was provided in the Premier and Treasurer's Budget speech—pay-roll tax increased by an enormous amount in this State in the last 12 months. The increase was well above the estimate. It was well above the amount that was thought to be needed to concede. I forecast that at the end of this financial year there will be an enormous increase in the amount of pay-roll tax collected in this State. The increase will be well above the estimate and well above the amount notionally fixed at \$5m as the cost of the concession for this financial year. That will happen because wages will rise at a far greater rate than the concession that is alleged to have been given. That will be picked up by Treasury in due course. As members will see in the quarterly figures that are published in the Government Gazette, my forecast will be proved to be true.

There is considerable room for lifting the exemption level to \$500,000. If the notional cost of the present concession is \$5m, from the figures available to me I estimate that the notional figure for the cost of a \$500,000 pay-roll tax exemption would be about \$9m. Because of the increase in wages, this financial year more pay-roll tax will be raised than the amount raised last year. As the drought has broken, this year the situation is far more buoyant than it was last year. If a generous pay-roll tax concession is given to small business, many small businesses will be encouraged to become bigger businesses that are able to carry the overheads necessary to get into the pay-roll tax bracket. At this stage many small businesses cannot allow themselves to get into the pay-roll tax bracket because of the cost of keeping open the doors of their small businesses. I make this important observation: The figures that are published during the course of the year will reveal that what I forecast will be true.

There are some concessions already in the pay-roll tax story that are worth noticing. The wages of first-year apprentices are exempt from pay-roll tax. As the Minister for Employment and Labor Relations, I made that recommendation to the then Treasurer. My original recommendation was that the wages of all apprentices be exempted from pay-roll tax. Even that is trifling. Although there is an exemption of the wages of a first-year apprentice, only 300 individual employers took advantage of the scheme. Every one of the employers who employs first-year apprentices, whether he pays pay-roll tax or not, is known to the department. His name and address is recorded by the Treasury Department and the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs. Those employers can be individually advised that they are entitled to this tax concession, yet many hundreds of employers are not aware of its existence.

I counsel the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs to write to each of those employers to let them know that the concession does exist. It is no use the exemption being announced in some enclave without the people who would benefit from it being aware that it exists. True, it is a retrospective adjustment. Pay-roll tax is paid first and the refund is received subsequently. Nevertheless, thousands of dollars would be involved for a single employer. It is something to which the employer is entitled, and I hope that he receives it.

Last year's Budget made provision of \$1.1m for the concession. That, in my opinion, was a fairly accurate estimate of the concession for first-year apprentices and group apprenticeship schemes, which also come within the exemption. Actual refunds, however, totalled only \$408,000. On the basis of the accurate prediction of \$1.1m by the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs and the Treasury—the number of first-year apprentices and the employers who pay pay-roll tax would be known accurately to within \$10,000 or \$20,000—fewer than half of those entitled to a refund of pay-roll tax applied.

Again I draw to the attention of the Committee and the Premier and Treasurer that the provision in this year's Budget for that concession is only \$500,000. Is it to be assumed that half of the employers entitled to the concession will again not apply for the concession this year? It is dangerous to base the figure in the Budget on last year's expenditure and some escalation. Once employers discover that they are entitled to the concession, the amount will reach the level that Treasury and the department originally estimated. I repeat my assertion that that would have been an extremely accurate estimate. I hope that the \$500,000 estimated as the requirement for the concession in 1984-85 is wrong and that the Minister will write to employers advising them of the concession. I hope that the additional \$500,000 that is required will be found to meet the rebates. Frankly, my opinion is that exemption for first-year apprentices is not enough. The wages of all apprentices should be exempt from pay-roll tax. Such a concession would be far more valuable to employers generally.

Pay-roll tax can be used to assist decentralisation. No such provision exists in Queensland. Other States have a scale of pay-roll tax for decentralised industries. That is not so in Queensland, which lends further support to my claim that the exemption level should be raised to \$500,000 with a view to abolishing pay-roll tax over five years.

The ALP leader provided an alternative scheme for pay-roll tax. He claimed that the scheme presently in operation should be abolished and that the tax should be levied on individual companies. What an absurd proposition.

Mr White: That would assist small business.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That would treble the burden on small business. Approximately one-third of the amount received in pay-roll tax comes out of the Government's coffers, anyway. As I mentioned, about one-sixteenth of the total pay-roll tax receipts comes from the railways. If that is abolished and the amount levied on private enterprise, which is the ALP's proposal, is abolished, the result is obvious.

Is the tax to be taken from quangos and levied on private enterprise? Is it to be taken from local authorities and levied on private enterprise? If that were so, a \$100m shortfall in pay-roll tax would have to be met by private enterprise. Certainly, the burden would not be taken from private enterprise. In my view, the tax inhibits private enterprise. It is a disincentive to employment. Certainly, it destroys many opportunities in the State that could readily be available.

If the exemption level was increased to \$500,000, stamp duty would certainly increase in many ways. Tax reimbursements would increase. Because the number of people in employment would increase, their ability to buy motor cars would increase; hence, motor vehicle registrations would increase. More businesses would be established, and they would require services from the Government and be prepared to pay for those services through the various fees and charges that the Government levies to provide them. So an exemption of \$500,000 would not mean a loss to the State.

Because I regard pay-roll tax as one of the most iniquitous taxes that the community can possibly endure, I recommend to this Committee that much more attention be given to the incidence of pay-roll tax in the community.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (4.36 p.m.): In speaking in this debate, I must refer to some of the questions that have been raised in the Chamber today.

Over the last few weeks, during the Address in Reply debate, I have had to listen to a lot of garbage from Government members, particularly in relation to the sugar industry. The State Government must be held fully responsible for doing nothing to relieve the plight of that industry. On the other hand, during that debate, I heard some pretty smart remarks from Opposition members. Today, I wish to go a little further in discussing the problems of rural industry.

I have just heard the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) speaking about small business and his attitude towards it. I point out that not very long ago he was the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of this State. During that period, there was no improvement in the conditions of small business in this State, and conditions continue to get worse. Certainly, any contribution that the honourable member has made today has not improved the position of small business.

The 1984-85 Budget falls far short of the State's needs in many areas. As I proceed, I will look at the various sections. First, I bring to the notice of the Chamber an irregularity on page 62 of the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditures. If honourable members look at that document, they will see that code reference 05 should relate to bovine brucellosis and tuberculosis. However, code references 04 and 06 are also on the wrong line. If the code references are dropped down to correct that error, one finds that there is one too many code reference. I checked that through the Department of Primary Industries and was told that that could not be right. The department checked it with the accountants and found that it was right.

On page 62, for "Major New and Replacement Capital Items Eradication and Compensation—Direct Costs 05", the figure shown is \$15,000,000. However, the correct figure is \$3,000,000. A close examination of that table shows that the State Government and the accountants of the State Government do not know what they are doing.

Let me point out that the Premier and Treasurer has been engaging in quite a deal of trickery in the media. I would almost class it as dishonesty. Some honourable members may not like the use of that word in this place, but, in my opinion, it has been a distortion of the truth. The Treasurer has not told the people where most of the money is coming from.

At page 16 of his Budget Speech, the Premier and Treasurer said—

"The threats of Bovine Tuberculosis and Brucellosis have been substantially reduced through long and sustained efforts by the State, the Commonwealth and the cattle industry. A target date of 1992 has been set for complete elimination of these diseases and the Government strongly supports this objective.

The Program this year will involve expenditure from Commonwealth and State sources of \$21.6 million including \$1.5 million for freight rebates payable to assist affected primary producers with restocking. It represents an increase of 89 per cent on the amount expended in 1983-84."

He was not wrong in stating that there is a contribution from both Commonwealth and State Governments.

Page v of the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditures, under the heading "Probable Ways and Means", reveals that \$15.29m will be received in Commonwealth payments for bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication. That figure was not spelt out by the Premier and Treasurer in his grandiose media statement. He made no real mention of the contribution from the Federal Government. Apart from that, the allocations for that purpose are about \$7m more than those for last year. Although the program is warranted,

that \$7m cuts a large slice out of the extra \$20m allocated for primary industries purposes this year. The Premier made great play of that extra allocation by saying, "OK, we are \$20m up for primary industries.", but he did not say where it came from. In effect, that sum, along with a few other obvious increases, reduces values to the rural sector in real terms compared with last year's allocations.

Still on page v, I note another grant from the Commonwealth of about \$15.5m for natural disaster relief. So one-third of the primary industry allocation has been made available by the Federal Government. Although the Premier and Treasurer says that he has increased Government expenditure—I have not checked the figures against those for last year—I am prepared to say that that one-third contribution by the Federal Government is a fairly significant amount.

Another let-down in the Primary Industries Vote is the cut-back of almost \$1m in funds for the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme.

Mr Borbidge: The Temporary Chairman is impressed with your speech.

Mr KRUGER: Yes, he is impressed, and I hope that all other members will be equally impressed although, because they are so blasted ignorant, I doubt that Government members will be. Most Government members do not remain in the Chamber to listen to the debate on the Financial Statement even when I am stating the facts, something that the Premier and the Treasurer does not do. He bypasses Government members and goes straight to the media, but Government members swallow the fact that he spends tax-payers' money on paid advertisements. They do not have the guts to stand up to him. They are not like Opposition members, who stand up in caucus and have their say. Government members are not worth their salt; they are not entitled to the salaries they collect.

As I said, there has been a cut-back of \$1m to the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme, which is probably a good thing because with this Government's mismanagement of the rural sector it would be wrong to entice young people into primary industry. The only people I have heard of who have ever got anything from that fund are the sons of National Party supporters, and that is not cricket. We have some very good farmers on this side of the Chamber and their sons are entitled to a share of the funds available under that scheme.

A major set-back to primary industries is the lack of initiatives for long-term assistance to the sugar industry. This issue has become a political football, with this Government using any muck it can find to try to discredit the Federal Government and the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin).

Mr Austin: It is not difficult to find, is it?

Mr KRUGER: The Minister for Health cannot handle his own small portfolio, let alone talk about primary industries.

Mr Austin: Can you explain to me what the macro-economic theory is behind the primary industries sector of the Budget?

Mr KRUGER: I would not try, because the Minister would not understand.

As I said, the sugar industry is controlled mainly by the Government, and it should be taking steps to improve viability throughout the industry. The Government boasts of its financial assistance to the industry, and has complained that the Federal Government has not matched the State Government's latest \$5m grant. Mr Kerin has made it clear from the start that propping up the industry with cash donations will not heal its problems. I agree with him. The sugar industry is conducting an internal review—

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr KRUGER: The only sweets that the honourable member has are dressed as meter maids. He should not worry about the sugar industry. The only stalks he knows about are certainly not sugar-cane stalks.

The current internal review could show the way for improved viability, but quite some time has elapsed since the former Minister for Primary Industries spoke of a Government review of the industry. Time and time again Mr Ahern referred to a review, but nothing has happened. He first referred to such a review towards the end of 1982.

Already two years has passed, possibly the worst two years of modern sugar history, yet nothing has happened. This is a clear case of the Queensland Government letting the industry slip downhill.

I will now quote parts of earlier statements made by the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern). Firstly, on 22 September 1982, he said—

“I believe that the amendments I propose will correct the more pressing problems currently being faced, but I feel that the time is appropriate to undertake a complete review of all sugar industry legislation. In this regard, I propose to involve all sectors of the sugar industry in a full-scale review during the next 12 months and will shortly be announcing the appointment of a representative committee to carry out such a review.”

I emphasise that the then Minister for Primary Industries said that in 1982, but nothing has happened. He should have suggested a full judicial inquiry, but he said nothing about one. He did not even get on with the type of inquiry he was suggesting. Later, in October 1982, the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) said—

“As I say, some honourable members look on the Act as being Holy Writ, but I suggest that what is clearly required is something out of the ‘New Testament’. This is 1982. In 1915, the sugar industry in this State was a fledgling industry. At that time, who could have imagined the tremendous advances that would be made in the industry.”

Surely the marketing game, as it is today, was not perceived then. I use that word ‘game’ advisedly because when one gets into the international market with any commodity, that is exactly what it is. Internationally the industry is very competitive, particularly today when many countries with a great deal of cheap sugar are in the market and trying to sell it. The Australian industry is very good and understands the market very well.”

That was before the present Federal Government came to power. That is when Mr Ahern believed that there were problems in the sugar industry, but did nothing about them.

A question was directed to the Minister for Primary Industries by the member for Archerfield (Mr Palaszczuk) in these terms—

“With reference to the 1983 annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Board which stated—

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

(1) To which primary industries was this money directed to assist, how much did each industry receive, in what form was the money made available and when was the assistance provided?

(2) Does he agree with the statement made by the board that its funding operation ‘has been impaired’ by the removal of this \$10m by Treasury?”

The Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) replied—

“(1) I understand that the \$10m withdrawn from the resources of the Rural Reconstruction Board was used to provide Treasury loans in the 1982-83 year to certain co-operative sugar mills which were experiencing financial difficulties.

(2) The allocation of the \$10m to provide urgent assistance to the co-operative milling sector of the sugar industry has reduced the board’s ability to meet the needs of some individual farms but on the other hand the assistance given to the sugar mills has been of substantial benefit to over 1 200 cane-growers.”

The money set aside for the purpose of assisting has gone. In the past few weeks, the Minister for Primary Industries, the Premier, and Government members during the Address in Reply debate, have time and time again rubbished Mr Kerin because he has not got the \$5m. They have been utterly ridiculous. Never have they acted more irresponsibly.

I will deal now with the Government assistance. The carry-on finance given to date has helped—and I admit that it has helped—but a continuation of such funding will only assist farmers to buy themselves further into debt. The Government can continue to keep giving them money if it wishes to do so, but the farmers will only buy themselves further and further into debt. It is all very well for Government members to complain. The fact of the matter is that the State Government has let the primary producers down, particularly those in the sugar and dairying industries. Long-term initiatives are required to overcome the problems. The temporary Primary Industries Minister (Mr Turner) has taken a leaf from the Premier’s book. He has started Canberra-bashing, as the Premier has been doing for many years. In all fairness, I should say that the Premier bashes the Labor Government in Canberra. He bashed the Fraser Government and he will bash anyone else if he thinks that doing so will prop him up here.

Mr Prest: He bashed Mr Harper, too.

Mr KRUGER: That is right, and he will continue to bash the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. The Premier cannot stand anyone who challenges him, and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General is a real challenge to the Premier. In a press statement, the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner), described the Federal Budget as “a masterpiece of deceit”. I have pointed out the deceit in the Budget and the incompetence of the people who drew it up because they could not put the code numbers on the same lines as the articles to which they refer.

Mr Austin: Could you just explain the deceit again without your notes? I am anxious to see whether you understand it.

Mr KRUGER: If I needed half the notes that the Minister for Health uses to prop himself up, I would give the game away. Today I am using copious notes for reference because the points that I am making are very significant and they must be spelt out correctly. I know what Government members will do. The Minister for Health cannot quote a figure because he cannot even add two and two together.

Mr Prest: I was told that the Minister for Health, who is an engineer, couldn’t fit a bandaid.

Mr KRUGER: I have heard that too, and I think it is very fitting.

In the press release from the Department of Primary Industries, Mr Turner said that the most glaring instance of the Labor Party’s contempt for the rural sector is in its failure to match the State Government’s allocation of \$5m. As I have pointed out before, and as I will continue to point out, Mr Kerin indicated quite clearly what the situation is and what will arise in the future.

I turn now to an article in the “National Farmer” of 27 August to 5 September 1984. It is very significant because it points out that the problems that Government members go on about were well in existence long before the Federal Labor Government

came to power. If I do not tell Government members about this, and read from articles, they will not have enough brains to understand what I am talking about.

The article from the "National Farmer", which is headed "No help from Canberra", states—

"About half the State's growers have large debts—20pc of them owing more than \$100,000—and the Canegrowers Council has warned that many will not be able to continue without further financial aid."

That is not good for the farmers.

A recent article in "The Courier-Mail" stated that more cane-producers would be driven into bankruptcy by the Federal Government's refusal to provide further financial assistance. It was reported that half of the State's 6 200 growers had reasonable debts, and about one-fifth had excessive debts of more than \$100,000. Mr Kerin and the Federal Government cannot be blamed for the plight of 20 per cent of the State's cane-growers.

I have another article here. I will not read it because it will worry the Minister for Health, who knows very little about farming.

Mr Austin: It is easy to see that no-one wrote this speech. About 30 people wrote it!

Mr KRUGER: The Minister for Health should not be like that. He does not have enough brains to know what he is doing.

A need exists to consider the industry's efficiency. The Government should have undertaken a study very early in 1983. Some answers could have been forthcoming well before this time, but the Government has sat back. That statement is backed up by two feature articles in last week's press.

Mr Austin: If the Xerox copier had not been invented, you couldn't make a speech in this place.

Mr KRUGER: If contraceptives had been available earlier, the Minister for Health would not be here because, at best, he is an accident.

I now discuss events within the industry itself. A report of an Australian Sugar Producers Association motion reads—

"That the ASPA seek to have removed the control of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board over the purchase and sale of cane farms and land purchased for the purpose of growing cane.

In proposing this motion, Mr Scodellaro stated: When a farm sale is being proposed, the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board does not have details of the financial ability of a purchaser at the time of consideration of the price of a farm. The Board's controls are designed to safeguard the parties but have the effect of imposing costly burdens by the preparation of submissions designed to achieve acceptance.

The authority that limits the price of cane farms and assesses liability is the lending authority. They have the responsibility to advise clients as to the practicability of the proposal.

It is my submission, we should accept that clients with finance approved have an ability to service the debt. If not, the purchaser has no one to blame and certainly should not require the protection of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board."

An article in the Mackay "Daily Mercury" referred to the prospective loss of 20 per cent of Queensland's cane-farming community. It stressed the urgency of the problems that face the industry in its proposed restructuring.

Mr Casey: The policy of this Government is to force those small family farmers off the land.

Mr KRUGER: I accept the honourable member's interjection. The Government has been doing that for years, and it will continue to do it until such time as the people behind the National Party wake up. The average small farmer, the run-of-the-mill farmer, is not the person who is causing the problem; it is created by those people who prop up the National Party and who run certain organisations. I see one such person sitting back waiting to take the chair. He is one of the greatest failures that we have seen.

Mr Menzel: Are you talking about yourself again?

Mr KRUGER: No. I am talking about the honourable member for Mulgrave. He knows what it is all about. He has seen the failures. In fact, he has played a part in bringing about the failures in Babinda. So he should not try to bring incorrect information to this Chamber. He is the greatest failure that the Babinda mill has seen.

The Queensland Government has not assisted in those areas in which it was in a position to assist. It has not assisted in any way to overcome the problems that confront the sugar industry.

I quote from a letter written by a Mr Pat Moore, who said that he does not mind my quoting it. He wrote as follows to the Minister for Primary Industries—

“Dear Sir,

As you are no doubt aware, the Sugar Industry is at present in a state of great crisis. Every effort must be made to ‘tidy Up’ our affairs in every facet of the industry. This must be done with the greatest possible urgency.

As is so often the case, the individuals who suffer most as excessive hardship takes hold are the providers of the industry, that is, the farmers and those, whose welfare is tied closely to this base of the industry.

Those individuals who are attached to the industry, in a bureaucratic role are able to plod along relatively unaffected.

I believe that at the moment there is a fast growing mood of ill-feeling by the farmers, towards the ‘top-heavy’ section of our industry. In particular the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board.”

Year in, year out, the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) has referred to this “top-heavy” business. I travelled the State with him when he spoke to people in the fields. He is not a glamour boy; he did not confine himself to this Chamber. He went out there into the fields. The letter continues—

“During my twenty-six years association with the sugar industry the C.S.C.P. Board has developed from an organisation which was regarded as a ‘slight pest, but its best to humour them’, to a serious problem which can be tolerated, no longer.

This industry concern is emphasised by the passing of resolutions at both 1984 annual conferences of the Queensland Cane Growers Association, and of the Australian Sugar Producers Association, calling for the removal of cane farm sales from the authority of the Central Board. (refer enclosed photocopies).”

Mr Austin: Read them.

Mr KRUGER: No, I shall not read them, as that would take too long. The Minister is only trying to interrupt me by making inane and stupid interjections.

The Central Sugar Cane Prices Board has refused to allow a sale that Mr Pat Moore applied for. He wanted a certain amount of money to get himself out of debt, just as many other small sugar-producers in Queensland need money to get out of debt. He applied to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board to have his sale allowed, and he was knocked back. He has lodged a third application. He had five farmers who were ready to buy one fifth each of his property. The purchases would have made those farmers viable and, moreover, would have got Mr Moore out of debt. What did the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board say? It said, “We will not allow it.” As I understand it—Pat

Moore did not tell me this, but I have conducted some research into the matter—the board wanted to have that property sold off to one of the big producers.

If the sugar industry is to be restructured, there is no point in selling off the small unviable farms to farmers who already have viable farms. The unviable farms should be sold in such a way that all unviable farms are made viable. That will occur as time goes on. It does not seem to be the policy of the Queensland Government to overcome the problem in that way.

Earlier I said that Mr Kerin has pledged his support to the industry. He is prepared to support the industry at the Federal level when the industry comes up with the goods.

Mr Menzel: Well, why doesn't he?

Mr KRUGER: Because the industry has not come up with the goods. The honourable member knows very well that the Queensland Government has not performed. The honourable member did not have enough brains to absorb what I was saying. I said that the industry has not come up with the goods. I will have a drink of water now and tell the honourable member about it.

Mr Menzel: I think that you have had too many drinks outside.

Mr KRUGER: I have not had a drink.

In 1982, the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) was going to have an inquiry into the sugar industry. It never occurred. A judicial inquiry should have been held. I will tell honourable members what has happened.

Mr Menzel: You opposed it at the time.

Mr KRUGER: I did not oppose it. The Opposition has never opposed it. It is ridiculous for the honourable member to say that the Opposition opposed an inquiry. The Opposition would have welcomed a judicial inquiry.

In 1982, the Minister for Primary Industries said that an inquiry would be conducted. However, nothing was done about it. We are now well into 1984. The Queensland Government is now talking about a pittance of assistance to conclude an internal review. Mr Kerin said, "At least finish it by April so it can be considered for next year's Budget." The Government will fool around with it and then will scream that the Federal Government has done nothing about the problem. The Federal Government has put out the challenge. However, nothing will occur. Government members know what has happened. If they do not, God help them!

Mr McElligott: I can recall Mr Sullivan calling for an inquiry.

Mr KRUGER: That is right. Mr Sullivan was talking about it.

Mr Hawke wrote to Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, suggesting that \$4m that was held in part A of the rural adjustment scheme could be moved into part B to allow it to be used for carry-on finance. I have not heard the Premier say, "We will accept that offer."

The Opposition keeps hearing Government members say that this year must be a Federal election year. One hears that from the members of the National Party, who want to belittle the Federal Government. Honourable members heard it throughout the Address in Reply debate. Not one member who supports the National Party has made an honest speech.

I have in my possession an article by Sir Roderick Proctor about a major stockpile of sugar. The Minister for Health would not know anything about it. He complains about the effect of sugar on one's health. As a member of the National Party who was recently a member of the Liberal Party, he knocks and plunders for his own personal gain. I assure him that he will not survive. He is history, and he knows that.

When I was a young boy, I heard about eating corned beef, potatoes and sugar for energy and strength. Now, all I hear is that sugar is bad. The sugar industry is trying to counter that suggestion. Although the member for Mulgrave and other persons in the sugar industry are part of a campaign to belittle and degrade the sugar industry, they go out into the field and say to the farmers, "You are our great mates." The dirty and nasty attitudes of the National Party in this State should not be underestimated.

One could talk for weeks about the problems of the sugar industry. Industry efficiency is needed. The role of CSR, as sole agent and as a refiner of raw sugar in Australia, needs to be checked.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr KRUGER: For once, I have the member for Mulgrave on my side.

What did the Queensland Government and the previous Federal Government do in an attempt to check the role of CSR in this country? Nothing! I am referring to the possibility of refining raw sugar to white sugar at the mill. Perhaps the Government ought to be considering whether cane-farmers should be paid for their raw sugar, divorced from the white-sugar trade. Whether that is right or wrong, the suggestion has been made. Things such as that should be kept under consideration.

Mr Menzel: We are paid on raw-sugar values.

Mr KRUGER: I am aware of that, but cane-growers are also tied in with the white-sugar trade.

This country has the best expertise available for the production of sugar. Why is the position of white sugar on the world market not improving? Very little attempt has been made to do that. It has not been attempted because the Fraser Government and the Queensland Government became complacent. That is a disgrace.

I have with me some press articles on the subject. I will not read them, because members would already be aware of them. The sugar industry has been one of our major industries. It is collapsing. The State Government ought to be propping it up, but really it has not done anything to support it.

I have here a press article headed, "Growers may buy top resorts". That seems to be a way in which they could diversify and overcome their economic troubles. I would like to think that the sugar industry was strong enough not to have to do that. If it is necessary for there to be diversification, then so be it. On the basis of that article, a person wrote to me——

Mr Austin: Another article?

Mr KRUGER: Yes, and a very important one, too. The person wrote—

"I hear with great dismay that the Queensland Government wants to subsidize cane growers due to the depression of the sugar market.

Most growers have had many good years and shown great profits, some of which has been used to overcapitalize in farm machinery so as to avoid paying too much income tax.

They receive income tax relief on many items that the ordinary tax payer is not eligible, even though they are used for the same purposes.

So now the 'poor' growers aren't making as much money as they were from sugar cane a few years ago. Yet they still grow and sell vegetables, own cattle (also receiving a Government subsidy in drought) have commercial fishing licences, own hotels, flats and charter boats.

If I purchase a business and that business runs at a loss (through no fault of my own) will I also receive a nice little compensation payment? No, it is all put down to bad luck, experience and perhaps bankruptcy.

Primary producers or not, in the past the sugar growers have made more money than I will ever have and now the 'fountain' is drying a little at a time.

I am enclosing a newspaper cutting—

which is the one I have just referred to—

“showing how our 'poor' cane farmers are intending to spend \$24 million on a tourist resort.”

The writer continued—

“It would be interesting to see an honest assets test to assess just how many cane growers really do have a 'plight' (and I don't doubt that there are a few genuine cases).

Diversification is a very sensible proposal in the light of the current downfall in sugar prices, but not at the tax payers expense.

I commend your decision not to subsidize these needy people . . .”

Mr Randell: Is that your opinion?

Mr KRUGER: That is a letter that a lady wrote. I have just said that. If the member for Mirani does not have sufficient brains to understand what I am saying, he might as well leave the Chamber. It is obviously beyond him. The lady is pointing out what she believes to be the facts of the matter.

Mr Neal: We know that it is a letter from someone; but is it your opinion?

Mr KRUGER: I did not go into that. I am repeating what the lady said, and it reflects the concern of many people throughout the State.

Mr Randell: You must agree with it, then.

Mr KRUGER: I do not intend becoming involved in that.

Mr Neal: Do you agree with that writer?

Mr KRUGER: Aren't they funny, Mr Fouras? Aren't they weak? Aren't they useless? To be honest, they just do not understand the problems. They may want to make a joke of the sugar industry, but I do not. I am very concerned about it.

Mr Austin: He has lost his place.

Mr KRUGER: No, I have not. Honourable members should not worry about my ability to confront a mob of weakies such as the members of the Government.

I want to go now to—

Mr Austin: Another press statement.

Mr KRUGER: No, I do not. I want to speak about something entirely different. I have covered the problems of the sugar industry and I must speak about some other matters.

I am concerned about the pittance of \$20m, the additional contribution to primary industries provided in the Budget. Not even that amount of money has been forthcoming.

The Government has stated that \$0.02m has been made available for research and planning for the Redcliffe railway line. In actual fact \$0.02m is only \$20,000—an insignificant amount. I point out to the Government that money should be spent on the railway line to Redcliffe.

The matter that I am about to touch upon may not interest most honourable members. Quite recently the Canine Control Council of Queensland convened a meeting of presidents and secretaries of dog clubs throughout the State. Because I got so involved

with the sugar industry and condemning the member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel), I will not have enough time to mention everything that I wish to mention about this subject. The meeting discussed the problems that local authorities are encountering with dogs running through the streets.

Mr Menzel: National Party dogs or ALP dogs?

Mr KRUGER: The troublesome dogs would be from the National Party and the well-behaved ones would be ALP dogs. The matter is significant; it is not a joke.

I have facts to prove that the dog industry is a multimillion-dollar industry. What the State needs is a Dog Act. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have such Acts. The meeting that I mentioned researched the controls needed in legislation. However, when I asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing and God knows what else to discuss this matter he refused and said, "The State is too large for such an Act." He did not say that the State was too large for a Litter Act, a Noise Abatement Act or any other Act. The State is small enough for them. The local authorities have differing by-laws and ordinances covering the ownership of dogs. A person who owns four dogs in Bundaberg and who moves to Maryborough may find that he is allowed to own only three dogs. There is a great need for uniformity throughout the State. As a member of the Canine Control Council and as a person who has enjoyed showing dogs for some time, I am in a position to say that the meeting came forward with all the goods.

Mr Davis: The National Party has the Dog Squad.

Mr KRUGER: That is right.

This is a very important matter. I would like to think that the Minister for Local Government would talk to those who are concerned about the problem. Disregarding the purchase of beef for dog food, the purchase of dried and tinned dog food from supermarkets runs into millions of dollars. After examining all of the legislation regarding dogs in southern States, what the Queensland dog community wants is a Dog Act similar to the Brisbane City Council dog regulations which allow those who are involved with showing registered dogs to have four dogs from which they can breed.

I want to get away from the usual ordinances and talk about a permit to have a kennel establishment, as it is called, which allows dog-breeders registered with the Canine Control Council to keep extra dogs for show purposes. I do not have time to go into the details, but I have some material here from a pet institute which made some reference—

Mr Prest: How do Queensland figures compare with those in other States?

Mr KRUGER: There is not much difference in the figures.

Almost 80 per cent of households own a dog, and the amount of money they spend on them is significant. Surveys in 1983 and 1984 by two of Australia's biggest pet food companies estimated that there were 2.5 million dogs and 2.3 million cats in Australia. The retail value of food sales for those companion animals was \$400m. That is pretty big business, particularly when the figures for the associated businesses providing accessories, pet-grooming and so on are included.

All I ask is that the Minister have the courtesy to talk to the people concerned. It is no good closing the door on them. The Minister tries to make out that he is concerned about other issues. He is pretty concerned about racing and a four-lane highway to the Gold Coast, but he should have a good look at this hobby, which is worth a mint of money to this country. It is an important issue, and the Minister should be able to spare at least 30 minutes to speak to those people. It is important not only to the people who show dogs but the businesses which supply their needs. Although large numbers of horses and cattle are shown at the Brisbane Exhibition every year, the largest exhibitors are dog-breeders.

Although uncontrolled dogs are generally one of the biggest public nuisances, if a Dog Act was introduced, dog-owners would have to control their animals or have sanctions imposed upon them. I do not ask for any favours for people registered with the Canine Control Council. If their dogs run loose, they should suffer the same fate as the owner of any other dog. A person who owns a dog worth \$500 and shows it does not allow it to roam the streets. A Dog Act would give uniformity and control, and it is high time that the Minister took the initiative and gave the people concerned a hearing. It would be of advantage to people who show dogs and also to those people who object to dogs which roam the streets, foul the footpaths and bark at night. Uniform controls can be achieved only through the introduction of a Dog Act. Until the Minister wakes up to himself, the problems I have heard about in local government for many years will continue. I know that the Pine Rivers Shire Council is now looking at new dog ordinances and that the Brisbane City Council has recently amended its dog ordinances, which have now been gazetted. Similar ordinances would be acceptable to most people throughout the State. Because I am running short of time I will conclude by saying that the Minister ought to at least hear us on that score.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (5.20 p.m.): The Budget handed down by the Premier and Treasurer provides a stark contrast between the low-tax high-growth policies of the National Party and the high-tax bureaucratic meddling of Labor. This Government's Budget thrust will provide growth in key areas of the economy without additional cost to the tax-payer. The Premier and Treasurer has handed down the best Budget delivered in any Parliament of Australia for many, many years. The anticipated expenditure of \$4,645.7m does not require new taxes, nor does it require additional taxes or increases in existing areas of State taxation.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member seems to agree that it is the best Budget to be presented for a long time. I am pleased to note that the Opposition Whip is constructive on that matter this afternoon.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I know that the honourable member for Mirani found the speech made by the member for Murrumba to be rather curious. I can only say to the people living in the great sugar-producing areas: Thank heavens most of the areas are represented by members of the National Party, such as the members for Mirani and Mulgrave.

The Budget is balanced. It allows for a minor deficit of \$149,657. Indeed, the Queensland Budget strategy and the Government's economic performance are consistent with a recent World Bank report entitled, "Links between taxes and economic growth", which examined the experience of 20 countries spanning a wide cross-section of world income. The study proved conclusively that those countries with a lower effective tax burden achieved substantially higher growth rates than those countries that are highly taxed. Faster rates of growth permit a substantial rise in real living standards in the low-tax countries.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, I point out that I am referring to a report from the World Bank. I would be more than pleased to provide the honourable member with tables from that document so that he may be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the Budget debate.

The report shows that faster rates of growth permit a substantial rise in real living standards in the low-tax countries. As growth accelerates, Governments have been able to provide a wider range of services to their people in key areas. The World Bank study, which I commend to honourable members, particularly honourable members opposite, demolishes the socialist idea that big government and high taxation are necessary to

improve living standards. That vague theory was espoused this afternoon by every Opposition speaker.

In effect, the World Bank report confirms Queensland's Budget strategy and economic growth policies. The \$600m Capital Works Program over the next two and a half years represents a major initiative unrivalled in this State's history. The 12 000 man-years of employment, indirectly increasing to 40 000 man-years, mostly in private enterprise, amounts to a commitment to job creation that has never been paralleled in this State. Yet, today, the Leader of the Opposition had the audacity to describe this scheme as nothing more than a hoax, and the honourable member for South Brisbane described the scheme as a gimmick. That is about all we can expect from the economic intelligence of Opposition members in this Parliament. In addition, honourable members opposite have been very anxious to overlook the point that this Special Major Capital Works Program is additional to the existing works program of \$348.1m this year. The impact will be considerable.

Unlike Labor States, Queensland is planning on not a Government growth-led recovery, but a Government-inspired private enterprise resurgence. Labor's criticism of the Budget is shallow and empty. Its criticism of the Government's economic performance and management is in tatters. Its response has been predictably empty, false and negative. Judging by the statements of Opposition members, if given half a chance, they would propel this State back into the Dark Ages.

It is important that the Budget incorporates substantially increased expenditure in a number of key areas of vital importance to the people of Queensland. I refer to major roadworks, major education funding, expansion of health facilities and tourism expenditure. I contrast that with the decision by the Federal Government once more to delay the completion date of the Brisbane International Airport. Despite the fact that this Government is building the Gateway Bridge, despite the fact that it is allowing for a \$100m road program linking the Gateway Bridge and the northern and southern approaches to the airport, Canberra has decided that there are higher priorities.

If wet weather and industrial action eventuate, it is highly likely that the Brisbane International Airport will not be completed by the starting date of Expo 88. That is a disgrace! I would like to see some of the members on the Opposition side of the Chamber stand up for Queensland for a change instead of expressing their narrow-minded attitude that everything that Labor does is good. They fail to stand up for the interests of Queensland. The airport is a disgrace. It should have been upgraded years and years ago and the Federal Government is still delaying its completion.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I suggest to the honourable member who is getting so excited that the Government is delaying the project simply to annoy the people of Queensland. Honourable members know the contempt with which it treats the people of this State because they are awake to what is going on down in Canberra and what the Labor Party is trying to achieve.

The works program is very ambitious, and it contrasts sharply and starkly with the way in which Canberra is letting down this State. I refer to education. The works program provides for 10 new high schools, 17 new or replacement primary schools, 79 pre-schools and 22 major or special education projects. That program will ensure that, by the start of the 1987 school year, the present heavy demand for school facilities will be met.

Mr Prest: Promises, promises!

Mr BORBIDGE: I will take that interjection because this Government, quite proudly, has a good record of keeping its promises. In fact, every major promise that it made in the State election campaign 12 months ago has been honoured and implemented. The honourable member opposite is sensitive and becomes upset when he is caught out, as

happens almost every day of the week when Parliament is sitting. It is about time that he started standing up for the interests of the people of Queensland.

For the first time, education expenditure in this State will exceed one billion dollars. This 15.7 per cent increase will provide 1 155 additional teachers this year and a computer network in secondary schools within three years. I welcome particularly the increased level and amount of subsidies made available to p. and c. associations throughout the state.

I welcome further support for the small business sector. Unlike the Federal Labor Government, the Queensland Government assists small business. It does not smear it, attack it or vilify it. Honourable members opposite should remember that disgraceful day of 29 August when the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating), not content with totally ignoring small business in the Budget, came to Brisbane to address the Institute of Directors and criticised and abused small business. What a contrast between these two Governments and political philosophies—the very differences between the National Party and the Labor Party.

In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 21 September, this report appeared—

"The Queensland branch of the Australian Small Business Association has applauded initiatives introduced in many sections of the state Budget as likely to provide much needed stimulus to industry and business generally.

ASBA also expressed its appreciation of the Budget statement that the government recognised the importance of the private sector in providing for the future prosperity of Queensland.

ASBA state president, Mrs Vivienne Quinn, said the increases announced for the capital works program would provide a boost for the building and associated industries on which the livelihood of many ASBA members depended.

She said that other initiatives likely to improve the business climate and therefore boost investment included the expansion of the apprenticeship scheme increases in the role of the Small Business Development Corporation, and the technology development program.

The \$1 million increase in funding to the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development would flow on into business and the provision for 1155 additional teachers should, in the long run, mean major improvements in the educational standards of school leavers, making these young people better employment prospects for business, Mrs Quinn said.

ASBA said it recognised efforts in promoting Queensland industry through overseas trade missions, and the Budget decision not to increase public service staffing levels should result in a lesser tax burden on businesses wishing to step up manufacturing and exports she said."

Mrs Quinn is the State president of the Australian Small Business Association.

Likewise, in "The Courier-Mail" of 21 September, the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce was reported as applauding the Budget and praising the Premier and Treasurer for "virtually balancing the books" The president of the Chamber of Commerce, Mr John Howes, was reported as saying that small business would welcome the decision to increase the maximum exemption figure for pay-roll tax. The public's reaction to this Budget has been outstanding.

Tourism receives high priority, with a 21 per cent increase in funding for the Tourist and Travel Corporation. Its allocation now stands at \$12.7m, and its total expenditure this year is expected to be \$16.7m. Queensland's tourist industry continues to consolidate its position as a key future income-earner and job-generator.

At present, six major hotel resort complexes are planned or under way, in the Gold Coast region, and they represent a total investment of \$735m.

Mr Jennings: Which shows terrific confidence in this Government.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Southport interjects, that shows tremendous confidence in this Government.

I know how sensitive Opposition members are, so I shall quote from a Federal Government body. According to the Commonwealth Employment Service, it is expected that at least 10 000 to 12 000 jobs will be generated directly and indirectly as a result of those projects.

Mr Jennings: There are not many Opposition members here. There are three, and a fourth is coming in.

Mr BORBIDGE: Whenever things get hot, Opposition members run for cover. That is a situation that arises regularly in this Chamber.

In the city of Gold Coast, many projects are either approved or under construction. One is the Holiday City Hotel, a 408-room hotel/convention centre with shops and a restaurant complex. It is at Surfers Paradise, and its capital cost is estimated to be \$70m. The project is expected to provide over 1 000 jobs.

Another project is the Surfers Paradise Hotel, which will be a 406-room hotel/shopping/theatre complex. It will form the second stage of Paradise Centre, and its capital cost is estimated at \$80m. According to the CES, that project should create at least 600 permanent jobs.

Mr Jennings: Fantastic!

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Southport says, it is fantastic for the Gold Coast.

Announced but not yet approved is the Daikyo Kenko Hotel, which will be a 400-room hotel with provision for a further 200 rooms as a second stage. That, too, will be at Surfers Paradise, and its capital cost is estimated at \$60m. According to the Commonwealth Employment Service, that project should create at least 600 permanent jobs.

A Commonwealth Employment Service spokesman said that, based on a recent public assessment, he believed it would be reasonable that 10 000 to 12 000 new permanent jobs would be created, both directly and indirectly, by the end of 1986 as a consequence of various investment projects now mooted for the greater Gold Coast area.

I turn to the Albert shire. Approved and very much under construction is the Jupiter's Casino/Conrad International Hotel complex. That will provide a 626-room hotel/casino/convention centre complex at Broadbeach. Its capital cost is estimated at \$175m. It is expected that it will provide approximately 2 300 permanent jobs.

The Hope Island Sanctuary Cove Marine Resort, which is being undertaken by Discovery Bay Developments, will comprise a 174 ha boat-building and marina resort complex. Regardless of newspaper reports, it will include as the first stage a boat-building yard, marina, 300-room convention-oriented hotel, a commercial village, a golf course and 150 residential units will be constructed. The total estimated cost is \$200m. Based upon his knowledge of similar projects in America, the project director estimates that, upon completion, the complex will provide approximately 650 permanent job opportunities.

Mr Davis interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Menzel): Order! I point out to the honourable member for Brisbane Central that, although I do not mind a few interjections, I object to members talking across the Chamber. I ask him to restrain himself and to listen to the member for Surfers Paradise.

Mr BORBIDGE: Thank you, Mr Menzel. I can understand the knockers and the whingers being a bit sensitive about all the good news that Government members have to report.

Mr Jennings: I have not been able to understand the member for Brisbane Central. It makes your intelligence level pretty high.

Mr BORBIDGE: I point out to the member for Southport that many of my colleagues have that problem.

Announced but not yet approved is the Hope Bay marine resort to be constructed by Development Equity Corporation. It will be a 206 ha resort development containing a 300-room hotel, a 500-unit village, a 230-unit condominium, 500 marina berths, boat storage, repair and servicing facilities, convention hall, golf course and other recreational facilities, at an estimated capital cost of \$150m. No estimate is yet available on the number of permanent jobs likely to be created, as planning is still at a preliminary stage. There can be little doubt that the casino project and the stabilisation of the Southport bar are emerging as major catalysts in a new era of tourist development for the Gold Coast. Once again, and most importantly, it is a Government-inspired private enterprise resurgence.

Mr Jennings: But the Leader of the Opposition said that it was a hoax.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Southport said, the Leader of the Opposition has described the Budget and the Queensland Government's performance as a hoax. I would venture to say that the Leader of the Opposition, like his colleagues, is very much out of touch with the people of Queensland.

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I would like the Leader of the Opposition to visit the Gold Coast as my guest. I am sure that my friend the member for Southport and I would be able to teach him a few facts of life of which he does not seem to be aware at present.

Mr Jennings: We want to keep him there, though. We don't want to knock him too hard.

Mr BORBIDGE: The comment by the member for Southport is valid.

The Australian Tourist Commission figures show that Queensland's international tourism increased by 16.3 per cent between 1981 and 1983, compared with 11.4 per cent in South Australia, 4.5 per cent in New South Wales and 4.1 per cent in Victoria. The 1981-83 figures show that Asian visitors to Queensland increased by 158.9 per cent, Japanese visitors by 97.9 per cent, American visitors by 76.9 per cent, and that, in 1983, 35.2 per cent of international visitors to Australia spent some time in Queensland, compared with 30.5 per cent in 1981.

I also commend the Government for the increased expenditure on sport, on health, on road construction and on other key services. I commend the Government for maintaining a nil growth public service. Members of the Opposition, in criticising the Budget and by interjecting, have shown themselves to be divided, desperate and discredited. For example, examine the Government's performance in regard to job creation, which will be considerably enhanced as a result of this year's Budget.

Figures released on 24 September by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which is a Federal Government body, showed that in the 12-month period ended May 1984, 41 100 new jobs were created in Queensland, an extra 12 800 blue-collar jobs—

Mr Prest: By the Commonwealth Employment Program.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member is quite wrong. If he could restrain himself and listen for once, he might learn something. An extra 12 800 blue-collar jobs were created, an increase of 4.6 per cent. The number of new jobs in the service, sport and recreation area represented 13 per cent. The number of new jobs in the tourism and hospitality industry represented an increase of 13 per cent.

I would like the honourable member for Port Curtis to tell me where the tourism industry is covered by the Commonwealth Employment Program. In the clerical field, 11 000 new jobs have been created. That is an increase of 7.3 per cent. Tourism, of course, once again leads the way. Queensland's contribution to Australia's employment growth has been impressive. It is about time that the prophets of doom, the knockers, the complainers, the whingers, the political Left, the trade union movement and some sections of the media acknowledged that fact.

A study undertaken by the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs shows that, in the six-year period from June 1978 to June 1984, more than one in every three jobs created in Australia was created in Queensland. Of the 467 000 new jobs nationwide, 159 500, or 34.1 per cent, were created in this State. That compares with 136 500, or 29.2 per cent, in New South Wales and 76 700 or 16.4 per cent in Victoria. That trend has emerged despite the State's rapid increase in population as a result of migration from interstate. That increase is still running at 1.6 per cent compared with the national average of 1.1 per cent. In the six-year period ended June 1983, Queensland's population increased by more than 131 500 as a direct result of migration from interstate. In the same period, socialist New South Wales lost 50 642 and socialist Victoria lost 68 156 people. People have confidence in Queensland because they trust this Government.

Mr Prest: What a joke!

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Port Curtis cannot dispute that people have been voting with their feet. The migration to this State from the States governed by his colleagues has been unprecedented in Australia since the gold rush. The honourable member cannot dispute the point. I suggest that that is typical of the ignorant, know-all, pompous attitude exhibited by the member for Port Curtis in the Parliament.

According to the August edition of the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicators of business activity, approvals for dwelling units other than houses is up by 17.3 per cent, the value of new housing is up by 42.9 per cent, population is up by 1.6 per cent, employment is up by 4.4 per cent, rural production is up by 35 per cent, electricity demand is up by 15.4 per cent, coal production is up by 24.1 per cent (despite what was said earlier this afternoon by the honourable member for South Brisbane) and production of clay bricks and ready-mixed concrete is up 17.3 per cent and 14.1 per cent respectively.

This State's economic position, in spite of some difficulties, is envied. That is despite a deceitful, dishonest and treacherous campaign to undermine public confidence embarked upon by the Opposition, its stooges and supporters. On 14 June the present Leader of the Opposition claimed that Queensland's public debt was the largest of any State. He has been contradicted by his own colleagues in Canberra. Indeed, if honourable members opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition, examined Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7 they would find that Queensland has the lowest public debt per capita of all States. Queensland also has the lowest level of State debt to the Commonwealth. I am referring to the public debt of the Government of Queensland.

Mr Davis: That is not true.

Mr BORBIDGE: I am quoting from the Budget papers of the Federal Government.

Mr Jennings: The fellows up at Trades Hall obviously haven't read them.

Mr BORBIDGE: It is quite obvious that honourable members opposite do not undertake a great deal of research.

Even when the debts incurred by statutory authorities and local authorities, such as the Brisbane City Council, the Gold Coast City Council or the Townsville City Council, are taken into account, Queensland is lower than the all-States average. How anyone on the Opposition benches, in the media or anywhere else could claim with a straight face that the debt of the Brisbane City Council, for example, should be included in the debt

of the Government of Queensland is totally beyond belief. That is what Opposition members have been doing, however, and that is how desperate they have become to discredit the Government and the State.

Mr Neal: The figures supplied by the Opposition are a fraud.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, nothing but a fraud.

Mr Jennings: They are a joke, too.

Mr BORBIDGE: Absolutely a joke.

I have a few facts for honourable members opposite to digest, particularly the member for Port Curtis, who at the best of times has trouble listening. In 1979-80, the public debt servicing costs represented 7.4 per cent of total consolidated revenue outlays. On the Opposition benches, I see blank faces everywhere. The Budget reduces that amount to 5.6 per cent. Additional annual debt servicing costs can be committed within the Consolidated Revenue Fund without exceeding the relative cost to the Budget, and, importantly, the debt incurred is for capital works, not for the funding of a Budget deficit. By comparison, I will look at what the Labor Party is doing in Canberra. The Federal Government's public debt interest cost is 8.8 per cent of total Budget expenditure, which is growing each day and is being used primarily to fund the disgraceful level of the Commonwealth deficit, a deficit which, unless checked, will haunt future generations of Australians.

Federal Government expenditure as a percentage of gross domestic product is now a record 31.1 per cent—higher than under the Whitlam Government. The stage has already been reached when Governments in this country are consuming 43 per cent of the nation's income. Apparently, that is of no importance to the honourable member for Port Curtis and all those curious individuals who sit alongside him on the Opposition benches.

Mr Jennings: They don't understand it.

Mr BORBIDGE: They do not understand it. Because it would embarrass them and their political philosophy no end, they do not want to understand it.

Mr Jennings: Their wives control their home budgets; that is why they are reasonably well off.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the interjection of the honourable member for Southport, but I am unable to comment on its accuracy.

Let me examine the performance of Labor in Government and see how it compares with the performance of the National Party Government in Queensland. It is important for Queenslanders to have some idea of what could happen if the unusual collection of individuals opposite ever managed to seize control of the Treasury benches.

Victoria has implemented a levy on statutory authorities and a levy on energy consumption. New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia have all implemented a fuel tax and a tobacco tax. The Labor State Governments have also implemented a financial transactions tax, which is quaintly referred to as a financial institutions duty. Needless to say, it is the tax-payers, not the financial institutions, who end up carrying the burden.

Mr Henderson: Shame!

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Mount Gravatt says, shame! It is a disgrace.

Labor States have had substantial tax increases across the board. It is estimated that Victorians are now paying 30 per cent more per capita in State taxation than

Queenslanders. Queensland's stamp duty, land tax and pay-roll tax levels are all substantially lower. New South Wales has even implemented a pay-roll tax surcharge.

Labor in Government has a pick-pocket mentality that simply cannot be satisfied. In its first year of Government in Victoria, the Labor Party turned a \$6m surplus into a \$90m deficit. These are the policies endorsed by Opposition members in this Parliament this afternoon and, in fact, every day of the week.

The Victorian Labor Government has a sorry record of funding many of its strange friends. Some of the groups receiving Victorian Government subsidies are Friends of the Earth, the Movement against Uranium Mining and the People for Nuclear Disarmament.

Mr Tenni: Fast Bucks is one of their great supporters.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the Minister says, Mr Fast Bucks, a convicted crook—

Mr Tenni: The Labor Party hands out all his leaflets for him.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Labor Party circulates his propaganda material. That certainly says something for the direction in which the Labor Party in this State is heading.

The truth is that many of the groups that are receiving Government assistance in Victoria have been involved in wilful damage to property and physical violence at such celebrated rallying points of the extreme Left as Roxby Downs. According to a report in the "Bulletin" of 4 September 1984—

"In normal terms (not allowing for inflation) the Victorian Government is spending 86 per cent more than it did five years ago."

In its two years in office, after allowing for inflation, Government activity has increased by 18.5 per cent—a figure unprecedented in the annals of Government in Australia. In Year 1, capital expenditure increased by 24 per cent; in Year 2, it increased by 69.3 per cent. The article then stated that in the last two years Victorian Government outlays have increased by 43 per cent, compared with the CPI movement of 18 per cent.

Victoria's growth industry is government. In the Labor Government's first year in office, an additional 10 000 public servants were employed to regulate and control small business and those other spheres of activity that the Opposition in this place from time to time pretends to defend.

Mr Jennings: Who had to pay for those 10 000?

Mr BORBIDGE: The tax-payer. Victorian taxation has increased by nearly 40 per cent.

Mr Price: Just as bottom of the harbour money built the Gold Coast.

Mr BORBIDGE: I note that honourable members opposite are very touchy. We are aware of the lengths to which they will go to pull people down, and of their automatic assumption that anyone who does anything or achieves anything is a crook, a con man or a tax-evader. I suggest that it is about time the entrepreneurial spirit in this country was given a great deal more incentive than it is now being given by the Labor Governments around this land.

Mr Prest interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Menzel): Order!

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Menzel, I heard an interjection from the honourable member for Port Curtis that was typical of his gutter level of politics. I found it most offensive, and I ask that he withdraw it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Surfers Paradise asks that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr PREST: May I substitute the word "prostitute" for "call girl"?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I believe that would be equally offensive, and I ask——

Mr PREST: But he hasn't taken offence at it.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member referred to crooks, amongst other things, and I take offence at that. I ask that it be withdrawn. I do not associate with crooks.

Mr PREST: If he is so thin-skinned, I will withdraw.

Mr BORBIDGE: I thank the honourable member. I trust that he will be more prudent in future.

The "Bulletin" article also states—no doubt this will be of interest to honourable members opposite—

"There is some dispute as to whether the statutory corporation payments should be called a 'dividend' or a 'tax'. Since the authorities do not choose to distribute the plans, and since the State Electricity Commission, the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works handled them in their balance sheets as costs, the tax definition would seem to win out. But after some communication with government officials, the Australian Bureau of Statistics has informed them that it will in future classify the payments as 'income transfers'."

How convenient! The Australian Bureau of Statistics has bowed to political pressure, and will now apparently assist State Labor Governments to hide the extent of their fiscal mismanagement. It will be interesting to see whether the Leader of the Opposition and his Treasury spokesman mention that fact of life when next they rise and quote from ABS tables and claim to be experts on economic affairs.

Part of the Labor strategy interstate has been to sell off Government assets and then lease them back to keep the books in order, and to milk the reserves of statutory corporations and the like, and I have not noticed the Opposition admitting to that in their interstate comparisons during debates in this Chamber.

The "Bulletin" article estimates that the Victorian deficit is now running at \$946.2m—a 514 per cent increase since 1980. That is the same political party that pretends to speak with some authority, with some credibility, on financial measures in Queensland. The record shows that Labor in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia has had essentially the same approach to government—essentially the same policies. Given half a chance, Labor would implement the same strategy in Queensland.

Under the charade of the Keating Budget there has already been a 23 per cent increase in personal income tax, a 20 per cent sales tax on very low-alcohol beer, a 10 per cent tax on wine and cider, a 22.7 per cent increase in the amount of company tax to be collected, an increase in the bank accounts debits tax and an increase in the levy on aviation fuel.

Mr Jennings: Fancy increasing the tax on low-alcohol beer when we are all trying to get people to drink low-alcohol beer!

Mr BORBIDGE: That is a valid point.

Already, one Federal Government Minister—Mr Barry Jones—has predicted a capital gains tax and death duties. In the past week, the idea of a property tax each year on the value of property was floated.

It is with regret that I say that some prominent business people in this country have been so stupid as to support a value added tax and a capital gains tax. Indeed, they have openly advocated it. I suggest that those people and the major Australian companies concerned are doing nothing more than grovelling before the sacrificial altar of socialism.

Mr Jennings: A capital gains tax would destroy small business.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, it would do that.

A value added tax would do immeasurable harm to the tourist industry.

I would like to know where the Opposition stands. Opposition members will have plenty of opportunity to declare their stand in the Budget debate. Do they support a capital gains tax? Do they support death duties, gift tax, property tax, value added tax, fuel tax, tobacco tax, financial institutions tax, statutory corporations tax, energy consumption tax? All of those measures have been implemented by their colleagues in the other States or are being contemplated at this time. I challenge Opposition members to state their position.

The silence is deafening. Opposition members have not the courage or conviction to own up to their true policies. I suspect that we already know the answer.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Of course the Government does not. The Government is proud of its stand on the reduction of taxes and keeping taxes as low as possible. Unlike the National Party Government, Labor with its socialist commitment, is for bigger, not smaller government, for more, not less taxation and for Budget deficits, not Budget surpluses.

The Queensland Budget sets the pace. It will be the catalyst for jobs, for confidence and for investment. It incorporates the most important Capital Works Program in the history of Queensland. Contrary to the critics and the prophets of doom who are represented so consistently well in this Parliament on the Opposition benches, and despite the allies of those people outside this Parliament, the Queensland Government has once again delivered the goods. I commend the Government and congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on an outstanding Budget. I am sure that it will be warmly welcomed and received by all responsible members of this Parliament.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (7.15 p.m.): I am disappointed to see you, Mr Randell, in the chair this evening, not because you are not a good speaker but because you are one of the better interjectors on the other side of the Chamber. I will miss your friendly gibes this evening.

I have been a member of Parliament for approximately one year, and I commence my speech this evening by quoting the final sentence of my maiden speech on 29 November last year. At that time I said, "An inactive Government is not moderate; it is weak and weak Governments seldom survive." In labelling that point, I address myself to the Government's unimaginative and undisciplined broadcast-type approach to fiscal growth and relief contained in its recent Budget.

The Federal Budget was aimed at sustained economic growth, the bringing together of the Australian people and the building of a more equitable Australia. The State Budget demonstrates the Government's obsession with appearing to favour low taxation while hoping that the Federal Government will foot the bill for the State Government's mismanagement and economic failings. Because the economic weather in this State is inclement, the Government through the Budget has sneaked back under the umbrella of Hawke economics. It has been a successful strategy for the Government to pretend that all is well and that if there is a slump, a set-back or some other problem, it is the fault of the Federal Government.

Mr Neal: Is this this year's speech or last year's speech?

Mr PRICE: I can assure the honourable member for Balonne that it is this year's speech. I did not speak in the Budget debate last year.

The Government's attitude is to blame not itself but the Hawke Government or anybody else for the economic ills of the State; but when the rain starts again, the Government quickly creeps back under the umbrella. When it is encouraged by Federal hand-outs to test the weather again, it bites the hand that feeds it and claims any spoils as the fruits of its own policies.

The Government's stop/start, haphazard approach has eroded Queensland's fiscal reputation and curtails necessary commitment to sustained non-inflationary growth. No clear, overall plan has emerged; no plan that Queenslanders can see the Government steadily and consistently implementing, and no plan under which Queenslanders can share in the promised results. Without a clear budgetary strategy, despair among the Queensland people will follow.

A persistent downturn in metal and sugar prices is being suffered world-wide. Because Australia is a small nation, its domestic market cannot provide sufficient protection to maintain the considerable size of the Queensland metal and sugar industries. The State's economy is based narrowly and it is in the doldrums. It is only by facing the problems honestly that the Government can hope to unite the people of Queensland and survive the rough patches.

The Budget should provide the occasion to assess the progress of the Government's strategy. It should also be an occasion to unveil new policies and to assess Queensland's prospects for the years ahead. Of course, that cannot be done in one Budget. The annual Budget represents only one step in a long journey for the people of Queensland. The Government should be committed to certain and steady progress. This Budget demonstrates no such commitment on the part of the Government. In contrast, the recent Federal Budget did so. It demonstrated the certain and steady progress in the past 18 months, which has lifted the pessimism and despair that was the legacy of the previous Federal Government. That certain and steady progress will deliver more jobs and will result in lower inflation in the year ahead. The Federal Budget also highlighted the certain and steady reforms of the Federal Government that will make Australian society fairer, ensure long, strong growth and help to banish unemployment. In contrast to the divisive, confrontationist policies of the State Government, the Federal Government has succeeded in dampening industrial disputation to the lowest level in recent history, which has helped to bring together the Australian people and build a more equitable Australia.

Since the coalition parties came to power in Queensland in 1957, this State has been fortunate in that it has been able to ride on the crest of the boom economy wave. World-wide demand for Queensland's mining and agricultural products has allowed a haphazard, zippity-do-dah approach to this State's prosperity to survive. Queensland has jumped in and borrowed heavily on its future prosperity, until Queensland now carries the largest per capita public sector debt in the Commonwealth. Queensland borrowed until it hurt. I challenge the honourable member for Surfers Paradise on the statements that he made earlier. Queensland borrowed and it borrowed until it hurt. Queensland is still borrowing.

As long as the voter does not see or does not understand, he will accept the circus approach of the Government. What a joke years ago when the Premier relocated the new power house at Tarong! That was an additional \$300m joke. It was played up as a circus and a win for the Premier over his colleagues. The Queensland people were snowed. They now have to find that \$300m.

The circus continues. We see the Brychs, the Oskars, the power houses that cannot be used, the railways that need to be built, the acid plants, the State Government's direct intervention in the business world and mining, the hordes of visitors, the huge investment that follows Joh every time he makes a junket overseas, and the thousand and one tales of Scheherazade Joh. Sugar and minerals can no longer sustain the nonsense. The no-plan economic strategy is coming home to roost. The Government is being touted as moderate.

Unemployment is the single greatest cause of poverty in this country. In July this year, the unemployment level in Queensland stood at 9.2 per cent, compared with 8.4 per cent nationally. Inflation was at 5.3 per cent, compared with 3.9 per cent for Australia. Stock exchange stimulation plans in this State have been a dismal failure. Turnover is struggling to show any increase. Retail sales have increased only to match inflation, so no growth. People do not have the money. Surely the best indicator is when there is no money in the bin. As the Committee was told earlier, the number of motor vehicle registrations is down. On and on it goes.

People may come to Queensland having been lured by these circus antics, but no jobs are available for them. This State's employment growth is 0.05 per cent, whereas the growth in Western Australia is 5.9 per cent. People are continually being pressured into believing that the boom is still with us.

This Government so dominates the State that it threatens seriously the long-term economic growth that can be attained so easily with a planned economy. Queensland has been so generous with this Government until now. The State has absorbed its excesses, but the Government endangers our future and that of our children. Queenslanders now face the gloomy picture of their State's performance and future prospects.

This Government now poses a serious threat to our productive industries, such as mining. Recently the Premier took the mining companies in this State to task over their apparent unwillingness to co-operate further in his rape of their industry. His long-term strategy was to bleed them for ever and a day. No consensus here! No burden-sharing! No lifting of the yoke! The mining companies agreed to a fee, come good times or bad.

To illustrate this sterling approach, I have gathered a few figures on MIM's contribution to this State over the past few years. I shall read some and have others incorporated in "Hansard".

MIM is the fourth largest company in Australia and it is Queensland's largest industrial enterprise, with over 7 000 people throughout the State on its pay-roll, which annually is \$275m. In 1983-84, the sales revenue was almost \$1 billion.

During its 60-year history, MIM has made a significant contribution to Queensland, particularly to north Queensland, including the development of cities such as Mount Isa, Townsville and, more recently, the construction or expansion of the Bowen Basin towns such as Collinsville, Glenden and Tieri. The company has been closely associated with Queensland development. Queensland's economy is heavily dependent on mining companies such as MIM Holdings Limited. More people need to be made aware of that.

Mining is a cyclical business; it has its good times and its bad times. The current trough in international mineral prices has been longer——

Mr Booth: The member for South Brisbane said that this Government believes only in a bit of agriculture and digging holes in the ground. He took a dim view of that, and now you are defending it.

Mr PRICE: I am not defending digging the hole in the ground; it is getting the jobs to dig the holes in the ground for the Queensland Government.

The current trough in international mineral prices has been longer and more severe than any for decades. The recession has brought about fundamental changes in the demand and supply forces affecting international mineral prices. A number of factors are involved in that—for instance, reduced demand. Increased conservation or use of substitutes, such as fibre optics, has significantly reduced the demand for minerals.

Over-supply has affected international mineral prices. Third World producers mine not for price but for foreign exchange. Half of the world's copper is produced by state-owned facilities. Changing markets have affected international mineral prices. For example, Japan is moving away from heavy industry to high-technology industry, causing reduced demand for coal, etc., in steel and cement manufacture. Decreased competitiveness has affected international mineral prices. There are increasing cost pressures on

Australia's mineral industries, such as heavy fixed taxes, that are not related to profitability. Among the most serious is Queensland's rail freights.

Copper prices are at the lowest level since the 1930s. Fibre optics, which can replace copper in electrical circuits, are having more and more impact, causing reduced demand.

Additionally, Third World producers, some with the aid of International Monetary Fund loans, continue to increase production. The beginnings of a recovery in the price of lead indicated earlier this year have largely petered out, and stocks are still high. Prices are currently buoyed up by strikes in the United States of America, but when they have concluded prices will fall.

As to zinc—there is a shortage of concentrate but not metal. Some improvement is expected in its price. Silver prices are largely tied to interest rates, and currently they are reasonably high.

I mentioned those metals specifically because they are the ones mined at The Isa mine, which is the Mount Isa mine connected to MIM Holdings Limited.

As to coal—despite record Queensland sales, the real prices of coking coal have not risen for almost eight years. Steaming coal prices have not reflected increased demand.

Mineral royalties paid by MIM Holdings Limited to this State in 1979 were \$22m; in 1980, \$30m; in 1981, \$22m; in 1982, \$24m; in 1983, \$27m; and in 1984, \$34m. In 1979, MIM Holdings paid \$5m in pay-roll tax; in 1980, \$6m; in 1981, \$7m; in 1982, \$8m; in 1983, \$10m; and in 1984, \$12m. The real crunch comes with rail freights. In 1979, \$29m was paid by MIM Holdings Limited; in 1980, \$31m; in 1981, \$39m; in 1982, \$46m; in 1983, \$61m; and in 1984, a whopping \$86m to this State's coffers. MIM estimated that the State Government's profit on its rail freight payments in 1984 would have been in excess of \$43m. It will be significantly greater in 1984-85.

While I am dealing with the subject of rail freights, I mention what I think is the first casualty of the State Government's failure to recognise the plight of the mining industry occasioned by its rail freight policy. About 100 km north-west of Mount Isa is Lady Loretta Mine, which was established initially by Placer Prospecting of Canada. The ore reserves are estimated at 8.7 million tonnes, grading 18.1 per cent zinc, 6.7 per cent lead and 3.5 ounces of silver to the tonne. Lady Loretta has a rich silver/lead/zinc deposit, but its future is not yet assured.

I refer to an article in "The Australian Financial Review" dated 4 October 1983, approximately a year ago. I do so to indicate the position of the mine at that time. The article reads—

"The immediate development of the rich Lady Loretta silver, lead and zinc deposit near Mt Isa is not yet assured despite the Queensland Cabinet's acceptance yesterday of an infrastructure program put forward by the joint ventures, MIM Holdings Ltd. and Triako Mines NL.

The partners are still waiting for agreement with the Government on the crucial issues of royalties and rail freights before committing themselves.

A MIM official said that because the Government had not yet agreed on the charges to apply to the project, the partners could not comment on yesterday's decision.

"We are seeking clarification from the Government", he said, noting that the joint venturers had agreed to proceed, subject to agreement on all three areas—infrastructure, rail freights and royalties.

Despite the refusal of the partners to commit themselves, Mr Bjelke-Petersen claimed the Cabinet decision would allow evaluation of the deposit to proceed."

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I remind the honourable member that, when he is referring to a Minister, he should refer to him by his correct

title. In this instance, I ask the honourable member to refer to "the Honourable the Premier"

Mr PRICE: I take your point, Mr Randell. I was quoting the article verbatim, and it refers to the Honourable the Premier as "Mr Bjelke-Petersen" The article continues—

"He was quick to note that development of the mine, if it proceeded, would mean a major boost to decentralisation in Queensland's north-west.

'Such development is particularly welcome following the closure of the Mary Kathleen Uranium mine in the Mt Isa region.'

Incidentally, the Gunpowder Mine in the Mount Isa region has also been closed. Gunpowder had a population of about 200. An auction is to be held on 27 November. I am not advertising the auction, but later I will refer to it in the hope that the Government will take note of the sale of the houses on that date.

The article said that Mr Bjelke-Petersen—

"said under the infrastructure guidelines the mine developers would build a township for about 300 people and fund the cost of providing education and police services as well as accommodation for the required staff."

The point I make is that in the last fortnight an announcement was made in the Business section of "The Courier-Mail" that MIM's share in the Lady Loretta joint venture has been put on the open market for sale. The decision taken in the Budget to give virtually no relief to MIM Holdings Ltd has crippled the venture. The joint venturers had spent in the vicinity of \$12.3m in the last two and a half years in proving the mine. Plans were in hand to spend a further \$60m on the development of the mine, which would have led to the employment of 140 people and a township of 300. The ore would have been transported from Lady Loretta into Mount Isa for treatment.

Had MIM been able to remain in the joint venture, it would have been a long-term venture for the district, with the creation of jobs and the maintenance and improvement of highways. For instance, the Barkly Highway from Mount Isa to Darwin would have been improved to carry the trucks with the concentrate coming from Lady Loretta into Mount Isa. Now that has been blown apart. MIM Holdings Ltd has placed its share of the venture on the open market and this Government is to blame. It has stolen the opportunity from the people of the north west; it has really stolen their birthright in this area. The Government has succeeded where others have failed; it has temporarily sent the spirit of the people of the north west into decline. The Government, which espouses private enterprise, has stolen the incentive from the company and from the people. Whereas the project may have replaced the projects at Mary Kathleen and Gunpowder, the Government, through its Budget, has destroyed all of that.

That is not all that the Government has stolen. I now speak of a land register and refer to "Lawn Hill" station, which is north of Mount Isa. The average holding in the north-west region is 57 000 ha. Mr Maia, the Brazilian millionaire whom all honourable members would know, owns the glorious "Lawn Hill" station, which has in the vicinity of 1 million ha. I do not decry Mr Maia for owning the land or developing it. In some areas he is doing a very good job. My point is that in speaking to that gentleman I mentioned the vacant land owned by absentee landlords and the threat that that is to the TB and brucellosis eradication program in those regions. He was very forthright in agreeing with me that some sort of a land register should be held and that in reality Australians should know who owns the country in which they live.

The cattle industry is welting—I mean wilting.

Mr Booth: It is a bit of an advantage if you read it first.

Mr PRICE: That is a good point.

Under the Government's relentless pressure to clean up that disease problem by 1986, the cattle industry is wilting. I was very happy to read recently that some relief

will be forthcoming. I could not understand why the Government selected the 1986 eradication date. The only connection I could find is that the Federal Government has stopped tax deductibility on improvements from that date. For some weird reason the State Government has tied its demands to 1986, despite the fact that the Federal Government has agreed to fund that program until 1992. Only a week or so ago at a meeting at "Escott" station attended by the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner), the graziers and others of the north west were very, very vocal about the fact that they could not possibly comply by that date. One or two of them could but, on the whole, there was no way that they could get the program completed by 1986. Already there have been casualties in the district. So, in reality, the Government is stealing their livelihood by applying unrealistic deadlines whilst at the same time trying to blame Federal authorities.

All of these problems involving absentee landlords are festering among the few concerned and worried property-owners. If the State had a land register, ownership would be made public. Landlords would be approached and be obliged to work in with local authorities, for the good of all. Yet the Government steals the fruits of the labour of the people of the north west who contribute a great deal to the State. As a matter of fact, at the recent opening of a hospital the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter) mentioned that the people of the north west contributed somewhere between five and seven times more per capita than the people of the south-east corner of the State. That is quite significant—five to seven times more to the State's prosperity and yet the return to that area is so very little.

I will table a statement of the Federal taxes including income tax paid by MIM Holdings Ltd. Because it is significant, I will mention one figure in particular. The net earnings compared to assets in 1984 were 0.9 per cent of that \$27m.

Mr FitzGerald: This State gets no return on State taxation, yet you are saying it is generated here.

Mr PRICE: I agree with the honourable member, and I will be tabling the figures to indicate what this company is doing for Queensland.

Mr FitzGerald: This State does not get any extra out of that tax.

Mr PRICE: I did not say that it did.

I now turn to employment and training. MIM currently employs 7 250 people in Queensland. The company's employee numbers have fallen by almost 1 000 since the beginning of this year, owing to attrition at Mount Isa itself—that is now called the Isa Mine—which accounted for 450 people; early retirements at Mount Isa, Brisbane and Townsville, which accounted for 400 people; and retrenchments in Brisbane and Townsville which accounted for another 80 people.

The current approximate work-force numbers now are: at Mount Isa itself, 5 000; at the refinery in Townsville, 450; At TTS, which is the transport arm of MIM, 120; on the coal-fields, 1 200, and in Brisbane another 400. MIM is currently training about 600 apprentices in Queensland, and has trained over 3 000 since 1962.

The company's capital expenditure is as follows—

Year	\$m
1979	84
1980	103
1981	201
1982	503
1983	648

1984 452

In 1984-85, partly because of the effects of this Budget, the company's expenditure will, of course, be much lower.

Mr Fouras mentioned earlier that resource investment had dropped by 30 per cent. I advise members to watch this company—

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Randell): Order! I once again ask the honourable member to address other honourable members by their correct title.

Mr **PRICE**: Thank you, Mr Randell. I was, of course, referring to the honourable member for South Brisbane.

I advise members to watch the performance of MIM in the coming year. The figures I have cited are not so much to elicit sympathy from this Committee but to illustrate the responsible role that companies such as MIM play in the overall economy of the State. It is not so much to illustrate what a great company MIM is but to show that Government incursion robs them of their role in their own economic strategy when pressures are retained in vital places. This rigid approach causes revolution in one form or another. Ask Marie Antoinette! The first sign was in the coal industry earlier this year. The reason why it collapsed is not known. Obviously industrial bosses do not have the spirit displayed at the Eureka Stockade.

The Federal Government, however, recognised the plight of the mines and budgeted relief to keep the industry marching forward. General mining exploration costs are tax deductible. This Government's approach has been draconian. What has been done by the Government to give relief? One mine—Isa Mine—has been told that the State-wide increase of 6 per cent on rail freights will not apply to it in the coming year. It has been stated that that should save the mine \$6m. The truth is that the mine discovered that by siphoning to road transport some of its 330 000 tonnes of product railed to Townsville annually it would save about 30 per cent in rail costs. That reduced this Government's generosity to a business ploy to have the Isa Mine retain its rail cartage and replace the missing State revenue. However, if I took a negative line and included all the "didn't dos" of this Government I would surely require much of this session, and I will leave that to others.

The Hawke umbrella takes up about \$370m of the anticipated \$432m expansion in revenue expected by Queensland in 1984-85. Most of the remainder comes from rail freights and royalties under this destructive rape that I have just mentioned. I will cite just a few comparative figures to show the Federal Government's allocation to Queensland.

To take the wind out of the Queensland Government's sails, I draw attention to moneys given to this State, which, incidentally either inadvertently or deliberately—and I would choose the latter description—appear surreptitiously, in an attempted snow job, in the State Budget. The Budget document does not claim that these are Federal moneys or State moneys or that the expenditure is taking place as a result of the Government's foresight. Nevertheless, it is in the Budget.

Earlier, the honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) condemned the provision for Queensland in the Federal Government's Budget, and stated that it did very little for the State. Honourable members should pay attention to the following: \$3m is provided in 1984-85 as the Federal Government's initial contribution towards the capital cost of its participation in Expo 88; \$61m is provided to develop the Brisbane airport.

Mr **FitzGerald**: Will it be finished in time for Expo?

Mr **PRICE**: If the Federal Government said so, it will. The honourable member seems frightened.

The list continues: \$57.96m for community employment programs; \$82m for public housing; \$35m for additional compensation for Medicare. Of the national vote of \$265m for the first-home-owners' scheme, Queensland can expect to receive about \$54m; \$259m has been allocated for road funding, which is a 2 per cent increase over the allocation for the previous year and a 44 per cent increase over the allocation for the years 1982 and 1983 under the former Liberal Government. The sum of \$41m has been allocated for the new Family Court building in Brisbane. Zone rebates are to be increased by 25 per cent. That will benefit Queensland in particular.

Mrs Chapman: The Family Court should be squashed and the money should go to the sugar industry.

Mr PRICE: Thousands of people would not agree with the honourable member.

The list continues: isolated patients travel and accommodation assistance scheme, \$15m; subsidies for TAA for air services to communities in Queensland, \$1,125,000; \$27.9 to Queensland under the Federal Water Resources Assistance Program—Federal money for the Burdekin Dam, the Eton Irrigation Project and the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme. In addition \$3.3m has been allocated for navigation aids for the new channel through the Great Barrier Reef. Coolangatta Airport is to get \$1.7m; Mackay is to get an office building costing \$4.1m and Rockhampton is to get one for \$1.5m. The sum of \$4m has been allocated for the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme, \$2.7m for the Eton Irrigation project and \$19m for the Burdekin Dam. The list goes on and on. The Townsville Airport has been allocated \$15.3m.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr PRICE: It will be a holocaust.

An amount of \$7.5m has been allocated for the Commonwealth offices in Townsville; \$62,000 for the Townsville Rehabilitation Centre; \$32.8m for the Tourist Commission; \$500,000 for Queensland to subsidise diesel fuel costs for the Great Barrier Reef island resorts; \$400,000 for the coastal surveillance of the Great Barrier Reef. In addition, \$7.4m has been allocated to the Australian Institute of Marine Science; \$4.4m for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority; half a million dollars for small operators of air services in Australia; \$6m for the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication campaign; \$1.99m to fund rural research; \$1.26m for Torres Strait fisheries management; \$5m as a loan guarantee for the northern prawn fishery; \$2.2 for the second regional radio network of the ABC; \$220,000 for the Bougainville Reef; \$400,000 for flood mitigation work in the Herbert River. I will go hoarse if I keep reading the list.

Mr FitzGerald: How much for soil conservation?

Mr PRICE: Did any of those figures ring bells?

On examining the State Budget, I had a few anxious moments in thinking that there was a double dose of allocations. Short of Queensland's red-tape delays and the odd fraction of a per cent that was shaved off, the grants were Commonwealth instigated.

One of the unfortunate things that are precipitated by this haphazard, unplanned economy is the demise of election promises. Such promises come in surges and, in a way, are similar to the recent mortgage legislation that was rushed through the House. It appeared from nowhere and had to be passed through all stages just to beat the other States. Unfortunately for this Government, the public is none the wiser and its public relations exercise was a fizzer.

Election promises, which are announced for parochial gain and which tend to favour minorities, seldom make it into a Budget. I have found that, unless the Government loses a marginal seat, the promises have little chance of being fulfilled. It did not make much difference in my case. The people of my electorate still await the fulfilling of National Party promises.

Mr Milliner: Broken promises.

Mr PRICE: Yes, broken promises. They include: a psychiatric unit; the completion of the extensions to the Mount Isa Base Hospital; the air-conditioning of Government homes, including Housing Commission houses, pre-schools, primary and secondary schools. This year, I have organised an outside group to look after the high school students doing their examinations in the summer months. The students will be doing the exams not in school buildings but in air-conditioned halls. That is the only way in which the children can be given a fair go. It is obvious that the Government does not believe the claims made about the effect of heat on human endeavour. However, it keeps making promises.

Other promises that have not been fulfilled include a contribution to the Cloncurry water supply, a water treatment plant for Mount Isa, housing for Doomadgee and Mornington Island, a good water supply for Dajarra, and sufficient Housing Commission houses to significantly reduce the long waiting list. If I had delivered the Budget and included in it a progress report on the Government's achievements, I would have said that it had made zero progress.

I have already mentioned the occupancy rate of the dwellings at Doomadgee. For a population of 1 250 people, 120 dwellings exist. Approximately 60 per cent of the dwellings are corrugated iron shanties without doors or windows and have one electric light and one tap outside. The houses are situated on a block of land that is about 30 feet long and 60 feet wide. Pieces of canvas hang on the sides of the buildings, and fires burn in the yards. The occupancy rate for each of those dwellings is about 10.5 people.

On 27 November at Gunpowder, an auction will be held of 60 to 80 transportable houses built by Planet Homes of Townsville. Those houses would go a long way towards reducing the need for housing in the most isolated and denigrated community in Queensland. If every one of those 60 or 80 houses could be bought and transported to Doomadgee, the housing problem would be solved almost overnight. I am sure that they could be purchased cheaply, and I hope the relevant Ministers are taking note.

Mornington Island has a similar problem, but the price of transporting houses to that area is very high. Approximately 900 people live on Mornington Island, and they share about 100 homes. The occupancy rate, therefore, is 9 to 1. It is unbelievable to see those people trying to cope when really they have nowhere to live.

At Urandangie, which is in the electorate of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, an interesting situation has arisen. The Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter) stated that he knew of no problem in the region. That town has been there for 30 years and has had an Aboriginal population all of that time. Only now is the Government beginning to wake up to the fact that shelter is needed for those people.

It is not only shelter. If Mr Glasson had a close look at the situation in his electorate, he would find that schools and other facilities are lacking. All Queenslanders are waiting for the National Party to honour its promises.

If the State did have an economic strategy and an overall plan for consistent growth, all facets of its potential prosperity would be included. Pork-barrelling would be minimal. My electorate along with all others would not only contribute but also benefit accordingly.

When some sections of the State contribute as much as five or six times the contribution of their fellow regions, and yet obtain an unjust redistribution for their labours, something is wrong economically. When the Premier shouts abuse at the State's largest private contributor to Queensland's prosperity, he stands on shaky ground. Queensland's economy is not sound; it is in the doldrums. Let us face it; next year the contribution from the Federal Government may not be as large as it is now. Then will come the taxes. Queensland has no growth other than that promoted by Federal money. This Government has become moderate. Therefore, it is weak, and it will fall.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (7.56 p.m.): Mr Randell—

Mr Prest: Who wrote this for you?

Mr BOOTH: Nothing has been written for me. I shall speak principally off the cuff, so I do not have to worry about reading anything.

Today I listened with interest to the speeches made by Opposition members who addressed themselves to the Budget and also, of course, to the speeches of Government members. The honourable member for Mount Isa, who has just resumed his seat, decided to fight for the mining company in his area, and I commend him for that. However, I was surprised at the lack of confidence that he has in his electorate. Anyone who thought of investing money and who listened tonight to the honourable member for Mount Isa would run a mile and invest it elsewhere. I am sure that many people would do just that.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I am sure that people will still invest in Queensland, but it will not be in electorates represented by ye of such little faith. If the honourable member for Mount Isa is to make an impact in this place, he must have some faith in his own electorate. As I say, I do commend him for the attitude that he adopted to that company, and in that regard his contribution was an excellent one.

The honourable member for Mount Isa did, however, get carried away with the knocking and the gloom and doom that seem to prevail among Opposition speakers. The greatest weakness in the make-up of Opposition members is that they appear to have no loyalty to Queensland and no faith in Queensland. They are carried away with the idea of redistribution of wealth.

The most outstanding difference between Government members and Opposition members who have participated so far in this debate centres on the philosophies of the respective political parties. On the one hand, the National Party believes in the free enterprise society and offers as much encouragement as possible to those people who are prepared to work diligently and to devote themselves to the task. The National Party backs those people. On the other hand, the socialist philosophy is that people should just be kept going along after they get up each morning.

To me, the highlight of the day was the contribution made by the new Leader of the Opposition. When he was elected, the media claimed that he would not be as flamboyant as his predecessor or as the honourable member for Lytton, but that he would be solid. I suggest that the media got their adjectives confused. "Stolid" would be a better way to describe him. His speech was ponderous and at no time did he electrify the Chamber. No-one would have thought that he was interested in his subject. He took the Government to task on one main issue; he said that the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program was a hoax.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I have told honourable members that this speech will be heard in silence.

Mr BOOTH: I suggest tonight that as the buildings appear and as the works program progresses the Leader of the Opposition will find himself in a very embarrassing position. I cannot think of any better way of creating employment and encouraging employment than by embarking on a works program. The Budget should be judged on the success or otherwise of the works program. As things fall into place, the Government will be proud of its Budget.

When I commenced my speech I referred to the philosophy of the parties. It is a matter that comes into the social issue too. At present, the Federal ALP Government

appears to be hell-bent on destroying the family unit and the social standards that we hold so near and dear. The attitude it adopted towards the Australian Broadcasting Corporation was something to be deplored. Had the Federal Government been prepared to defend society in any worthwhile way, it should have been prepared to step in and to say to the ABC, "We will not allow the continuation of the attitude that you are developing." I see no reason why an attitude that is contrary to our way of life and to our social standards should be allowed to continue. The Federal Government should have stepped in to prevent the deterioration of those standards. I can only suggest that the Federal Government is aiding and abetting the deterioration of those standards. The family unit has served this country and the European society in the Western World well. We should think about the matter thoroughly before the family unit is destroyed.

I have dealt to some extent with the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot remember one good word that he had to say about Queensland. He referred to the Budget and discussed it. I could say that to some extent he stuck to the subject. I cannot think of one good word that he had to say about Queensland. He did not appear to think that Queensland had a future. As a result, he did Queensland some harm.

I shall now discuss the Budget and refer to the items that were criticised. The Government has become accustomed to Opposition members saying that the Budget is no good because it does nothing for education. Today, the Opposition remained strangely silent. The only thing that the Leader of the Opposition had to say about education was that the extra funding for education was welcomed. My word it is! It is welcomed by everybody. The Budget has certainly proved that the Government has decided to tackle the problems in education. Class sizes will be reduced. Money will be ploughed into providing extra teachers. The Opposition can level very little criticism at the education funding in the Budget. There is no doubt in my mind that many of the problems have been solved. The increase in education funding is 15.7 per cent, which is more than twice the inflation rate. In real terms, the Minister for Education has got on top of the matter. The Opposition has not been able to tackle him. No-one has laid a punch on the Minister for Education because of his attitude towards education and the way in which he is tackling the problems that exist. The increase in funds available for education services this year totals \$1,072.6m. That proves without any doubt that the Government is out to tackle any problems. The 982 extra teachers and the plans to further reduce class sizes is sufficient proof of that.

One of the minor matters about education that has been referred to from time to time is the extra funding for schools through general purpose grants. The Budget increases that funding by 33½ per cent. That may not be enough, but it will go a long way and will certainly be appreciated. It will reduce most of the criticism, which is why the Opposition refrained from commenting on it today.

Let me refer to some of the other initiatives. The Budget contains a \$4.5m provision for computers. It has been suggested that the Government had done nothing about computers. The Budget provision will allay that criticism. I refer to the expansion of TAFE facilities. It has been obvious for some years that, if the Government were to tackle the problem of students who were perhaps not suited to an academic career continuing at educational institutions, it had to confront the problem of TAFE college facilities. It has done so. I am pleased to note from the point of view of my own electorate that Warwick is mentioned as the site of a new TAFE college. A date has not been mentioned, unfortunately. I would be even more pleased if a date had been set.

What about funding for private schools? The speech by the Leader of the Opposition contained no mention of private schools.

Mr Campbell: Where does the funding come from?

Mr BOOTH: I ask the member for Bundaberg to be patient. I will tell him where the funding comes from.

Grants to private schools have been increased to a maximum of \$348 per annum for a primary student and a maximum of \$621 per annum for a secondary student. Where do the funds come from? I remind the honourable member for Bundaberg that Queenslanders are taxed by the Federal Government under an agreement between it and this State. Does he suggest that the money should not return to Queensland? Surely he would not hold such a view. Surely he understands that the money must be returned.

Mr Gunn: Don't they want it to come back?

Mr BOOTH: No, they do not appear to. They seem to be disappointed when it comes back. They must refrain from knocking Queensland. Most Queenslanders despair that the Opposition will ever make headway. If it wants to make headway, it has to love Queensland. It must push for Queensland.

Throughout the Budget there are increases and renewed emphases on various areas. I move from education to transport. The Department of Transport attempts to give assistance in many ways. I feel that the Queensland Road Safety Council is one of the most important bodies in Queensland. It has received a large increase in funding—over \$1m.

Mr Underwood: Federal funding.

Mr BOOTH: I do not care where it comes from. I am pointing out the priorities we are giving it. The member for Ipswich West should appreciate that. If money allocated to the Road Safety Council is spent in the right direction, it should help Queensland tremendously. It is imperative that we educate our people on road safety. Even the Opposition would agree, I feel sure, that if we are to overcome the slaughter on our roads we must do it through education. It must begin in the schools but, for those who have left school, it is never too late to learn.

Mr Casey: Mr Gunn has a better idea. He suggests that we do away with the motor car.

Mr BOOTH: I am sure he would not suggest anything like that. The honourable member for Mackay should stick to subjects he knows something about. Recently I paid him the compliment of saying that he knew a little about sugar. He ought to stay on that subject, which is the only subject he knows anything about.

Let me now deal with sport which, for a number of years, has received subsidies from the Queensland Government.

Mr Prest: What about horse-racing?

Mr BOOTH: I will certainly deal with that matter. I have the Totalisator Administration Board report with me. I might even have sufficient time to tell the member for Port Curtis how much his area benefited from TAB distributions. He may not admit it, but the amount of money distributed by the TAB is the greatest thing ever to have happened to horse-racing in this State. Whatever else members of the Labor Party say about the Minister for Racing, they have to admit that he has made greater headway with that sport than has been made in any other State.

Mr Casey: Money for racing but not for people.

Mr BOOTH: I will have a look at the money that is provided for people. I will consider money for sport, which I was talking about when I was side-tracked by the honourable gentlemen who wanted to get the Minister for Racing by the throat. I ask the honourable member for Mackay to remember the money that has gone into junior coaching and the grants for the provision of sporting facilities.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I remind honourable members that, although I am fairly tolerant and have allowed a fair bit of cross-firing, occasionally I would like to be able to hear what the member on his feet is saying. I ask that the persistent interjections cease.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member for Mackay is quite entitled to bring to my attention the need for money for people. I appreciate that but in the areas of junior coaching and capital facilities for sport, the Government scores a plus. I would be delighted to have the member for Mackay visit me so that I could show him all of the things that have been built with a Government subsidy in my electorate. Almost all sporting bodies occupy a comfortable club-room. I know the honourable member will say that the participants in those sports had to find much of the money and I know that that is so. Nevertheless, the Government subsidy gave them the necessary encouragement to build those facilities. The people responded to that encouragement and I do not think that they want it any other way.

Mr Casey: Unlike the sporting bodies, the race clubs did not get a subsidy of 25 or 30 per cent; they got full grants.

Mr BOOTH: No, but the racing clubs are involved in an industry. Racing is one of the big industries in my electorate. I am sure that all honourable members who have racing in their electorates are proud of that fact.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr BOOTH: To the honourable member for Bundaberg who smiled, my electorate has the Lyndhurst Stud, Canning Downs and many other studs which employ a great number of people in the Warwick area.

I will leave the racing industry and move to an implication from the Leader of the Opposition that worried me a little. That was in regard to the things that he calls quangos. None of the members of the Liberal Party are in the Chamber this evening, but they were the people who loved to attack quangos and they invented that derogatory term. I was a little surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition getting into the company of the Liberal Party and attacking quangos because I believe that if a statutory organisation is no longer needed, it should be disbanded. However, if there is a need for it, the Government wants it to continue. The Leader of the Opposition implied that, if he had his way, many of the quangos would be knocked over. That implication was quite foolish and quite uncalled for.

The biggest quango that I can think of in Australia today is Telecom, which is the darling of the Federal ALP Government. It increases its fees at the drop of a hat. Telephone subscribers cannot even get a detailed account from Telecom, yet it is the darling quango of the ALP. The ALP Federal Government loves Telecom. I suggest to members of the Labor Party that if they want to have a go at any quango they should have a go at Telecom.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member for Mackay is quite right in saying that I was once the chairman of one of the statutory bodies, but I am mighty proud of that fact and of what I put into the organisations with which I was involved. I defy the honourable member for Mackay to name any organisation of which I was chairman or a member that got into financial difficulties during my involvement. When he has the time, the honourable member for Mackay might tell us the history of his association with companies.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I have been very tolerant. I will warn some members shortly. The honourable member for Warwick will address the Chair.

Mr Prest interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis will be warned if he persists in interjecting.

Mr PREST: I rise to a point of order. He is misleading the Committee. He was protected. We had to bring in retrospective legislation to protect him when he was on a quango.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. If the honourable member transgresses once more, I will warn him.

Mr Prest interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I now warn the honourable member for Port Curtis under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr BOOTH: I will continue, Mr Randell. Perhaps I was being a little provocative and, if I was, I hope that that will be forgotten.

In presenting the Budget the introductory comments of the Premier and Treasurer were right on target. He said that the breaking of the drought and improving economic conditions world-wide had a lot to do with his being able to bring down a slightly more optimistic Budget. He also said that he did not believe that primary producers would share in the better economic conditions to the extent that they should. He said that this was because of the terrific escalation in costs, particularly of fuel, which place primary producers in a position from which it might be difficult to get out from under. That was a correct interpretation of the facts, and I do not think anyone could quarrel with it.

The Treasurer also said that the thrust of the Budget was about capital works and employment. There appears to be a difference of opinion on that subject between the Leader of the Opposition and the Treasurer, because as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, the extra \$600m to be spent on additional capital works is nothing. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition is carried away with the socialist idea that it would be better to employ people to sweep the streets or do some useless task than to employ them on capital works. There will be a long-term benefit if funds are put into bricks and mortar instead of being left to languish. The money will be spent on extra school buildings and an extensive hospital building and redevelopment program. I am happy to see that the Warwick Hospital has been included in that program. We will see some real benefits from that program.

Mr Hamill: Warwick will be helped by a Federal Labor representative.

Mr BOOTH: I am glad that the honourable member mentioned that because I am delighted to be able to inform the Committee that we have recently selected a National Party candidate for Rankin. He is an excellent candidate, and when the chips are down on the night of counting I will bet that the member for Ipswich will be biting his fingernails. Our candidate is on the job and going well. I am convinced that Mr Cec Jamieson will be the member for Rankin.

Mr Hamill: Is he a friend of yours?

Mr BOOTH: He certainly is, and that will assure him of a great many votes for a start. It will help him immeasurably.

I want to return to the subject of the Warwick Hospital and the hospital building program in general. If we are to have new and redeveloped hospitals and better education

facilities, what better way is there than that to create employment? The Leader of the Opposition has picked a bad front on which to fight; it is not an issue that will do him much good. He will be left languishing.

I turn now to water resources. The Federal Government has almost completely pulled the plug on water resources, but the State Government is continuing its funding. I was delighted to hear that the construction of the gates for the Leslie Dam will soon be completed. It is to be hoped that the job will be done within the next six months. The Minister told us this morning that the gates are almost complete but he thinks that six months may be a little ambitious.

I want to make a special plea for soil conservation. Many people do not understand the problems associated with it. Most soil conservation planning requires farmers to co-operate with others. The man at the bottom end of the plan often has to undertake huge amounts of work to get the water off, but that is of little benefit to him. The work must be done if the plan is to succeed. Many plans are held up because the people do not have the money to carry them out. To get the job going, any Government money allocated to soil conservation should be directed to works of community benefit. I would like to see a rapid escalation in the funding of soil conservation. Efforts should be concentrated on works of community benefit. A great deal of money will have to be spent but, in comparison, the costs may not be as high as envisaged. I do not think that this big job can be completed until Governments take a firm stand and divert funds to this problem.

I am not an expert on the sugar industry, but it has been such a grand industry for Queensland for so long that we should try to give those engaged in it a ray of hope. If anything can be done financially to improve the conditions of cane-growers, it should be done. If cane-growers are not given a ray of hope, it could well be that people will start to withdraw their funds from the industry.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What do you suggest?

Mr BOOTH: I prefaced my remarks by saying that I was not an expert on the sugar industry. I suggest that the position of the industry be closely examined. If Government money is required to discover what lies ahead, it should be forthcoming to determine whether it is worth while for farmers to continue putting money in. If it is considered to be worth while, they should put the money in but, if it is not worth while, there is no point in doing so. I will say no more about the sugar industry because, as I said, I am not an expert on it.

Mr Casey: That's very wise.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member for Mackay knows a little bit about sugar. He knows how much to put in his tea.

Mr Kerin said that, unless the wheat industry accepts his proposals, payment might be held up. That was an ominous statement. It is worrying to the growers. What has happened to consensus? If the ALP in Canberra really believes in consensus, it would talk to those in the wheat industry in an attempt to reach agreement rather than hold a bludgeon over the industry's head. I hope that the problem may be sorted out successfully.

Mr Casey: Most of that applies to the feed-wheat areas in some of the other States.

Mr BOOTH: Many permits are being allowed for feed wheat in my area and more so in central Queensland.

Mr Casey: Basically we have a better quality than have the other States.

Mr BOOTH: We used to think we had. Something has gone wrong this year. Probably growers planted a little early and the season was not right. I agree with the honourable member that, generally, over the years we are in a better position.

I must comment on the remark of the member for South Brisbane that all that the National Party believes in is ploughing up a little ground or digging a hole. That is pretty right. We believe in encouraging primary industry and mining. I know that the honourable member for Mount Isa is disappointed in many things that he thinks are wrong, but if it had not been for the encouragement given to mining in Queensland in the early days, the population of Queensland would have been considerably lower. That might have made the job easier for the State Government, but it would not have given so many people the hope that they have in Queensland.

While I am speaking about primary industries, I would like to turn my attention to quangos. It is true that Queensland has many statutory bodies; it also is true that, from time to time, those bodies have had to make decisions and carry them out to the benefit of Queenslanders. An interesting decision, which is only one of many, was made by the Barley Marketing Board. It is mentioned in the Budget paper entitled "The Queensland Economy". That board made a decision to allow barley-growers to elect to take a discounted cash price. That price, which was mainly for feed barley, was not drastically discounted. About 34 per cent of barley-producers elected to accept the discounted price. I have no doubt that that was done to increase their cash flow. That highlights another problem for primary producers, namely, that when cash flow is at a fairly low ebb, something should be done to try to keep it up.

Because members of statutory bodies understand their jobs and the problems of the people with whom they deal, they can make adjustments quickly for the benefit of primary producers. For that reason, if for no other, I make the plea to any Government that is examining quangos, or statutory bodies, as I prefer to call them, to examine them on their merits. If, on their merits, some statutory bodies should be done away with, I have no quarrel with that. However, if the statutory bodies are doing an excellent job and providing a worthwhile service to producers, they should be maintained.

Mr Davis: All of those quangos are made up of National Party stooges.

Mr BOOTH: I tried to explain the position in a reasonable manner. The member for Brisbane Central has made a provocative and foolish statement. It makes me feel sorry for him.

Mr Davis: You know that is true. Your predecessor, Mr Cory, is a member of a board.

Mr BOOTH: He is doing a good job, too. He has knowledge and expertise, and that is why he is a member of a statutory body. He has the know how. I will not allow that interjection to side-track me.

I believe that the Budget was well received. However, the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was ponderous in the extreme; in fact, it was a big yawn.

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (8.28 p.m.): I intended congratulating the member for Warwick on his speech, which concentrated almost solely on the 1984 Budget, because, one of the things that Opposition members, particularly the newer members like myself who are not used to the phenomenon, tire of is National Party members repeatedly attempting to criticise the Federal Government. The cry goes up continuously about having faith and pride in Queensland. I assure the Committee that the members who sit on this side of the Chamber do have pride in Queensland, in Australia and in the national Government. I thought that it was in very poor taste for the Premier and Treasurer, at a conference in London, to criticise the Australian Government. His criticism was flashed across national and international television. That is not pride in one's country.

The facts are clear, and the honourable member for South Brisbane spelt them out in some detail in his speech earlier today. I will repeat those facts very briefly. Queensland does very well from the Commonwealth in financial assistance. In the Treasurer's Annual Statement, the Auditor-General makes quite a lengthy comment about the tax-sharing

arrangements, and I invite honourable members to read that comment. He concluded by saying that the factors that determine the allocation of taxes to the States are progressively advantageous to Queensland and the other more heavily populated States.

The figures that appear in the Budget papers indicate that, in this financial year, Queensland will receive \$787.83 per head compared with \$592 for New South Wales and \$503 for Victoria. As the member for South Brisbane pointed out, if Queensland received its allocation based on the same per capita figure as Victoria, it would require an additional \$500m from State taxes. It cannot be argued that Queensland does not do very well under the Commonwealth's tax-sharing arrangements.

Another practice that numerous Government members adopt is to compare Queensland with other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria. The Queensland Budget was classified by the media generally as a "steady as she goes" Budget, with its only real highlights being the special capital works allocation of \$600m and an increased commitment to education. In a few moments, I shall come back to both of those aspects.

Compare that description in the media with those given in Victorian and New South Wales newspapers when the Budgets for those States were brought down. In relation to the Victorian Budget the press carried the headline "Taxes cut by \$72m in Victoria Budget". Beneath that headline this appeared—

"The Victorian Government yesterday reduced and abolished a range of taxes and increased spending on health, education and police in its Budget. Heartened by the State's economic recovery, the Government slashed about \$72m off taxes and introduced a \$20m housing scheme for the long-term unemployed. There are no new taxes."

One of the headlines concerning the New South Wales Budget states, "No tax increases in New South Wales Budget". The article under that headline states—

"No tax increases and concessions for small business and property owners form the good news in the New South Wales Budget brought down last night."

That is the comparison between the media response to the Queensland Budget and that to the Budgets of New South Wales and Victoria. So let us get away from the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Governments; let us see what the Queensland Government's Budget does or does not do for this State.

I and, I am sure, other members were attracted to two pie graphs that appeared in the "Telegraph" and indicated where Queensland's revenue comes from and where its funds are expended from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I thought it would be interesting to compare this year's Budget allocations with those of 10 years ago and 20 years ago, so I took out some figures.

On the receipts side of the Consolidated Revenue Fund—in 1964-65, receipts of Commonwealth funds constituted 40.7 per cent of the Budget; in 1974-75, they made up 47.6 per cent of the Budget; and this year, they make up 48.1 per cent of the Budget. State taxation 20 years ago accounted for 14.8 per cent; 10 years ago for 23.1 per cent; and this year, for 19.8 per cent.

Other interesting figures on the receipts side concern railways. In 1964-65, they contributed 29.87 per cent; in 1974-75, 16.6 per cent; and this financial year, 18.6 per cent.

Figures on the expenditure side—and again selecting the highlights—can be seen from the following table, which sets out what certain portfolios received in 1964-65, 1974-75 and this year.

Portfolio	Percentage of Total Budget Allocation		
	1964-65	1974-75	1984-85
Education	18.5	23.5	23.1

Health	13.0	16.0	19.6
Lands, Forestry and Police	6.0	5.9	5.4
Transport	18.5	22.25	20.3
Welfare Services	1.0	1.9	1.9

From that table it appears that Health will do quite well from this year's Budget.

The Budget document "The Queensland Economy" acknowledged the likelihood of lower inflation and interest rates as well as better prospects for growth generally. It stated—

"The prospects for Queensland's manufacturing industries to expand in 1984-85 are better than in recent years and growth of overall output, employment and profits seem assured."

I doubt that assessment of the future of the Queensland economy. I agree with the comment concerning the likelihood of lower inflation, and so on, as the signs are very clear. However, the signs do not indicate that the second prediction will prove to be correct. I ask: What is the State Government doing about it? Again, let us forget about trying to criticise the Commonwealth Government.

In my electorate, a major manufacturing company, Goninans, was encouraged to come to Townsville—in fact, forced to come to Townsville—to construct locomotives for the central Queensland coal-fields. A condition attached to the tenders was that the successful tenderer must establish its plant and construct the locomotives in Townsville. Naturally, at the time, as the potential member for Townsville, I applauded that decision. Goninans was welcomed. I attended the official opening. I was in the company of the Minister when the first locomotive left the workshop. I was also present when the last locomotive left the workshop. That plant has no good prospects for the future.

Goninan North Queensland Pty Ltd is very concerned about the State Government's attitude, particularly as it feels that a Queensland Government direction forced it to go to Townsville to develop that plant. I was somewhat shocked to hear the Premier accuse MIM Holdings of mismanagement. Today the Deputy Premier accused Massey-Ferguson of mismanagement and inefficiency. He said that it led to the closure of the Massey-Ferguson plant in Bundaberg. I wonder whether the Government will make similar accusations about Goninans.

In recent times emphasis has been placed on the development of high-technology industries. Townsville is an ideal location for the establishment of a science park, if that is the direction in which the Government thinks that it ought to be going. It has been suggested to me that Townsville with its university, its Institute of Marine Science and so on, has the greatest concentration per head of population of scientific knowledge and research potential of any city in Australia. If there is potential in high-technology industries and science parks, I put in a plug for Townsville. As the member for South Brisbane said earlier, more jobs will not be provided by the creation of high-technology industries and science parks.

I noted an article written earlier this year by Professor Rogers of James Cook University in which he said—

"For the first time in human history new technologies offer the promise of an abundance of goods and services with reduced labour inputs required."

He further stated—

"It is necessary to accept the argument that at a time when there is already substantial unemployment encouragement should be given to investment in enterprises which could well increase further the unemployment. That is to say it is necessary to support 'sunrise' industries to give us production of goods and services rather than to create jobs."

I hasten to point out that the article was entitled "Learning to Live with Economic Evil". In the first part of his article he argued that we may have to learn to live with inflation. He went on to say that we may have to learn to live with high levels of unemployment. He also referred to the social problems of the unemployed and the feeling of success in those who have achieved in employment. He stated that it is paradoxical that the human endeavour in the last century to ameliorate the squalid and arduous conditions of the work-place could founder on the inability of society to cope with the benefits. In other words, we may not be able to live with the benefits of technological change.

He concluded by saying that unemployment is not bound to continue at unacceptable levels, but it might. He asked what we in society are doing to prepare a contingency plan in the event that that situation occurs? I repeat that question. What are the contingency plans in Queensland in the event that the sugar industry does not recover, the price of copper stays down or the season is bad for cattle, sheep, wheat, and so on?

Again I comment on the very sensible statement made by the member for Warwick. I detect a change coming from the Government in regard to the sugar industry. The Government has now acknowledged that it is necessary to sit down and talk about the problems in the sugar industry. I noted that only this week the member for Burdekin and the member for Hinchinbrook made very sensible comments about what could be done for the sugar industry. Both members suggested that, firstly, the Queensland Government had to acknowledge that it had a role to play and, secondly, that everyone should sit down and talk about the problems confronting that great industry at the moment. In my humble opinion, it is time that we stop blaming Canberra for everything that goes badly. It is time for a total review of the economic performance of this State and the establishment of a manpower planning unit with proper representation from the trade union movement. I suppose that I am being a little naive when I ask: Would it not be marvellous if the members of this Assembly could form all-party committees to examine those very serious problems that affect us all? Today I heard the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) refer to discussions on penalty rates. However, I heard no offer to include in those discussions representatives from this side of the Chamber.

It is crazy for the Government to refuse to talk to the unions about a 38-hour week for local authorities. The shorter working week may be one of the few solutions to the unemployment problem. I am not tonight debating the matter of the good or evil of a 38-hour week, but I am suggesting that it may be one of the solutions. Why are we not sitting down and talking about it instead of encouraging confrontation?

Decentralisation must be a corner-stone of Government decision-making, not something trotted out at election-time. On another occasion I have referred to Goninan North Queensland Pty Ltd. Its contract was announced immediately prior to the last election as something of an election gimmick. It involved a major company establishing itself in Townsville to carry out a contract. When the contract ran out, it was left holding the bag.

One of the requirements for rescuing the steel fabrication industry in north Queensland is an alteration in the prices charged for steel by BHP. Steel fabricators in north Queensland must face additional costs when competing with southern tenderers for projects in the area. I received from the manager of BHP steel division a very lengthy justification. The portion that I wish to refer to is the concluding paragraph—

"The question really boils down to the geographic position of major regional population centres relative to the State Capital. We do not believe that as a public Company, BHP can be held responsible for the accident of geography that has resulted in the Capital of Queensland being in the extreme South-East corner, with major population centres stretched over 1600 kilometres up the East Coast. If the state Government really wants to promote the development of industry in regional centres, the solution is in their hands.

As pointed out earlier, we pass onto our customers the exact charges as levied on us by Queensland Railways, a State Government instrumentality, to transport steel to regional locations.

The plight of the steel fabrication industry in North Queensland, is really no worse than elsewhere as evidenced by a number of recent plant closures, Company failures and massive labour force reductions in Brisbane."

Obviously, the Queensland Government can take some action to rescue decentralised industries along the Queensland coast.

On a previous occasion the member for Townsville West mentioned that the Northern Development portfolio must be given real teeth if north Queensland is to develop. Last week, along with other members of Parliament, I had the good fortune to attend a ceremony commemorating the commencement of construction of the Burdekin Falls Dam. We all accept that it has the potential to signal a new era of development and progress in north Queensland. I say here and now, however, that that development and progress will not follow automatically. A tremendous amount of work is yet to be done. The cost of bringing the water from the dam to Townsville is estimated at \$50m. There is a need for a spirit of co-operation if we are to succeed as we all hope we will.

In recent days north Queensland has suffered from the closure of the Australian National Line. I congratulate the member for Warwick on his speech, but at one stage he became embroiled in the argument about socialist philosophies. The only solution that the so-called free enterprise people on the other side of the Chamber had to offer was for the Federal Government to inject more money into ANL. The only solution it has for the problems confronting the sugar industry is for the Federal Government to put in more money. It seems to me that that is socialism. If free enterprise is the solution to all our problems, why is not ANL turned over to free enterprise? Why is not the sugar industry turned over to free enterprise? We on this side of the Chamber have no problem in arguing for a mixed economy. We appreciate that Governments have a role to play in stirring up the economy or in doing whatever else needs to be done to assist organisations or industries that are confronted by difficulties. We are not ashamed to say so.

Youth unemployment is a matter of concern to everybody in this place. In this context I wish to refer to a document put out by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, entitled "Places and Incomes: an Accord for Young People" That publication is the result of a survey into the aspirations and concerns of approximately 1 200 young people around Australia. The survey reveals that the major concerns of youth today are employment and income security, relationships and nuclear war. It documents their basic needs as vision and a sense of hope in their lives so that they can move beyond their present situation, a legitimate and recognised place in society through which they can contribute as people with value and dignity, and an economic base by which they can provide for their basic needs of living at a standard considered adequate in Australian society.

Young people said that powerlessness is a basic experience in their lives, so that empowerment is an essential part of the way forward to a full life. The quite extensive document argues for what is called "Places and Incomes: an Accord for Young People". The commission believes that young people are entitled to a place in society, which does not necessarily mean a job. If jobs cannot be found for all young people, a place in an educational institution or some other situation that gives them status and meaning has to be found for them. I support that basic view.

Relationships refers to young people's private, family and personal relationships.

The third concern, which a State Government can do very little about, relates to nuclear war, which appears to be a very real concern among young people.

I shall now deal very briefly with small business, which can provide jobs. I know of the very grave conflict that presently exists between the Queensland Government and the Queensland Motor Industry Association concerning service stations. Those who have come to me representing lessee service station proprietors are very, very concerned at the future prospects for their industry and at the Minister's reluctance to properly deal with their concerns.

I have had referred to me an article contained in the "Business Review", which indicates that similar problems have at last been tackled by oil companies in the United States. Honourable members might be surprised to learn the major US oil companies have agreed to allow more than 50 000 service station-operators to sell any brand of petrol they choose, even though their neon signs and franchise agreements identify them with a single brand. Industry experts say that the result will be more competition and lower prices.

Representatives of service station franchise-holders in a 1971 law suit had charged restraint of trade in the sale of petrol. Petrol industry experts and consumer groups said that the settlement would let service station-dealers shop round for the cheapest wholesale gasoline, lowering their costs and ultimately the price at the pumps. The agreement, which will run for five years, could become permanent through legislation or further negotiations and could substantially cut future petrol prices by perhaps as much as 10c a gallon.

That article goes on in some detail about what oil companies in the United States are doing to overcome the problem. I would suggest that as most of Australia's dealing with oil companies are very closely aligned with what happens in the United States, there are some important words for us all there.

The Special Major Capital Works Program has been discussed at length by the Leader of the Opposition and a number of other members. One aspect that certainly confused me is that, although the Budget mentions a \$600m allocation over two and a half years, it also indicates that only \$72m will be spent this year and \$100m next year. If my mathematics are correct, that leaves \$428m to be spent in the third year. I find it difficult to believe that that is either practicable or possible.

Unlike the member for Mount Isa, I have done very well in my electorate, or will do very well if the promises included in the special works program do come about. Construction works are in progress at the moment at the Townsville General Hospital and the new women's hospital at Kirwan, both of which no doubt will continue. A new high school at Rasmussen has been promised, as have primary schools and a new Government building.

While on the subject of capital works, I want to dwell for a moment on the supervision of such works. Members may have noted some comments I made about the theft of building materials from the prison at Stuart in Townsville. Investigations into that theft are still proceeding, and police have interviewed a number of people. But, irrespective of who is finally found to have stolen the material, the fact remains that nobody denies that about \$27,000 worth of material was stolen from a building site within the prison at Stuart, which was, presumably, supervised by the State Works Department.

I made some allegation about the possible involvement of prison officers, based on information given to me by witnesses who claimed to have seen the material actually being stolen. I have now heard a counter-argument from prison officers, who claim that prison officers in the tower saw subcontractors remove the material. But the point is that none of those people thought it important enough to go to the police, and whoever was in charge of that project certainly lacked supervisory ability.

Another matter that has come to my notice only in the last couple of days in regard to the same area of supervision relates to the extension to the Townsville General Hospital. Apparently, tenders were called for the supply of tiles to the project. There

were four tenders in the first instance: \$81,456; \$80,713; \$78,000; and the lowest tender was \$67,631. The lowest tenderer was given the contract. But when the tender went to the supervising contractors to check the bill of quantities, they found a minor discrepancy, which, I am told, involved an additional amount of less than \$1,000. In its wisdom, the hospitals board decided to re-call tenders. The three highest tenderers did not bother to change their tenders, but the lowest tenderer, knowing, of course, from the previous public opening of tenders that he had won the contract and had a fairly substantial margin to play with, increased his tender from \$67,631 to \$75,952. So he picked up a cool \$8,000 in that little exercise. Those two matters indicate to me that there is a clear need to tighten supervision in the expenditure of public funds on capital works in Queensland.

As I mentioned earlier, the increased allocations to education have received favourable comment. The increase is of the order of 15.7 per cent. It has been acknowledged that the Queensland Government has at last agreed that expenditure on education needed to be substantially increased, and I hope that this will be the start of a continuing program to bring the standard of Queensland education facilities up to that of the other States, and also that class sizes will be reduced appropriately.

Parents and citizens associations have indicated to me that, although they acknowledge and appreciate the assistance that has been given to relieve them of the responsibilities that have been unfairly thrust upon them in the past, substantially more funds need to be allocated to allow them to do the job for which they were originally formed, without the need to raise large sums of money to provide basic educational requirements at their schools.

As I mentioned earlier, my electorate has been promised a new high school at Rasmussen. The basic requirements for Townsville, as indicated by the parents and citizens associations, are for two additional high schools, so that they can only hope that a second high school is on line for next year's Budget, or perhaps the one after. There has been some argument that perhaps Murray had a higher priority than Rasmussen for the first of those two additional high schools. I have no parochial interest, because both areas are in my electorate. I will accept the guidance of the experts. It is to be hoped that when the high school is provided, it will help to alleviate a very serious problem.

Public hospitals are to be provided with only an additional 461 staff compared with the union's claim for 1800. Again, I hope that the allocation in this year's Budget represents only the beginning of a program to bring the staff levels in hospitals up to a reasonable standard.

In the week-end edition of "The Australian", an article concerning conditions for nurses in outback Queensland caught my attention. I presume that the article has been brought to the attention of the Minister for Health. If the accusations in the article are anywhere near the truth, a problem certainly exists. The article concludes by quoting the person interviewed in these terms: "I think the Queensland Health Department knows it is sitting on a time bomb." If the department knows that, I trust that something will be done about it.

The police force has received a disappointing response, in that only 100 additional police are to be provided instead of the 525 sought by Commissioner Lewis. His request was endorsed by the Queensland Police Union.

The situation at the smaller country police stations is very grave. Very recently, I was told about what happened to Sergeant Thorpe of the Giru Police Station. He was called to attend a fracas on the Bruce Highway, between Giru and Townsville. Because he was the only officer on duty on the Saturday at 6 p.m. he had to go by himself. On arriving at the scene, he found four drunken louts in the middle of the Bruce Highway having an almighty brawl with broken bottles. When he entered the fracas, he took quite a hiding. Fortunately, relief arrived from Townsville. He assured me that the situation was very dangerous and that he feared for his life. My firm conviction is that no police

officer in Queensland should be involved in such a situation unaided. The problem can be overcome only by the smaller country stations being provided with more staff.

I express grave disappointment at the failure of this year's Budget to come to grips with the real need in Queensland for additional welfare funding. It has been said on a number of occasions that new legislation is to be expected this year. In his Budget speech, the Premier and Treasurer said that the legislation was a joint response by the Government and community organisations to individual needs, with the Government adopting a partnership role rather than that of a direct service delivery. Community groups are asking whether this is a two-way arrangement. There is no commitment to consultation on a regional basis on policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation. It seems that the Government is saying, "You must do more work, and we will tell you what you must do."

In the Budget, there is no real commitment to providing additional resources for non-Government welfare organisations. Research undertaken by the Social Welfare Research Centre of the University of New South Wales indicates that Queensland non-Government organisations have the lowest income of all the States. Almost half—that is, 45.7 per cent of them—have incomes of less than \$5,000 a year. Whereas 16.7 per cent of organisations in other States have incomes in excess of \$250,000 a year, only 7.6 per cent are in that category in Queensland.

Although voluntary groups have shown an extraordinary ability to respond to local needs, it would be a mistake to assume that there is an inexhaustible supply of volunteers and resources waiting to respond to additional demands. On the contrary, these groups are being pushed to the limit as to workers and resources. In Queensland organisations, over 41.3 per cent of income is derived from fund-raising; 13.6 per cent from membership; 13.2 per cent from fees; and only 2.4 per cent from the State Government. In New South Wales, the State Government allocation is 16.8 per cent; in Victoria, 25.5 per cent, and in South Australia, 13.3 per cent.

When considering the contribution of volunteers throughout Queensland, reference can be made to a report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics entitled "Provision of Welfare Services by Volunteers in Queensland for the year ended November 1982". That report indicates that, in 1982, 483 786 volunteers worked a total of 59 522 600 hours. This contribution of labour is valued at about \$400m and represents 30 000 full-time jobs. That is the level of contribution by the voluntary sector in the provision of welfare services in Queensland. In his Budget speech, the Premier and Treasurer said that the Queensland Government will provide an additional \$1m; that is clearly not enough.

Queensland spends considerably less on welfare than any other Australian State. This year, 1.12 per cent of the total Government appropriation has been allocated to welfare. Last year, the figure was 1.02 per cent, compared with the New South Wales figure of 2.5 per cent, Victoria 2.9 per cent, and South Australia 3.9 per cent. Last year, the Queensland Government allocated \$17.68 per head, New South Wales \$32.33, Victoria \$38.14, and South Australia \$51.51. The figure for the 1984-85 financial year is about \$20. I will have much more to say about this during the debate on the proposed Family and Community Development Bill. However, I make the point that, if that Bill is to succeed—and the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs has acknowledged this in a number of public forums—additional resources will have to be made available.

I congratulate the Government on establishing a Department of Youth this year. It has been Labor Party policy for a number of years, and Opposition members are pleased that a similar policy is being implemented at Government level. However, at this stage it is merely window-dressing. As I understand it, the staff of seven allocated to the department has simply been produced by a reduction in the Department of Children's Services. Those people are virtually sitting at the same tables doing the same job.

It has become fashionable to talk about a youth policy. Most parties have a youth policy, but I do not think that anyone really understands what is needed. Governments

and interested groups should liaise with the young people themselves. The survey that I have already mentioned referred to the aspirations of youth.

I think that every honourable member has been shocked in recent days at the disclosure of the incidence of drug-dealing in Australia, and Queensland is involved. Hard drugs are now freely available in this country and the consumption of alcohol by young people is becoming an increasing problem. I suggest that Australians would do well to establish some sort of national foundation to try to combat this un-Australian activity. I say that it is un-Australian because it has been said—and I believe it—that heroin did find its way to Australia during the Vietnam war mainly through American soldiers on recreation leave here. It is an un-Australian activity, and a national foundation should be established so that something can be done about it. I suggest that there could be no better person to be patron of such a foundation than Mrs Hazel Hawke. I think that everyone would acknowledge her contribution in recent days in bringing the serious nature of the heroin problem to the notice of every Australian.

Last year, when I spoke on the Estimates, I applauded the decision of the Government to name 1984 as the Year of the Family. It has been a remarkable public relations exercise for the Government. It has drawn every possible benefit out of the promotion in a public relations sense and, I am afraid to say, in a party political sense.

I now quote from a statement by Dr Don Edgar, who is the Director of the Institute of Family Studies. He said—

“I am increasingly dismayed at the blind eye politicians of every ilk turn to family policy issues. On the one hand is the rhetoric of each Party about the centrality of the family unit, the good deeds they will do for families, their concern for motherhood, the welfare of the nation’s children, the viability of the family home. On the other, sits an ignorance of what is happening to Australian families, of their real needs and problems and (worst of all) of the way every policy impacts on family life.”

That is the sort of concentration that I hoped the Year of the Family would achieve in Queensland in 1984. Unfortunately, that has not happened.

Dr Edgar went on to question the fact that, in order to obtain welfare support, a person has to prove that he or she has failed society in expectations. In other words, a person claiming welfare benefits has to fill out a form saying that he or she has failed in one way or another. Dr Edgar asks: Where are the funds for family support services, marriage preparation, preventive marriage guidance, financial counselling and parent support? I hasten to add that that does not refer to Queensland alone, nor is it a party political statement. It indicates quite clearly that, according to Dr Edgar, no Government in Australia is coming to grips with the real problems that face families today. I certainly acknowledge that criticism in regard to the Queensland Year of the Family.

Dr Edgar demands a systematic approach to family support. He said that it is time to abolish the term “welfare” and to talk instead of family support and of positive action for the well-being of all families instead of meeting needs as they arise or of finding patch-up solutions to what are social structural problems.

As I said, the Year of the Family has failed to come to grips with the social pressures that exist today and are causing problems to families. I think I speak for all Opposition members when I say that we resent the actions of Government members who repeatedly claim that Opposition members do not favour the family and want to introduce policies that destroy the family. I can assure Government members that their comments could not be farther from the truth. What Opposition members do say is that it is time that this Government acknowledged the problems that really face young people and families today and came to grips with those problems.

I am afraid that the Government is about to make a similar mistake with the International Youth Year. Again the Government is setting up a body that is nothing more than a public relations exercise. I have here the first document that has been

published by the committee. It has a photograph of the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs displayed prominently on it. I am led to understand that he issued instructions that his photograph was to appear on all posters that are distributed throughout Queensland advertising International Youth Year.

Set out in the document is the membership of the State co-ordinating committee. I quote the expertise and qualifications of the chairman of that very important committee, which has been set up to deal with the problems confronting young people in our State. This is what is stated—

“Greg Chappell has extensive investment and business interests, much of it in real estate throughout Australia. He is highly respected as much for his business acumen as for his sporting ability.”

Quite frankly, those qualifications do not fit that person for the task of dealing properly with the problems that confront young people today. I do not cast aspersions on Greg Chappell personally; I do not know the man. Certainly, he has been a magnificent cricketer. However, the committee has been set up to deal with real social problems that confront young people today. I suggest that he has no affinity with those problems.

Recently, a public meeting was held in Townsville to establish a local committee of the International Youth Year. A fellow by the name of Russell Schroter walked through the door and announced to the meeting that he had been appointed to the State co-ordinating committee for the International Youth Year and that he had been told he was to be the Townsville chairman. The public meeting told him exactly what to do. I can assure honourable members that, although he is a member of the State co-ordinating committee, he is not the Townsville chairman. I also note that he is a member of the Young National Party.

Finally, the welfare section of the Budget hits the Department of Children's Services hardest of all. I am sure that those members who have had anything to do with the department know very well that child-care officers, in particular, presently work under a massive work-load. Because of changes in the titles of positions, it is difficult to assess accurately the changes that will take place in 1984-85 compared with the previous year. The total number of established positions has been reduced from 539 in 1983-84 to 528 this year. That is a disgrace. Child-care officers are not able to cope with their present work-load. They have told me that they could do much more to assist people before a crisis situation develops. If they had the time to counsel people in their own homes, they could assist potential child-abusers before a crisis situation developed. Because of the reduction in the number of staff employed in that department, that will not happen in the foreseeable future.

Bearing in mind that the new family and community development legislation will require departmental personnel to accept additional work-loads, they will not be able to cope. A careful examination of the Bill will need to be made when it is introduced.

I impress upon the State Government the importance of the new initiative taken by the Federal Government in relation to the provision of support for homeless people. It is termed the Supported Accommodation and Assistance Program. It is aimed at providing accommodation for the young homeless, women in crisis and homeless people generally. A substantial amount of money is being provided by the Federal Government. The Queensland Government has indicated in the Budget papers that, provided agreement can be reached, matching finance will be provided. I assure the Government that the problem is massive.

My experience indicates that when a refuge is established, the number of persons who use that refuge increases substantially. At present, many people do not receive even basic accommodation, because it is not available. When accommodation is made available under this program, an increased demand will be placed on its facilities and services. I hope that the Queensland Government will consider the program seriously. I sound a note of warning that substantial additional funding will be required in succeeding years, because the problem will not go away.

A number of questions have been asked by welfare organisations about the Commonwealth/States Housing Agreement, and they are waiting for replies. I understand that the Commonwealth and the States have reached agreement on a 10-year plan to attack housing poverty. It involves the provision of \$82m to Queensland in the current financial year.

I am waiting to hear whether the Queensland Government has agreed to some new initiatives, one of which relates to the extension of the availability of public housing to youth and single persons. That would mean that, in addition to the traditional family groups that now have access to welfare public housing, youths and single people would be able to join the public housing queues. I understand that the Queensland Government has not yet made a decision on that matter. Again, assistance is needed urgently.

Some more good news in the Budget is the increase of 27 in the number of staff of the Probation and Parole Service. The Opposition and community groups generally have placed a great deal of pressure on the Government in that field. Because of inadequate staffing, virtually nothing was being done to prepare prisoners for parole. The Premier and Treasurer said in his Budget speech—

“The Government sees that no useful purpose is served by exposing people unnecessarily to a prison environment. Locking people up does not necessarily mean the community or the individual is the better for it.”

I never thought that I would hear the Premier and Treasurer utter those words. However, he uttered them; I heard them. They appear in his Budget speech. He now appears to have some conscience about prisoners. He is now prepared to make staff available to prepare those people to take a meaningful role in society.

On previous occasions Opposition members have argued that the Parole Board ought to be restructured to broaden its membership, particularly to take cognisance of the extraordinarily large number of Aborigines and Islanders who find their way into penal institutions. If the Parole Board is to deal sympathetically with those people, there ought to be appropriate representation.

I shall conclude my speech by making a brief reference to the Queensland prison system and to the report given to Cabinet on that system up to the year 2000 and beyond. The report is scathing in its criticism. It expresses concern at the lack of proper planning in the past to take account of the changes that have occurred. It makes the damaging point that both the Brisbane Prison Complex and the Stuart Prison in Townsville have facilities that do not meet the minimum requirements laid down by the United Nations. Those deficiencies were brought to the attention of the Government prior to the riots last November.

In recent days, malicious stories have appeared in the press about the potential for riots in Queensland prisons. An article in the “Daily Sun” of 27 September referred to a confidential news-letter prepared by prison officers. I have that so-called confidential news-letter. I assure honourable members that it is nothing more than a giggle sheet, obviously prepared for the enjoyment of prison officers. I had intended to read some of the ridiculous comments in it to illustrate the standard of the publication. However, time does not permit of my doing so. I assure honourable members that, on my information, the prisoners are very happy about the recent concessions. I appeal to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs to continue with the work that he has begun. Obviously, he is now receiving advice from people who understand the need for more enlightened thinking in a modern prison system. My information is that the Brisbane Prison Complex is very quiet indeed. I reiterate that the prisoners are appreciative of the concessions given to them. They are not prepared to risk them by creating unnecessary problems.

Any stories of riots at the prison are being fueled, as I understand it, by a small group of prison officers who resent change. Unfortunately, whenever change has occurred in State prison systems, such a negative attitude has been exhibited by a minority of prison officers. Clearly, it exists in the Queensland prison system today. I hope that the

Minister overcomes that problem and continues to implement concessions of the type that he has indicated.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (9.18 p.m.): It gives me much pleasure to join the debate and to say what a remarkably progressive document the Budget is. All Government members noted the expressions on the faces of Opposition members when the Budget was being read. We did not see very many smiles.

Mr Menzel: They were not very happy at all.

Mr STEPHAN: No. It is obvious that they cannot stand a success story. They do not appreciate positive action. They are so used to being negative in their thinking.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It is one of the greatest flops of all time.

Mr STEPHAN: No, it is not the greatest flop.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Wolston to withdraw that comment.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Which comment?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member knows which comment. If he does not withdraw the word "flop", I will warn him under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I withdraw it.

Mr STEPHAN: It is interesting to note that anything positive runs against the grain with members opposite. Every Opposition member adopts the attitude that it cannot be done. Of course, they are hoping against hope that their predictions will prove true. That attitude was advanced by the Leader of the Opposition, who was trying to find his feet or, should I say, trying to get his feet firmly planted on the ground. He was trying to make himself out to be a man of integrity and a man to be respected in the community.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the things that he feels cannot be done. The former Leader of the Opposition also had a problem with his integrity. Not long ago—in May—the member for Rockhampton (Mr Wright) told everybody who cared to listen that he did not intend to stand for election to the House of Representatives and in fact was not even interested. How dare anybody suggest that he should have been thinking along those lines! At that time speculation was that the long-serving Labor MP Mr Doug Everingham would stand down in Capricornia, which is based on the home of the member for Rockhampton, who said that there was no truth in any of the rumours. A couple of months later the honourable member for Rockhampton stood down from his position as the Leader of the Opposition and is now to stand for the Federal seat of Capricornia. Where is his integrity? This is the man who preceded the present Leader of the Opposition. It is all very well for members of the Labor Party to laugh and smile, but they have to bear these things. That is the standard of behaviour that the people in the community have come to expect from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Davis: I don't think that will be a big issue in Capricornia.

Mr STEPHAN: I do not think it will be a big issue, either. These may not be big issues, but they are niggling issues that presently worry the Labor Party.

When I have spoken to the general public about the Budget, they have asked me, "Is it an election year? Surely the document indicates that this must be an election year?" Of course it is not an election year; this is what can always be expected from a National Party Government. I must compliment the Premier and Treasurer as well as the other Ministers on the very positive document that was produced.

Mr Menzel: Do you think that we should publish Mr Kruger's speech and send it out?

Mr STEPHAN: Yes, I do.

Nothing has been said by any member of the Opposition to dispel their fear of the Budget, which gives a dynamic \$600m boost to job creation. I have not heard any Opposition members adopt a positive attitude and say what a good thing that is. They are trying to say that it cannot be done. They will be very disappointed when they find that it is being done. It is a new level of support that demonstrates the Government's commitment to employment which has set the pace for job creation during recent years.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Is there really a need to play nasty personality politics?

Mr STEPHAN: I am not doing that at all, I am speaking the truth as I know it. For members of the Opposition, it is a pity that these are the facts.

The practical impact of the spending over the next two and a half years on top of the normal capital works expenditure of past years will be the earlier completion of essential projects in education, water resources, hospitals, Crown employee housing, road-works, public buildings and so on. This is what the people have come to expect.

Mr Davis: Who gave you that brief?

Mr STEPHAN: Nobody gave me a brief; I worked these things out myself. Just because Government members occasionally read from notes, the Opposition wants to know who has given them a brief. I hold the distinct opinion that members of the Labor Party are told to read speeches that are delivered by the Trades Hall. They are told that if they do not read those documents in the Parliament they will not win the next preselection. People should not get the idea that Government members work in that sort of environment. They hold their own attitudes and are given a free rein.

The Queensland Budget contrasts sharply with the Federal Budget. Queensland lives within its means whereas Canberra lives beyond its means. Low household Budgets have long survived Labor's style of big spending, big debts and high, rising costs that outpace incomes. The Federal Labor Government believes that it can put off and is putting off the hard decisions and the bad news until after the early election, which is expected in either late November or early December. The Queensland Government rejects the Federal Labor budgeting responsibility, its philosophy of spend today and pay tomorrow. Australians want something better for their children than increasing debts, higher taxes, wasted opportunities and reckless spending. They have come to expect much more than that from their Governments.

The Budget lays down a path upon which a National Party Government will take Queensland as part of its general policy to ensure growth, development and continuing prosperity, with which I am very pleased and proud to be associated.

I must again return to the Federal budgeting policy. The great need for Australian industry and business today is to become more competitive. That is the only way in which more growth and more jobs can be created.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: It might not be palatable to some honourable members opposite, but jobs will not be created unless Australian industry becomes more competitive. That will not occur if, without regard to the capacity of industry and business to pay, there is a continuation of wage increases for those who already have jobs.

The reason for high taxes is excessive Government spending and the inefficiency of government at every level. The first need is to attack the cause of high taxes, which is Government spending. After that has been done, there might be some benefit for taxpayers through tax reform. In my opinion, those businessmen who advocate the introduction of capital gains taxes, wealth taxes and death duties in exchange for personal tax reform must be out of their minds.

Mr Davis: What is your view on penalty rates?

Mr STEPHAN: They are completely different. Certainly, they are not doing anything for the tourist industry at week-ends. Any person who is honest with himself would admit that penalty rates make up a large part of the high prices that have to be paid during week-end trading. If members are genuine in wanting to see more jobs created, surely they would want to improve conditions for employers who are trying to provide a service over the week-end. Opposition members should not try to cut the ground from under the feet of people who are trying to create employment.

It must be admitted that at present there is a coalition Government in Canberra. The coalition between the ALP and the ACTU means that, for the first time, there is a coalition Government with one partner that has not been elected by the people. And the ACTU regards itself as an equal partner in the coalition! The coalition should not be ignored.

I noted a recent comment by the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood), the Opposition spokesman on tourism. He suggested that it was a waste of effort for Queensland to be represented in Tokyo or to send Ministers to Japan because the NHK television team from Tokyo that is to visit Australia will not be coming to Queensland. It is obvious that the honourable member is out of step with what is happening. I remind him that the NHK team will be visiting this State as part of its preparation for the filming of a documentary on Australia's bicentenary. His statement was certainly well off beam. A two-person pre-location crew will arrive in Australia next month and will visit locations from Brisbane right up to Cairns. Of course, that is the type of comment one has come to expect from the honourable member for Ipswich West.

He equally made uninformed comments relative to nursing homes. More nursing home beds are urgently required in this State. Since it took office last year, the Federal Government has not given approval for the provision of a single nursing home bed.

Mr Kruger interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I advise the honourable member for Murrumba that I consider his interjections to be inappropriate. They are contributing nothing to the debate. I ask him to desist.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The interjections of the honourable member for Wolston are not helping the debate, either.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr STEPHAN: The Committee must realise that Opposition members cannot help being derogatory.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member not to make such comments.

Mr STEPHAN: I am trying to point out how much has to be done to get some sense into the Federal Government's thinking on the very pressing problem of nursing homes.

I now read from a newspaper article, which said—

“At least 50 people are in urgent need of a bed in one of Gympie's two nursing homes—Winston House and Lister—and lack of action by the Commonwealth Government stands in the way of providing a partial solution.

Attempts by both nursing homes to ease the problem have failed and as a result Winston House has four unoccupied beds and Lister two which cannot be used because they do not have the required government approval.”

Unfortunately, 6 beds are unoccupied because Government approval is lacking. Winston House has 50 people on its waiting-list, and it is a 37-bed nursing home.

The manager of Lister described the whole situation as a heart-break for a number of people who have sought nursing home beds for aged and usually incapacitated relatives who require constant attention, only to be told that there is no bed. He said—

“I’ve had people here in tears desperate for a bed for a relative who needs 24-hour attention.

I can tell you it is a tragedy .

Everyone appreciates that the government’s aim is to keep people in their own homes as long as possible but there comes a time when this just is not possible.”

The Government’s aim should be commended, but it can be taken only so far. When people cannot be kept at home, they need nursing home attention; but they have nowhere to go.

Mr Davis: This lousy Government cut the home care grant.

Mr STEPHAN: I am talking about nursing homes. The home care grant has not been cut. It has been increased.

Mr Davis: It has not.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is talking about a different home care grant from the one to which I am referring. The home care grant certainly has not been cut. The people who do that work are to be commended.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Give us some details.

Mr STEPHAN: I will do that if the honourable member ceases interrupting.

The main need for nursing home beds is related to the fact that people are living longer. Longevity is adding to the problem. Another problem arises from the 35-day limit on a patient’s stay in hospital. Thereafter, patients must move on, but they have nowhere to go.

Over a number of years, the Gympie hospital redevelopment plan has envisaged the building of a nursing home. The hospital management has become somewhat frustrated. Instead of a 40-bed nursing home, the management is seeking a 30-bed nursing home in the redevelopment plan. I hope that the request will be approved and that building will soon be under way.

Another private hospital in Gympie, Glandore, requires recategorisation. Many accusations have been made. This morning, I listened very closely to what the Minister said, namely, that subject to section 24, if upon an application made in accordance with the approved form by the proprietor of a private hospital for a variation in the category to which the private hospital belongs, the Minister may, in his discretion, vary the determination under that section by substituting for that category such other category as he thinks appropriate. Subject to this section, the Minister may, of his own motion, vary the determination under section 24 of the category of private hospital to which a private hospital belongs, with effect from such date as he thinks fit, by substituting for that category such other category as he determines to be appropriate and, where he does so, he shall, by notice, in writing, served personally or by post, notify the proprietor of the hospital accordingly. Comments have been made about the Glandore Hospital not being recategorised simply because the State Health Minister has not seen fit to support it. As the Minister for Health has said, he has not been asked for his opinion, and until he is asked, he cannot give an opinion.

While speaking about health support services generally, I turn my attention to the ambulance service. I commend the local ambulance brigades and boards in my electorate for the work that they do and the enthusiasm with which they carry out their work. The

ambulance bearers deserve credit for their co-operation and for their work, in which they take great pride.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The member for Brisbane Central has lost track of what every member has said tonight; he has gone quite off beam.

Mr Casey: Are you the Stephan who gave Mike Ahern his new hair-do?

Mr STEPHAN: The member for Mackay is deliberately trying to mislead me and take me away from the subject of my speech. I do not know what Mike Ahern's appearance has to do with the Budget debate. I point out to the member for Mackay that he is looking at the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Vince Lester). He is not Mike Ahern, so perhaps Mr Casey needs glasses or contact lenses. Whichever he needs, I suggest that he use them so that he can get the Ministers straight; he will then be of some benefit to his electorate and perhaps even to the cane-growers in the Mackay area.

For a number of reasons the rural sector has problems. Not the least of those problems is the possibility that some producers are becoming too efficient on the home market for their own good. Primary producers at the moment must cut back on production because the local markets are saturated mainly as a result of over-production. The overseas markets will not pay the price of Australian produce, but that is what it costs an Australian farmer to produce such goods.

Mr Casey: Is cane grown in your electorate?

Mr STEPHAN: Yes, cane is grown in my electorate, but not a great deal of it.

Many other crops, particularly horticultural crops, are grown in my electorate. The value and importance of horticultural crops is often underestimated. Last year, the value of horticultural crops was almost \$340m, an increase of 20 per cent over the previous year. Such crops are the life-blood of many people who enjoy healthy food and prefer a healthy environment.

Mr Scott: What are your main areas?

Mr STEPHAN: It makes no difference what the main crops are. I am talking about horticultural crops at this point. If the member for Cook listens a little longer, he might learn more about them. Such crops include bananas, beans and cucumbers. Dairy produce involves cows, and that is a different part of agriculture altogether.

Another matter of concern to primary producers is the slow way in which the Federal Government is moving towards the creation of plant variety rights legislation. One of my constituents has recently returned from a fact-finding tour of America. He was particularly interested in bean varieties, and discovered how far behind Australia is in plant varieties and how much catching up it has to do.

Mr Casey: Do you think that the pea tree has a commercial future?

Mr STEPHAN: The peach tree?

Mr Casey: The pea tree!

Mr STEPHAN: I am not too sure what the member for Mackay wants to do with pea trees.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: That might be so. I think that the member for Mackay is talking about the pea vine.

One of the many advantages of establishing plant variety rights in Australia is the supply of overseas varieties and the negotiation of co-operative plant-breeding between institutions and companies within and outside Australia. Plant variety rights enable variety seed production to be tailored to market size. They have a stabilising effect on prices. They encourage investment in breeding and they enhance variety distribution. They will also result in further rewards for breeding organisations and licensees and additional funds for research. In addition, production and quality will receive far more attention. Without plant variety rights, Australian primary producers do not have access to overseas varieties. Not too much has been done in Australia, or in Queensland in particular, in relation to breeding. However, some work has been carried out in relation to selection.

It is realised that overseas markets exist for avocados, custard apples, grapes, litchis and mandarins. With the development of markets, those fruits could be exported in larger quantities to South East Asia.

Reference was made earlier to quangos. When members of quangos go overseas, they look for extra markets.

Mr Davis: You made this same speech two weeks ago.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member would not remember what anybody said two weeks ago. Two weeks ago he could not even remember where his electorate office was, so how could he remember what any member said at that time?

People such as Dick Coutts, a COD economist, took part in a recent survey mission to explore markets for tropical fruits and vegetables. He set out a list of 15 fruits and vegetables for which a potential market existed in South East Asia. He said that further research was warranted by growers, exporters and Government departments. The members of the mission identified a further 13 fruits that had no significant market prospects in South East Asia. That was because those fruits are grown widely throughout that region and are sold at very low prices. Importers said that if Australia could develop a large, red, seedless grape, with other desirable characteristics, it would be in great demand in South East Asia.

Another aspect of the Budget that is quite encouraging relates to water conservation. Certainly, in this respect the Budget takes a step in the right direction. However, there is still a long way to go. Queensland receives a good deal of rain in the early part of the year and, in the remainder of the year, relies largely on water conservation and irrigation.

The importance that the Queensland Government places on the development of water resources is reflected in the \$100m special program as outlined in the Budget. That program will be of immense value to many areas of Queensland.

For some years, capital expenditure on water conservation works throughout Queensland has been limited. That has restricted the rate at which water conservation measures have been able to proceed. The level of funding that will be available over the next three financial years for water resources will be virtually doubled, so I look forward to significant progress in that area.

Schemes such as the Deep Creek Dam, just east of Gympie, will make a tremendous difference to the localities in which they are implemented. Certainly even more schemes are necessary to ensure the success of water conservation measures. Such schemes will support the dairying industry.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: Earlier the honourable member was getting mixed up between a cow and a cabbage.

Mr Vaughan: Where is Deep Creek?

Mr STEPHAN: I will be very pleased to take the honourable member on a tour of the Gympie district. He will find it a very pleasant tour indeed.

Forestry is a somewhat controversial subject. At times, certain individuals have the idea that trees should be allowed to remain where they are and that none should be knocked down and replaced with pine tree plantations. Such people lose sight of the value of pine plantations. Many hardwoods, as good as they are, take a long time to grow. There is no comparison between the commercial viability of pine trees and that of hardwoods.

Mr Davis: There are no birds in pine forests.

Mr STEPHAN: There are birds in pine forests. The honourable member should travel beyond the last street light in Brisbane. He would find that it does not take very long for the black cockatoos to get to know where the seeds and the pine cones are. If, as the honourable member claims, there are no birds in pine forests, why is it that flocks of them live in pine forests? Perhaps the honourable member has been wearing the wrong pair of glasses.

The Forestry Department recently opened a forestry museum which is aimed at identifying the importance that the timber industry has played in Queensland both in past and at the present. To help preserve the history of that rich industry, a forestry museum has been established at the Gympie forestry complex. It is a co-operative venture between the Forestry Department and the Queensland Museum. As well as having static displays, the museum features demonstrations of wood-working with old tools, such as the adze, the cross-cut saw, the pit-saw, about which we do not know very much. Some people do not realise that the museum exists. It was opened in March this year. The comparatively small amount of \$360,000 was required to establish it. It shows the great value of the timber industry. It plays a great role in the area.

Mr Casey: This is spellbinding material.

Mr STEPHAN: Yes, it is.

The member for Townsville (Mr McElligott) referred to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Geoff Muntz). I commend him for his thoroughness in stating what a good job the Minister is doing in his portfolio, particularly in regard to prisons and the welfare area generally. Recently I had the privilege of inspecting, with the Minister and the members of his committee, the prisons in the southern part of the State. Even though it might be pointed out that many things are lacking in the prison system in Queensland, many things are also lacking in the prison systems in other States. It is interesting to note that the booklet "Queensland Prisons to 2000 and Beyond" sets out ways to overcome many of the problems. They would go a long way towards making the prisons more comfortable and a far better place in which to rehabilitate prisoners to become fit and proper persons to once again take their place in society. Hopefully, they will be far better citizens. It is pleasant to work with the Minister. He is doing a very good job in that area.

I compliment the Government on its support of youth training and the administration of youth organisations. Although organisations such as Rural Youth are usually located in provincial areas, they are also located in the metropolitan area. Rural Youth is a leading youth organisation. It is doing a tremendous job. I commend the Government for its encouragement of such organisations.

I compliment the Government on the tremendous amount of assistance that it provides to sport. The assistance that is provided by way of subsidies is supported by the general public. The increase of 23 per cent in sporting subsidies and expenditure on sport is greatly appreciated. The money is used to teach young sportsmen and sports-women the techniques to win medals. It is also used to teach them to attain a far greater level of achievement in the sport in which they compete throughout the world.

The amount provided for junior coaching has increased from \$920,000 last year to \$1,050,000 this year. The amount provided for capital facilities has increased from \$1,193,000 last year to \$1,350,000 this year. The amount provided for team travel has increased from \$362,000 last year to \$500,000 this year. As I go further down the list I see that the total allocation has increased from \$3,800,000 last year to \$4,622,000 this year. If anyone ever doubts the value of what has been developed since 1972 at a total cost of about \$25m, which is not an enormous amount of money, he should look at the role played by sportsmen throughout the world in cricket, athletics or tennis. The young people of Australia are taking their rightful place in the sporting world and are playing a very important role. Australian sportsmen and sportswomen compete with others from countries that have a great range of sporting equipment. It is important to point out to sportsmen and sportswomen how to improve their techniques, whether it be running, jumping or any other sport. It is important that they be given support.

The Minister for Works and Housing is in the Chamber, as he usually is, and I wish to refer to the allocations to his portfolio. The Budget has recognised the need for increased expenditure in the areas for which he is responsible, and it contains the largest ever allocation for works and housing. As a result, continuity of funding for major capital works projects is guaranteed. The Works Department will undertake a capital works program providing for a wide range of new State Government facilities. It is expected to generate more than 3 200 man-years of employment for the State's construction industry.

The second area under his control is housing, whether for rental accommodation or home-ownership. I compliment the Minister on helping to break down the barriers of home-ownership.

Mr Davis: Why don't you compliment the Minister in charge of finance?

Mr STEPHAN: When I began my speech, I complimented the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, but the member for Brisbane Central was making so much noise—he was upset by the comments I made about members opposite—that he did not listen to what I said. When I rise to speak in a week's time, he will make the same interjections as he is making tonight.

Mr Casey: You will be silly enough to answer them, too.

Mr STEPHAN: When all one receives is silly interjections, what is one supposed to do? It is one of the hazards facing honourable members on this side of the Chamber. If members opposite wish to have their names recorded in "Hansard" by making interjections, one must oblige them occasionally. If they were ignored completely, the public could be excused for thinking that there was no Opposition present.

The Queensland Housing Commission's interest-subsidised, income-g geared loans scheme will provide those obtaining housing finance with the opportunity to take out a second loan through the Housing Commission. That second loan will help those who, despite the assistance provided through the commission's scheme and through the Commonwealth Government's first-home-owners scheme, still have difficulty bridging the funding gap to purchase their own home. It is a move that will be thoroughly appreciated. The maximum loan available under the scheme will be increased from \$35,000 to \$37,500.

A record program of assistance has been provided. The Housing Commission's spending in both instances will amount to \$181.6m—an increase of almost \$30m, or 20 per cent on the total in the 1983-84 financial year. In the field of home purchase assistance, the Government expects to make available a total of \$105.4m to help families in the low to moderate income bracket into their own homes. The Government will continue its highly successful income-g geared housing loans introduced two years ago, through which advances have already been made to a total of more than 5 000 home-purchases. The allocation of money in the Budget for that scheme represents an increase of 14.6 per cent over the amount for last financial year.

Finally, I touch briefly on education. Most members have referred to the amount provided for education in the Budget. I comment on only a couple of aspects. The provision of flying gangs for schoolground maintenance was raised when I first became member for Gympie. At that time, smaller schools, not being large enough to have their own permanent groundsman, found it very difficult to maintain their grounds without a great deal of voluntary help. The pilot scheme is providing ground maintenance assistance to Queensland's smaller schools, and is to be continued this year. The trial scheme that operated last financial year proved very popular. I point out that 11 schools in the Gympie area have taken part. As the many larger schools have their own groundsman, very few schools are not catered for.

Mr Casey: For donkey's years the Works Department had flying gangs doing the maintenance. It was your Government that sacked them all years ago.

Mr STEPHAN: There have not been flying gangs in ground maintenance. When I was at school, we were given a reaping hook to cut the blady grass and a chip hoe to keep the weeds out of the gardens. Whether the honourable member for Mackay did the same when he went to school depended on the amount of energy that he had.

Mr Casey: Are you advocating that the children of the schools should keep the grounds clean?

Mr STEPHAN: I am pointing out that if the honourable member for Mackay did the same as I did when he went to school, he helped to keep the grounds clean. That is something that does not presently occur in the education system. Many young people enjoy doing a little bit of gardening, lawn-mowing and watering. At the moment, the flying gangs have eliminated that requirement.

The other success story of the last couple of years is that of instrumental music teaching. Although it operates only in the larger schools with the necessary facilities, it certainly is appreciated. As a result of that program, the orchestras, bands and choirs in the larger schools are progressing very well indeed. I am encouraged to learn that additional music staff will be appointed to consolidate the instrumental music program.

Mr Davis: I will tell you how good that music teaching program is. Up at Spring Hill, they got rid of two music-teachers.

Mr STEPHAN: I am not sure what the honourable member was doing in Spring Hill. Perhaps the teachers were sent to areas in which their services were in greater demand. When the honourable member makes comments of that nature, he is way off beam.

I have a great deal of pleasure in complimenting the Premier and Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer and all the other Ministers on their efforts. This wonderful Budget will bring enjoyment to the people of Queensland.

Progress reported.

SENATE ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Senate Elections Act of 1960 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Gunn, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (10 p.m.): I move—

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

In late 1983, the Federal Parliament enacted the Commonwealth Electoral Legislation Amendment Act to amend the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918, which governs the conduct of elections for the House of Representatives.

Included in the amending Bill was a provision to enable a date for the close of the rolls to be inserted and another provision fixing 6 p.m. as the time for closure of the poll.

The law governing the conduct of Senate elections in Queensland is contained in the Senate Elections Act of 1960, which is a short Act of the Queensland Parliament.

The purpose of this Bill is to bring the provisions of the State Act relating to Senate elections into line with the provisions of the Commonwealth Act relating to House of Representatives elections.

Approval already exists in the State Senate Elections Act for the fixing of dates for the issue of the writ, closing of nominations, polling day and return of the writ.

The amending Bill now makes provision for a date to be inserted in the writ for the close of the rolls. This date will be seven days after the issue of the writ. Honourable members will be aware of complaints from various sections of the community that the sudden issue of election writs has in the past prevented the last-minute enrolment of electors. In the Federal sphere, electors will, in the future, have seven days to arrange to be enrolled after the issue of the writ.

Under Queensland law, voting at State elections since 1915 has ceased at 6 o'clock in the afternoon. It is perhaps interesting to mention that, prior to 1915, the polls closed at 4 p.m. The fact that voting at Commonwealth elections has been permitted until 8 p.m. has caused a great deal of confusion in the minds of some electors at State elections. Honourable members are undoubtedly aware of cases of their constituents arriving at polling booths after 6 p.m. seeking a vote in State elections. The reduction of two hours in the period for voting at Commonwealth elections will bring into line the times for the close of voting at both Commonwealth and State elections. I hope that this action will remove all confusion in the future regarding voting hours.

The Bill is a very simple one. I commend it to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Warburton, adjourned.

**QUEENSLAND TOURIST AND TRAVEL CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL**

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Act 1979-1981 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr McKechnie, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (10.3 p.m.): I move—

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

Tourism is now Queensland's second largest industry. In direct expenditure terms, the industry is worth \$832m annually, and when the full effect of tourism spending is calculated, it is worth a massive \$2.25 billion.

It is also the State's largest employer, and is a growth industry with the capacity to employ tens of thousands of Queenslanders. The industry has provided 25 000 new jobs during the past five years alone.

Queensland is the prime tourist destination for Australians, and, even more importantly, is now establishing itself as a major international destination.

The influx of American, Japanese, Singaporean, British and European tourists during the past few years has been most marked, and this State and its magnificent attractions are now being sold by major tour operators around the world.

Queensland is the only State of the Commonwealth with three international airports. Five years ago, international airline operations were confined to three major carriers. Now, no fewer than 11 international airlines operate services into our gateway ports.

During the last financial year, Queensland enjoyed 73 per cent of the total growth of Australian tourism. Whereas international tourism growth to Australia last year stood at 4 per cent, Queensland's international growth factor was 37.9 per cent.

Many years ago, the Queensland Government recognised the potential of the tourist industry and moved to assist private enterprise in exploiting both the Australian and international markets, by establishing the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in 1979.

Much of the credit for the spectacular growth of the industry must go to that body. It has promoted the State, assisted the private sector and generated wealth and jobs to the benefit of all Queenslanders.

However, the point has been reached at which we must make a major decision as to whether we allow the industry to rest on its laurels and continue to benefit from the present level of activities, or we go boldly forward, challenge major tourist destinations overseas and really establish this State as one of the great destinations.

Naturally, the Government has decided on this latter course and, along with private enterprise, will proceed to establish major international resorts at prime sites along the Queensland coast. The purpose of this Bill is to allow that course to proceed.

The Government will do its utmost to assist the corporation and private enterprise to achieve their goal of establishing major international destination resorts. However, I stress that, under the Bill, the corporation will not be involved in the day-to-day operation of tourist developments.

The Government is prepared to vest to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation parcels of Crown land which may be used to establish these resorts which are now being demanded by both sophisticated Australian tourists as well as by the big-spending international visitors.

Honourable members will notice that contained in this Bill are a number of minor mechanical measures which will enable the corporation to act as a partner in these proposed developments.

In clause 5, provision is made for the appointment of an additional director to the corporation. The Government believes this move is necessary to further strengthen the expertise of the corporation's policy-making body in the light of these exciting new developments. There is also provision to allow this new director to serve his term concurrently with the present directors of the corporation. This provision appears in clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: The honourable member for Brisbane Central has interjected. I might mention that the only tourists whom the Opposition encourages to Queensland are by way of Federal intervention of the Labor Party. That brings the Federal people here very frequently.

Earlier I mentioned to the House that the State Government is prepared to transfer selected parcels of Crown land to the corporation so that it may proceed to encourage private sector developers and financiers to complete these prime international resorts. Clause 7 of the Bill, therefore, provides for a minor change in the functions of the corporation to allow this course to proceed.

The Government would see the corporation not as the prime developer but rather as the facilitator of such projects. The corporation will receive ultimate financial benefits from the development, but will also have the capacity to ensure that such developments are of world standard and to the ultimate benefit of all Queenslanders and the State's economy. The corporation will, in fact, be able to use the value of these parcels of land as its holding in these developments.

It is proposed that the Corporation, as tourism specialists, take over the responsibility for the development of certain lands and administer and organise the tourist development of these areas in accordance with specific guide-lines.

In each case it is intended that the project will be advertised seeking expressions of interest, after which the basic conditions will be laid down, including the corporation's commitment and/or percentage equity involvement in the venture by way of the contribution of land and public tenders then called where applicable.

In all cases, the object of the exercise will be an insistence on the part of the corporation that any developer or developers will perform in accordance with the agreed conditions efficiently and within specific time limits.

In some cases it could be practicable and in the interests of the overall project to have more than one developer on a particular site.

It is also expected that in some cases the conversion of certain sections of some properties to freehold will be considered, based on specific development works being completed and in operation for a period of years.

Clause 8 will allow the land transfers to happen and will also allow the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation to enter into certain financial arrangements to ensure that these developments proceed in the manner required by this Government.

Sections 41 to 48 of the Act will be repealed because the powers which are reflected in clause 14 (3) of the Bill are now covered in terms of the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982.

The provisions that the Government has introduced are historic for the future development of tourism in this State. They will allow the tourist industry to enter a whole new phase, because, when completed, the proposed resorts will be equal to anything available in the world. The Bill will ensure that Queensland becomes one of the leading world tourist destinations.

An Opposition Member: You have a bit to go yet.

Mr McKECHNIE: Members opposite are always knockers.

Most importantly, the Bill will mean additional wealth for Queensland and all Queenslanders, and jobs for our future generations.

The Bureau of Industry Economics says that every time Queensland increases its net intake of international tourists by 25 000, another 1 200 jobs are created. These proposals are designed to do just that—create jobs, jobs and more jobs for Queenslanders.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Underwood, adjourned.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (AMENDMENT OF SUPERANNUATION PROVISIONS) BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 474) on Mr Powell's motion—

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

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (10.12 p.m.): Superficially, the Bill appears to be a simple enabling mechanism to correct an anomaly that was detected by the Government and other authorities as a result of moves to set up a national superannuation scheme for the staff of Australian universities.

I am not entirely satisfied that all the information that could have been provided has been made available. Therefore, Opposition members are not in a position to give carte blanche approval to the Bill, even though the Minister for Education has indicated an expectation of support from this side of the House.

That reservation is prompted by the ever present and shrill cries from all Government members about the right of individual choice and freedom from Government control or restraint. This Bill is undoubtedly an example of Government intrusion, which may or may not be justified.

Nevertheless, I am more concerned with the proposal that the Auditor-General, under the powers confirmed under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, be authorised to audit accounts and records of the universities. I make that comment with respect to the superannuation scheme, as it could be seen as a dangerous precedent that might lead to the eventual undermining or loss of autonomy of Queensland universities.

I do not suggest that that is the intention of the Minister, but in a State that is prone to heavy-handedness, particularly for those who do not always accept that all wisdom originates in George Street, it seems to me to be a dangerous move that could encourage the Government in the future to advance a concept of the accountability of universities to the Government by the wider application of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. There is no doubt in my mind that that Act has been used to centralise control of CAEs in this State.

That matter is, of course, of some concern to me. However, I have been reassured by the previous chairman of the board, Dr Allen, with whom I had some discussions recently. Unfortunately, there is no doubt that the provisions of the Act were intended originally to control the acknowledged excesses of one college. I shall not name the college, but the effect has certainly been to overregulate the remaining colleges and to disadvantage them, to varying degrees, in their ability to respond to a wide range of administrative matters.

Of course, the academic staff have always maintained that the Act intruded on their professionalism and reduced the flexibility in their relations with the college administration. That may or may not be so; nevertheless, that view is held.

I return to the Government's claim that there is a need for the Governor in Council to approve any amendment that is made to the university superannuation schemes. It is unfortunate, but understandable, that some participants in the James Cook University of North Queensland scheme decided to exercise an option in what amounted to the conversion to cash of their interest in the existing scheme, which was a private scheme held together by a number of leading companies, including the AMP, and to enter the new national scheme basically as new contributors rather than elect to transfer the benefit to the new scheme. I certainly agree that that is not a desirable practice.

It is true that contributors to the public service scheme have argued, without success, the case with the Government, on both access and portability. Perhaps the action of the James Cook University people draws attention to the fact that participants in the public service scheme believe they ought to have greater access.

Incidentally, the principal reason universities in Queensland have sought to avoid association with or inclusion in the State Service Superannuation Scheme is that the portability provision to which I referred a moment ago is absent. The lack of that provision greatly inhibits the movement of staff between the different States.

The universities in New South Wales are tied to the State service scheme, so they will not be able to participate in the national scheme. That is considered to be a major disadvantage suffered by the staff of colleges in New South Wales. I do not argue that element of the case.

It came as some surprise to me to learn that the Emerald Pastoral and Agricultural College is not covered by the State Service Superannuation Scheme. Until the Minister's second-reading speech, I thought it was. I hope that the Minister, in his reply, will be more explicit about this matter, because I presume that the private scheme must be more attractive, but as the level of Government contribution would not be higher, that, probably enhances the credibility of the public service claim that the earning rate and benefits to contributors to the State Service Superannuation Scheme compare unfavourably with those under other schemes, including private schemes such as that which the college may have or public service schemes in other States.

Because of recent events at the Burdekin school, the situation at Emerald has aroused interest. I note on the most recent organisation chart in the Education Department that the rural college boards are still shown as reporting directly to the Minister. That is a unique and, I might say, a privileged position. I did note, however, that the position description of the new Assistant Director-General of Education referred to responsibility for the rural colleges.

A moment ago I mentioned the accountability of rural colleges and said that it has to be examined. It is not desirable to have a situation such as that which existed at the Burdekin school, where the chairman, Mr Ray Hoey, and the school principal, Mr Bruce Boniwell, felt themselves so immune from the normal accountability that they were able to thumb their noses at the Government, ride roughshod over other board members, control the staff on the basis of fear, and treat parents and students as imbeciles. That is unacceptable. I take this opportunity to record my approval of the Minister's action in bringing about the resignation of Mr Hoey and the dismissal of Mr Boniwell.

What happened in that college should serve to ensure that the voice of the less privileged in the community is heeded by the Government. I sympathise with the instructor, Mr Cooper, who was wrongfully dismissed from the college, because his superannuation entitlement will not sustain him for very long now that he is unemployed.

I hope that some ministerial assistance is forthcoming to rehabilitate Mr Cooper, if not at the Burdekin school, in some other avenue of Government employment.

As the Grammar Schools Act clearly provides for superannuation, it is the other provision of the Bill applicable to grammar schools that has aroused my concern. My concern with respect to the grammar schools is, however, not as great as my concern with respect to the universities. The Opposition endorses the principle of accountability of the independent school sector now so generously funded by the Federal Government and not insignificantly funded by the State Government not only in per capita grants but also by way of subsidy on capital works and the numerous other support mechanisms.

The Federal Government would perhaps be more justified in for accountability, but I suspect that the Queensland Government has other motives, which I will outline. The matter to which I refer is the principle of permanent part-time teachers. The Budget papers indicate an intention to employ 400 teachers in that capacity. At the same time, I understand that, because of outstanding differences over superannuation entitlements,

there has not been any success in removing the impediment to reaching agreement with the Queensland Teachers Union on employment conditions.

Mr Powell: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr SMITH: It has. The Minister should bear with me.

As I said, there has not been any success because of outstanding differences over those superannuation entitlements. That is how it has something to do with the Bill. The independent schools certainly use part-time teachers to considerable advantage. I hope that the interests of the grammar schools are not used as a means of exercising control over the conditions of part-time employment that could be used as a yardstick by teachers in Government schools. If the Government exercises control to that extent over the superannuation scheme, it could be used as a bargaining stick to bring about the conditions with which there is now some disagreement. I would welcome the Minister's reassurance on that matter.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (10.23 p.m.): Like the honourable member for Townsville West, I believe that the Bill contains a series of important amendments. Even though those amendments seem to be relatively minor, I agree with his comment about the nature of the legislation. It is an interesting piece of legislation from a Government that prides itself on expressing a philosophy of minimal Government interference. Like so many pieces of legislation that the Government introduces in a variety of areas of concern, this Bill places a particular responsibility on the shoulders of the Governor in Council. The Executive, which is already heavily burdened with a range of other responsibilities under other Acts, has now to concern itself with the establishment and amendment of superannuation schemes and the continued participation in them by grammar schools, universities and so on.

I certainly share the Minister's concern that there needs to be some regulation of superannuation. I am concerned that the legislation that has been devised by the Government places increased powers in the hands of the Executive. On a number of occasions in this House I have been critical of the extent of executive government that characterises the style of Government of the National Party in Queensland. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the system under which Parliament is in recess for long periods and Cabinet Government is the order of the day. Again, in this Bill the Executive is being given the responsibility of overseeing that important area of superannuation. It does not sit very easily with a party that professes concern for non-interference in small government.

Nevertheless, again I share the concern of the honourable member for Townsville West, who highlighted the concern expressed by a number of CAEs when they were brought under the control of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. The point in that legislation can be extrapolated to a more general issue in relation to superannuation. I said at the outset that Opposition members are not opposed to the regulation of superannuation. In fact, it is very important that the Government maintain a rein upon superannuation undertaken in areas affected by the direct policies of the Government. I am concerned about the method of regulation and the relative success of the mode of regulation that is adopted.

It is significant that the measure is introduced now, close on the heels of an interesting report on public sector superannuation that was handed down in New South Wales. The institutions of the University of New South Wales, the University of Sydney and a number of other institutions of higher education in that State came under public notice in that report. The liability for superannuation in a number of those institutions of higher learning was far outstripping the receipts from the funds. I understand that the report highlighted unfunded liabilities of \$166m for the University of Sydney, \$167m for the University of New South Wales and \$7m for the Sydney Grammar School. I sincerely hope that similar instances of unfunded superannuation liabilities are not found in Queensland's institutions of learning. The New South Wales report estimated that

the unfunded liability for public sector superannuation in that State was \$2.5 billion. The problem is not restricted to areas covered by the Bill. More general principles of wider application ought to be considered by the House on the issue of superannuation.

The report to which I refer contains the findings of the Public Accounts Committee of the New South Wales Parliament, which has done sterling work in bringing to the attention of the public the very serious ramifications of an insufficiently funded superannuation system. The chairman of the committee, Mr Bob Carr, MLA, described the problem in that State as one of undisclosed, inadequately costed expansion of public sector superannuation benefits. I share the concern of others who have commented that the circumstances prevailing in New South Wales would extend to other States as well. Unfortunately, as we all know, the Queensland Parliament does not have a public accounts committee by which a similar investigation could be undertaken into the unfunded liability of public sector superannuation in Queensland. That is very sad. In New South Wales, the Auditor-General can issue a report. Under this Bill, the Auditor-General is charged with the responsibility of auditing the accounts of the superannuation schemes dealt with in the Bill. However, Queensland does not have a public accounts committee to delve into the fine details of that report. The lack of the appropriate machinery to fully investigate such important areas of public concern detracts from the regulatory machinery that the Parliament could put in place to ensure that we do not find ourselves burdened with a heavy public liability for superannuation.

I conclude by reiterating that control over superannuation schemes, particularly those involving public moneys, whether directly or indirectly, is very important. Appropriately, it is an area in which the Government ought to take some responsibility. I welcome the efforts of the Government to impose a degree of regulation. I always have concern when that responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the Executive. I am concerned, particularly in the broader area of public sector superannuation in this State, that members of this Chamber do not have the machinery of a public accounts committee, which is available to other Parliaments under the Westminster system and through which proper examinations and investigations by the Auditor-General can be thoroughly and properly discussed in the Chamber. I sincerely urge the Government to review its attitude to that aspect of our system of Government in Queensland. The sooner Queensland has a public accounts committee that can undertake work such as that done by the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee in relation to superannuation, the better it will be for Government in this State. A more effective Parliament we shall certainly have.

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (10.30 p.m.), in reply: I thank the two honourable gentlemen who have contributed to the debate. However, I can really only say that I wonder whether they have read the Bill. Neither of them argued the matters contained in the Bill, which seeks to amend the Grammar Schools Act, the Rural Training Schools Act, the University of Queensland Act, the Griffith University Act and the James Cook University of North Queensland Act. It does not mention CAEs at all. The members for Townsville West and Ipswich both carried on about centralised control of CAEs. The Bill has absolutely nothing to do with CAEs and I think it is a shame that they had not read the Bill.

The member who has just resumed his seat spoke about financial control, and that is exactly what the Bill is all about. The Bill provides that the Auditor-General will be able to examine financial matters. The honourable member carried on about wanting a parliamentary public accounts committee.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr POWELL: The honourable member has had his say. I sat here in silence and listened to the diatribe from both honourable members. It is about time they sat and listened to what I have to say.

The honourable member for Ipswich completely missed the point, because Queensland has no need for a parliamentary public accounts committee. Queensland has the

strongest Financial Administration and Audit Act in the country. It provides for the accountable officer—that is, the Auditor-General—to report to the Parliament and his report can be debated if honourable members so desire.

What the Bill does is bring to account all of those superannuation funds in those establishments. It is not an attempt by the Government to take control of those superannuation funds. Surely the spokesmen for the Opposition would not want the Parliament to have to amend an Act every time one of those institutions wanted to change something to do with its superannuation scheme.

Mention was made of the Emerald rural training school. Again I remind the honourable member for Townsville West of exactly what is in the Bill. Employees of rural training schools are now members of the State Service Superannuation Scheme. Prior to 1974, however, when the State Service Superannuation Act was amended to bring such employees under it, the Emerald rural training school was operating a private scheme for a few employees still in it. The amendment to the Act is necessary to cover that scheme; it is not designed with any ulterior motive at all.

The honourable member for Townsville West referred to the Burdekin Rural Training Centre and alluded to the administrative changes that have taken place there. He made an incorrect statement which I must correct. He spoke about an instructor at the school by the name of Mr Cooper being wrongfully dismissed. I remind the honourable member that the Industrial Commission upheld the decision of the board to dismiss that particular person and so, in saying what he did, the honourable member for Townsville West really is in contempt of the Industrial Commission.

All the Acts under discussion deal with public moneys, and it is important that the Auditor-General survey the institutions. It is also important that, if amendments are required, the Governor in Council can require the Auditor-General to investigate the matter as soon as possible.

With those few remarks I have attempted to correct the mistakes made by the two Opposition members who spoke. I again say that it is a pity that they had not read and thoroughly studied the Bill, which contains no ulterior motive. I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion (Mr Powell) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Powell, by leave, read a third time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
“That the House do now adjourn.”

North Stradbroke Island Bridge

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (10.37 p.m.): Yesterday’s “National Times” carried a news item stating that the long-proposed North Stradbroke Island bridge would go ahead. This is in opposition to the wishes of a large number of Stradbroke Island residents and the majority of Queenslanders, and even such a conservative force as “The Courier-Mail”, in an editorial on 27 April 1984, questioned the entire concept of the bridge.

In view of this opposition, it is necessary that every weapon at the disposal of the Australian and Queensland people be used to fight against the construction of an unnecessary, uneconomic and environmentally damaging white elephant that will cost Queensland tax-payers at least \$100m.

Queenslanders can be saved the embarrassment of such a malignant act by this malicious Government by the implementation of two international agreements entered into by the Australian Government. I have today written to the Australian Minister for Home Affairs and the Environment (Mr Barry Cohen) asking him to use Australian Government powers under the treaties to prevent the building of the bridge. The first treaty is the Convention on Wet Lands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitat. This treaty came into force on 21 December 1975, and established a list of wetlands of importance.

The second treaty is the Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of Japan for the Protection of Migratory Birds in Danger of Extinction and their Environment. That agreement gives protection to both wetland habitat and 66 species of migratory birds listed in the annex to the agreement. At least 32 of the species named in the annex have been seen in southern Moreton Bay, near the many proposed bridge routes. By any objective scientific measure, southern Moreton Bay is a wetland of international significance, and is both capable and deserving of total protection by the Federal Government.

The construction of the bridge and the major environmental problems that the creation of a virtual satellite city would pose to the ecology of Moreton Bay's southern waterways are of sufficient concern to deserve Canberra's intervention. The area is a major mangrove area, with wide reaches of sand and mudbanks exposed by the receding tides. These mudflats and their adjacent wetlands cater for a wide range of species of resident birds and, importantly, for the seasonal wading and swimming birds mentioned in the treaties. Additionally, extensive sea-grass beds exist in the area, and they are grazed by the threatened dugong.

It is not known what the precise effects of the wastes from a new satellite city on Stradbroke Island or Russell Island would be. Clearly, it could be expected that the ecology of the region would be destroyed beyond repair and that Australia would not have fulfilled her treaty obligations.

Article 6 of the treaty with Japan states specifically—

“Each Government shall endeavour to take appropriate measures to preserve and enhance the environment of birds protected under the provisions of this agreement. In particular, it shall:

(a) seek means to prevent damage to such birds and their environment.”

In part, article 7 reads—

“Each Government agrees to take measures necessary to carry out the purposes of this Agreement.”

Honourable members will see that it is not a static treaty but one in which the Australian Government is expected to take positive action, and I hope that it will take positive action.

Article 3 in the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, is in these terms—

“1. The Contracting Parties shall formulate and implement their planning so as to promote the conservation of the wetlands included in the List, and as far as possible the wise use of wetlands in their territory.”

Under the powers conferred by the Australian Constitution and agreed to by the High Court in the Franklin case last year, the legal power is present for the Australian Government to act. In the interests of world conservation, in the interests of the Australian and Queensland people, and particularly in the interests of the people of Stradbroke Island and the Redland Bay region, it should act immediately to ensure the proper preservation of the area.

It is an area about which the Hawke Government has shown, by its intervention in the Franklin dispute, that it is concerned, and every thinking Australian expects the

Government to be concerned about it. However, honourable members in this House have seen no positive action from the Queensland Government.

Once again it is to be noted that the Government intends to develop at all costs. It will forget the environment and forget about people. Opposition members do not agree with that, and I hope that the Federal Government will act quickly on the matter.

Sister Janet Seale

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (10.42 p.m.): Tonight I wish to pay a very special and sincere tribute to a person who, in what has turned out to be a tragically short career, contributed a tremendous amount to the processes of education in eastern Australia generally and in Queensland in particular.

Sister Janet Seale, who lost her life on Saturday after a fall from a cliff at Yamba in northern New South Wales, will long be remembered for her very positive and productive role in the service of education as a member of the Ursuline Order—a Catholic teaching order—and, as well, her dedication to the best interests of those students who, without choice, have to live away from home so that they may receive education at an appropriate level.

At the time of her death, Sister Janet was in the last hours of an annual retreat with seven other nuns from St Ursula's. She was to have returned to her position as principal of St Ursula's school at Toowoomba which, apart from having a large day-student component, plays a major role in providing boarding places for some 220 young ladies who comprise a segment of the student population of this State that was near and dear to her heart.

This very dedicated member of the Ursuline Order—an order that numbers approximately 120 members in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria—was raised in the farming district of Cargo in mid-western New South Wales. The loss that her mother—who I understand is not in the best of health—her three sisters and two brothers surely feel as a result of this tragedy must be overwhelming. It is a loss to us all when such a dedicated person with so much to offer is taken at a mere 43 years of age.

Sister Janet joined the Ursuline novitiate at Armidale in New South Wales about 23 years ago. She went on from there to gain an arts degree at the Australian National University, Canberra, where she also gained a diploma of education. After leaving the university, she taught at St Michael's Primary School at Lynham in the ACT, before taking up a position at St Ursula's, Armidale.

She then went on to St. Ursula's, Toowoomba, before returning to Armidale where she was most deeply involved in setting up the O'Connor Catholic High School, incorporating St Ursula's and De La Salle College as a co-educational school. Sister Janet served there as deputy principal before being appointed, about eight years ago, to St Ursula's, Toowoomba, as principal.

At the time of her death, she chaired the Catholic Education Commission Committee on the education of country children and was working up a conference on that theme for early 1985. Sister Janet was also undertaking a review of the boarding school scene in general and, specifically, needs of students forced to live away from home. She was a driving force behind the initiatives to keep boarding places open in Catholic schools for girls.

Not only was this very dedicated nun highly regarded by her peers and associates within Catholic circles, but she also had a reputation of the very highest order throughout the entire education and general community.

My main association with Sister Janet came during the last two or three years when we were members of a ministerial committee charged with the responsibility of recommending ways by which allowances paid to isolated students could be streamlined and improved. Her sincerity in representing on that committee the Catholic boarding schools and students from all sections of the community played a major role in the

thinking of the committee, which had membership from several major representative groups as well as departmental officers. The recommendations of that committee were accepted and incorporated in full in the education section of the State Budget, which was brought down by the Premier and Treasurer a week ago. That is a fitting tribute to Sister Janet.

I know that I speak for all those who worked with Sister Janet on that committee when I say that her dedication and unselfish attitude touched us all.

I believe that the work of Sister Janet Seale should be recorded in the history of this House. I extend my deepest sympathy to her immediate family and to the hundreds of students and fellow members of the Ursuline Order who are saddened and shocked by her untimely passing.

Transportation of Livestock

Mr YEWDAL (Rockhampton North) (10.47 p.m.): Tonight I wish to discuss road transport and the responsibility of the Government in road safety.

I am advised that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) is involved in the transportation of livestock, namely cattle, throughout Queensland. Although he is not officially identified with McIver Brothers Transport, reliable information indicates that he is part of that operation. I accept the proposition that Ministers are entitled to participate in private enterprise, but it seems strange that the Minister for Main Roads and his son are engaged in an industry that permits exemptions and privileges. It is my objective to clear the air as to whether Mr Hinze and his son are engaged in the transportation of cattle, given that the Government, by permit, can allow cattle trucks to carry an unlimited weight of livestock.

It has been stated that the police have charged Mr Hinze's son on many occasions for breaches of the Traffic Act and that not one of these breaches has been followed up by the Police Department.

Some haulage contractors in my electorate use vehicles such as a Nissan UD, which is described as one of the best vehicles on the road and carries a compliance plate that provides for a load of 24.6 tonnes. Those contractors, of course, are subject to police enforcement of the relevant Acts. Haulage contractors using Nissan UD vehicles are allowed to carry only 20.4 tonnes, but other vehicles are allowed to carry weight over the requirements stated on the compliance plates. Cattle trucks, by way of special permit, are allowed to carry unlimited weights of livestock. These trucks can include interstate vehicles which move from the Northern Territory into Queensland.

I have received correspondence from the Minister for Main Roads indicating that, as Minister, he is concerned about the damage caused to pavements and bridges in Queensland by commercial vehicles. Because of that concern, particular requirements are imposed on particular vehicles.

The point is, however, that cattle trucks are allowed to carry unlimited loads of livestock by way of permit. To my mind, Queensland motorists are at grave risk because of the parochial decision of the Minister, which has arisen out of his personal family interests. I challenge the Minister to reveal the truth from a personal and family viewpoint and to advise the Parliament what he intends to do about the situation that I have described.

I have spoken to many local people working within the building industry who haul building materials. When I spoke to the Minister about specific vehicles used by a haulage contractor in my electorate, I was told that the situation would remain as it was. The compliance plate on a vehicle indicates the allowable weight that the vehicle can carry apart from the all-up weight of the vehicle itself.

The vehicle in question, to which I referred earlier, is considered by most people in the industry to be one of the safest and most reliable vehicles on the road, yet the

Queensland Government will not allow that vehicle to carry the weight as set out on its compliance plate. In another instance, a vehicle with a specific weight stipulated on its compliance plate was allowed to carry a weight in excess of the stipulated weight. I reiterate that expert advice given to me is that both vehicles are safe vehicles, yet one is not allowed to carry the weight set out on the compliance plate. It is a waste of time to have a compliance plate that indicates the allowable weight that a vehicle can carry if the Government will not allow the vehicle to carry that weight.

The Minister for Main Roads is being hypocritical when he speaks of protecting bridges and pavements. I remind him of the situation that arises when two-tier cattle trucks carrying livestock drive in the middle of the road, particularly in outback areas, and force other motorists to the edge of the road. I have been advised by the Cattlemen's Union that drivers are fearful that if they move their vehicles to the side of the road they will tip over, so they refuse to do so. That opinion is shared by people with expertise in the industry. The Government allows that situation to prevail.

I return to my initial comment, that the Minister for Main Roads is involved in the cattle transport industry and that his son is involved. I believe that the Minister has instituted certain procedures within the industry to protect not only his own interests but also his son's. He is not prepared to tidy the matter up in the interests of the community generally. He is not concerned for the safety of the ordinary motorists who are forced to share the roads with cattle trucks. Trucks from other States and the Northern Territory act in the same manner.

Time expired.

Northern Development

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (10.52 p.m.): Today it has been clearly shown in debate that the Queensland Budget is a spurious document and a totally dishonest one. It is weak in all aspects, but particularly so in regard to northern development. Except for a one-line reference to staff, no mention of northern development is made in the Budget papers.

Because the National Party has no policy on northern development, the scope of the Northern Development portfolio is quite limited. That fact is reflected in the capabilities of the various Ministers to whom the Premier and Treasurer has in recent times allocated the portfolio. To say the least, those Ministers have been very limited in intelligence.

Look at the role that the present Minister has played. He has touched on this and that, but even in that small effort he has been either wrong, if not downright dishonest, or concerned with trivia.

Because the Government has no northern development policy, the Minister has nowhere to go in relation to policy. However, that does not stop him gallivanting round the country at the tax-payers' expense—mostly confirming how foolish he is.

A classic example can be found in the Karumba barge project. Some time ago, the Minister learned that the Aurukun Co-operative Company was interested in an arrangement that would allow goods, particularly perishable food lines, to be carried by barge from Karumba to Aurukun, with cattle taken out on the return trip. Mr Katter attempted to get on the bandwagon and told me in this House that a similar scheme that he had in mind would result in a much lower cost of living for Peninsula and Gulf people. I have no doubt that the Aurukun Co-operative Company's proposal will benefit the communities of both Aurukun and Mornington Island when McIvors establish the barge service in the near future, but it will certainly be of no benefit to people in other places. The Minister is simply pulling the wool over the eyes of the people. What is needed are roads and communications, and the Minister should be aware of that.

On two occasions Mr Katter has mentioned roads. Earlier this year he called at Laura for a National Party meeting, and someone mentioned the need for a certain

bridge on the Peninsula Developmental Road. Mr Katter was not certain which bridge it was, but that did not stop him. He could not remember the name, so he picked one out of the hat. He mentioned a bridge over the Archer River. That bridge had been built two years earlier and opened by Mr Hinze, a Cabinet colleague.

Next time someone mentioned roads, Mr Katter was more careful. He simply said, "I will have to take that up with Mr Hinze." So he is capable of learning not to get his fingers burned twice.

The north is crying out for development, and the job warrants the appointment of a sensible, intelligent Minister. The Government, which has been in power for 30 years, cannot provide such a Minister. It has done nothing for the north, and it has no policies for the north. Road construction, port development and water supplies are required. Anyone who travels in the north can see that those facilities are needed, particularly at Thursday Island, Cooktown and Karumba.

Millions of dollars are earned for this State by the fishing industry and the prawning industry in Karumba. But where is the voice of the Minister for Northern Development in regard to the urgently needed water supply for that town? He is just not heard.

Where is he when he is needed? He himself does not know where he is. He did not even know when he was in his father's electorate. His honesty has been questioned by the media, in particular by "The Cairns Post" in an important editorial.

With those urgent matters under debate, the Minister stated that he organised lighting for the cattleyards at Mount Surprise. So all of the important things go begging. The Minister turned his attention to something that is certainly important to the people in Mout Surprise and the people trucking cattle out of that area; but what about the real issues? In fact, that small but important matter was sorted out earlier this year when I had a win with the Railway Department. It has agreed to provide lighting at the railway cattle-trucking yards.

The Government is not interested in major matters that are particularly relevant to northern development. One had only to look at the incredible "60 Minutes" program last Sunday to see how foolish the Minister is. He went totally beyond the bounds of the Government's policy on the deed of grant in trust for Aboriginal people. He has proved to be a divisive person as far as the Edward River community is concerned. A lot more will be heard about that issue.

The Minister is totally incapable. He is flapping round the place like a chook with its head cut off. In all kindness, that is all that I can say about the man. The Minister's permanent head in the Department of Community Services is going his own way and taking no notice of him. In the meantime, what is happening to northern development? It is suffering. In all of the Budget documents, the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer can give only one line to northern development, and that is where reference is made to staff on page 60 under the heading "Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs". I will have a great deal more to say about that matter during the Budget debate.

Northern Development

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (10.57 p.m.): Northern development is suffering as far as help from the Commonwealth Government is concerned. Before that last Federal election, the Federal member for Leichhardt (Mr Gayler) promised that five new patrol boats would be built by NQEA. On Thursday, 24 February 1983, in "The Cairns Post" he is reported as having promised that the Federal Government would build five new patrol boats. Honourable members probably heard that recently NQEA had to lay off about 90 employees because of lack of work in north Queensland as the result of the Federal Government's failure to honour its promise to build five new patrol boats.

Councillor Tom Pyne of the Mulgrave Shire Council and Alderman Ron Davis of the Cairns City Council have seen fit to go to Canberra to beg the Federal Government

to honour its promises. I might add that Councillor Tom Pyne is a Labor man. He stood for Labor endorsement at the plebiscite in Cairns, but he was defeated. He is desperately trying to get the Federal Government to do something about creating employment in north Queensland by keeping to its promises. It is unfortunate that the Labor member for Leichhardt (Mr John Gayler), who is pretty good at making a few comments and asking Dorothy Dix questions about me in Federal Parliament—which were absolute tripe and rubbish—cannot even look after his own affairs as a parliamentarian. The Labor Party is extremely worried about him.

Mr Scott: He will be a minister after the election.

Mr MENZEL: I do not think that he will even be a Minister of religion. He certainly will not be a member of a Government.

Recently Mr Gayler was in Cooktown with the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr Morris). I understand that the date was approximately 1 September. Apparently a reception was arranged at the Endeavour Inn, but Mr Gayler went to a fish and chip shop earlier that night—

Mr Booth: Would you say that he is a connoisseur of fish and chips?

Mr MENZEL: I do not know what he is. Apparently he forgot about the reception and did not turn up. There is obviously something wrong. He does not know what is going on. Whether he was drunk or not, I do not know. He seems to be gaining the reputation that he does not turn up where he should turn up. He has not honoured the promises that he made before the Federal election. He promised a great deal to the sugar industry. He promised a great deal to many others. The ship-building industry that was being built up in the Cairns district was very important to north Queensland. Assistance to North Queensland Engineers and Agents through continuity of orders assured the existence of many other industries. Expertise of use to other industries, including the sugar industry, could be gathered.

Mr Gayler has let down north Queensland. He has let down his electorate. Last Tuesday, I think it was, he claimed that the contract to build new patrol boats in north Queensland was cancelled by the previous Federal Liberal-National Party Government. That was denied, of course, and has been proved to be incorrect. It is unfortunate that Mr Gayler handles the truth carelessly. Whether it is intentional or not, I do not know. If he spent less time in the hotels—

Mr Booth: And fish and chip shops.

Mr MENZEL: Yes, and if he did his job, we in north Queensland would be much better off.

Instant Casket

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (11.2 p.m.): Not very many people, I suppose, know of somebody who has literally thrown away \$10,000. It has been my misfortune to meet somebody who, within the last three months, did that. The person had a winning ticket in Instant Casket, but he unfortunately thought that he had to have the three \$10,000s in line.

He saw me in my electorate office after returning to the newsagent from whom he bought the ticket. He did not discover his error until he spoke to his wife about two days after purchasing the ticket. He said, "I had a near miss the other day. I almost got three \$10,000s together. I just missed out." She told him the reality, which is that the figures may be in any position whatever. He said to the newsagent, "You must be able to verify this." He assumed that the distribution of tickets would ensure that. Of course, the newsagent rightly told him that, if he were able to say where those tickets were being distributed, the system would be subject to rigging, and crooked. When he came to my office, I of course told him exactly the same thing.

I discovered that his was not an isolated incident. The same newsagent said that he did not doubt what the person had told him. He had had other customers who, after several weeks, had confessed to not understanding that the figures could be at random rather than in line. On checking with other newsagents, I found similar reports.

I call upon the appropriate Minister, who I assume is the Premier and Treasurer, to instruct the Golden Casket Art Union Office to advertise the conditions. Those who have bought Instant Casket tickets will be aware that the conditions are minutely printed on the back. There is no place, as there is in New South Wales, for people to print "NFP"—not for publication. In other respects, the New South Wales ticket is virtually identical.

The important point is that, because of a complete absence of advertising, a battler or, in the instance I refer to, a person of average means—an extraordinarily good bowler, but not a rich man—could literally throw away \$10,000. It appears that many other Queenslanders of average means are throwing away money on the misunderstanding that the numbers must be in line. I call upon the authorities, if they advertise to attract the dollar of the person who buys tickets, to fulfil their obligation by advertising the conditions of the game and ensuring that people understand the conditions. I hope that I never again strike somebody who has thrown away \$10,000—or even \$100, \$50 or \$2.

I also call upon the responsible Minister to have the tickets printed in future with a space for those people who choose not to have their name disclosed if they are lucky enough to win one of the \$50,000 jackpots that are frequently drawn. The Instant Casket is clearly a great success. I have no objection to it. However, the Government, which can find plenty of money for advertising the Budget and for advertising the second electoral canvass in two years—it will lead to more people being disfranchised than enfranchised—has a responsibility to make sure that those who support the Instant Casket understand the rules of the game.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.