Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1984

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

PARLIAMENT HOUSE BOOKLETS AND BROCHURES

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, yesterday the honourable member for Lytton raised with me the matter of availability of booklets and brochures on Parliament House for distribution to schoolchildren and visitors. I wish to advise the House that present stocks are low, but I have today requested that urgent consideration be given to the reprinting of these important publications.

Honourable Members: Hear, Hear!

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Order in Council under the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act 1978

Regulations under the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971-1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing; Allegations by Member for Rockhampton North

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: I do not usually make ministerial statements, but last night in this House the member for Rockhampton (Mr Yewdale) made a statement that contained some extraordinary allegations about the business affairs of my family and myself. That statement, from beginning to end, is a farrago of nonsense. He is a member of the Labor Party, which in recent days has made much of its high-minded commitment to respecting the privacy of a politician's family life. Sadly, the honourable member does not subscribe to that commitment. As far as I am concerned, there will be no "Cry for me, Argentina" I can bite, kick and scream as much as he can. So when he picks on my family, he is picking on me. I thought that the honourable member was a good bloke. However, the person who fed him such muck is down the drain, and the honourable member went down with him.

The statement last night alleged, on the basis of "reliable information", to use his words, that I was part of an operation called McIver Brothers Transport. This company is supposed to be involved in the transportation of cattle throughout Queensland. That may be so, but I have no association with that company. The allegation is a contemptible, cheap smear with absolutely no basis of fact. I challenge the honourable member to repeat it outside this House. I will hit him with a writ so fast that his head will spin.

To continue with the honourable member's fantasy trip—I am supposed, with my family, to be engaged in the cattle transportation business and, by innuendo, for that reason I amended the Main Roads Regulations to allow cattle trucks to carry unlimited weight. I have heard some outrageous allegations in my life but that one comes close to the top of the heap. The only association that I have ever had with cattle is the buying, selling and breeding of dairy cows. Let me assure the honourable member and his Opposition colleagues that there is a considerable difference between beef cattle and dairy cows.

Whenever it has been necessary to transport dairy cows, my family company has retained the services of a carrier whose service at the time has been both available and as cheap as possible. I do not even own a cattle transportation vehicle.

The honourable member also alleges that the police have charged my son on many occasions for breaches of the Traffic Act and that not one of those breaches was ever followed up. That again is an outrageous lie. I have three sons who are engaged in a family business of transporting sand and gravel. Since 1980, they have, collectively, been stopped and their vehicles weighed by Main Roads Department weight-of-load inspectors a total of eight times. Those weighings have resulted in four prosecutions and four warnings.

If the honourable member is trying to suggest that I, as Main Roads Minister, have ever tried to intervene with my department in any way to try to have charges against my sons dropped, I seem to have failed notably in that intervention. Never—I repeat "never"—have I attempted to do so; nor would I. The normal processes of the law apply equally to my sons and anybody else.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North accused me of being hypocritical about my concern for the proper protection of Queensland's roads and bridges. That is as big a nonsense as the rest of his flight of fantasy. At all times in almost 10 years as Main Roads Minister I have placed the protection of our road asset at a high priority. It was because of my action that the weight-of-load operation of the Main Roads Department was improved.

The amendments to the regulations governing the road transport of livestock came into force on 1 July last year. They were introduced after a careful review. If the honourable member wants to find out about them, he should obtain the information pamphlet from the Main Roads Department. It is obvious that he has a strange and distorted view of what those new rules mean. Briefly, they mean that strict and specific dimension and stringent safety requirements must be met before an exemption certificate is granted for a vehicle carrying livestock. That exemption certificate system met the needs of the livestock transport industry and ensured that road safety and protection of the road surface were also observed.

The honourable member should apologise for his intemperate outburst. I can understand why he knows nothing about the regulations—he simply failed to do his homework—but I cannot understand why he used the protection of this House to make such an attack on my family. To put it mildly, he was wrong from go to whoa.

Auditor-General's Reports

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: In the course of his contribution to the Budget debate yesterday the honourable member for Nundah drew attention to the non-availability to the House of what he referred to as the Auditor-General's report and made certain comments regarding the usual timing of presentation of statements that are furnished to Parliament under cover of a report from the Auditor-General.

Honourable members would be aware that the format and composition of the major financial reports to Parliament have been changed significantly in recent years. This has resulted primarily from progressive improvements and refinements aimed at full conformity with the prescriptions and intent of the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

It is true to say that, prior to 1982, the Treasurer's Annual Statement and the departmental accounts, and the Auditor-General's report or reports thereon, were presented as a joint document more or less simultaneously with the delivery of the Budget and associated documents. However, in 1982, the two reports were separated for reasons explained by the Auditor-General in his report on the departmental appropriation accounts for the year ended 30 June 1982. In short, it was pointed out that presentation of the departmental appropriation accounts and the Auditor-General's report within the time space prescribed by the Financial Administration and Audit Act was not possible and, by agreement with the Treasurer, the report was to be presented separately. It was, in fact, tabled on 28 October.

The same procedure was followed in 1983; but, because of the late timing of the Budget presentation and subsequent debates in that year, the two reports were available to the House.

There is a third major report, namely, the Auditor-General's Report on the Miscellaneous Departmental Accounts and the Accounts of Statutory Bodies and Local Authorities, which is usually tabled well after the other two.

I fully appreciate the desirability of the departmental appropriation accounts and the Auditor-General's report thereon being available to honourable members during the Estimates debate and, to this end, the Treasury, the Auditor-General's Department and departments generally are giving top priority to completion of the document. The objective is to have the report tabled early next week and I am assured that, unless some major problem eventuates in the logistics involved in the completion of the document, that objective will be achieved.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Overseas Travel by Officers of Statutory Bodies

Mr WARBURTON asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Which officers of statutory bodies under the control of the Queensland Government travelled overseas during 1983-84?

(2) To which locations did they travel and for what purpose?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The information requested is not readily available and to provide it would require considerable research by all departments, involving many man-hours by numerous staff, which could not be justified. However, I assure the Leader of the Opposition that all overseas travel by personnel of statutory authorities is strictly controlled.

Since May 1983, the prior approval of Cabinet has had to be obtained for all such travel by members, officers or staff of statutory authorities in Queensland, with the exception of local authorities. Unless otherwise approved by Cabinet, the period of absence is not to exceed one month and a report is required to be submitted to the Minister concerned within one month of the employee returning to Queensland.

2. Young Farmer Establishment Scheme

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

With reference to the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme—

(1) What are the names of all people who have qualified under this scheme?

(2) What is the amount of finance involved in each case?

(3) What interest rates are charged?

(4) What is the type of farming to be undertaken?

Answer—

(1 to 4) The detailed information sought by the honourable member is contained in a table of two pages. I table that document and seek leave to have it incorporated in "Hansard"

Leave granted.

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

Borrower	Amount of Advance	Industry
	$	
Schultz, J. L. and E.	75,000	Small Crops
Tomlinson, P. C. and K. D.	184,800	Grain
Mullins, P. K.	150,000	Cattle
Kellock, J. C. and V. J.	175,000	Sheep
Dunbar, N. S.	150,000	Grain
Lines, M. A.	50,000	Grain
Johnstone, G. P. and B. A.	175,000	Grain
Woodward, D. and J. F.	130,000	Dairying
Finger, R. L. and G. J.	235,000	Cattle
Wieden, W. A. and C. M.	115,000	Piggery
Miller, G. L. and N. A.	150,000	Grain
Tuite, P. T. and M. J.	160,000	Grain
Wight, D. A. and C. A.	150,000	Cane
McClymont, C. N. and J. S.	200,000	Grain
Wheildon, L. J. and Palmer, R. L.	150,000	Small Crops
Cuttler, B. J. and M. J.	218,000	Dairying
Dwan, M. G. and M. C.	120,000	Dairying
Searle, R. J.	130,000	Cane
Cotton, T. W. C. and D. P.	156,000	Grain
James, N. W. and R.	120,000	Grain
Cupples, J. C. and J. A. L.	150,000	Grain
Marshall, M. M. and C. W.	125,000	Dairying
Hamilton, J. D.	200,000	Grain
Brierley, R. F. G. and G. C.	30,000	Small Crops
Cole, R. J. and P. A.	160,000	Poultry
Smith, T. F. B. and S. J.	140,000	Sheep
Steele, P. A. and C. D.	134,000	Sheep
Sue See, J. M. and Scott, J. J.	192,500	Lucerne
Aquili, L. J. and K. H.	85,000	Lucerne
Blacklock, B. M. and C. L.	100,000	Sheep
Bennett, P. B. and G. E.	150,000	Cattle
Keyes, M. I. and H. K.	152,000	Grain
Sattolo, L.	90,000	Cattle
Gaze, W. and B. S.	256,000	Grain
Gray, K. B.	150,000	Dairying
Scriven, P. R.	80,000	Sheep
Horrocks, R. W.	130,000	Grain
O'Halloran, J. F. and D. M.	220,000	Dairying
Crotty, A. B. and D. A.	170,000	Sheep
Pierce, P. A.	195,000	Cattle
Wright, P. A. and D. M.	145,000	Grain
Kopeinkin, N. T. and S. A.	100,000	Dairying
Milner, K. J. and S. M.	65,000	Cattle
Kapernick, R. R. and R. P.	150,000	Grain
Brown, G. P. and S. M.	120,000	Dairying
Weise, J. G. and J. R.	160,000	Dairying
Hamilton, St. J. W. and F. E.	160,000	Sheep
Newborn, R. D. and M. A.	125,000	Lucerne
Schouten, G. J. and L. M.	80,000	Small Crops
Schutt, J. C. and Peck, G. C.	150,000	Cattle
Usher, G. R. A. and W. J.	105,000	Sheep
Roger, W. B. and J. M.	90,000	Grain
Howland, R. M. and E. J.	160,000	Cattle
Rodney, P. M. and A. G.	65,000	Dairying
Hunwick, J. R. and P. J.	65,000	Grain
Batt, C. V. and D.	120,000	Sheep
Rowbotham, A. J. and D. M.	110,000	Dairying
Leeson, J. T. and A. A.	180,000	Lucerne
Torrisi, S. L. and M. E.	97,000	Cane
Southern, B. R. F.	170,000	Grain
O'Connell, B. R.	163,000	Sheep

(3) Initially, the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme was introduced based on an interest rate of 15% which was tied to the Commonwealth T.A.P. stock rate up to 25 January, 1983. The set of interest rates was:

First 2 years @ 60% of 15% = 9.0%
Then 2 years @ 70% of 15% = 10.5%
Then 2 years @ 80% of 15% = 12.0%

Then 2 years @ 90% of 15% = 13.5%
Balance of loan 15.0%

In a subsequent review dated 25 January, 1983, the interest rate was reduced to 13.6% in line with the prevailing interest rates on Commonwealth Bond at that point in time. A new set of rates was introduced.

First 2 years @ 60% of 13.6% = 8.2%
Then 2 years @ 70% of 13.6% = 9.5%
Then 2 years @ 80% of 13.6% = 10.9%
Then 2 years @ 90% of 13.6% = 12.2%
Balance of loan 13.6%

These new rates apply only to new loans negotiated after that date. Therefore, at present, two sets of interest rates apply to loans. The rate of interest depends on when the loan was approved.

3. Overseas Travel by Primary Industries Department Officers

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Which officers of the Primary Industries Department travelled overseas during 1982-83, 1983-84, and since July 1984 and, in particular, to what locations and for what purpose?

(2) Between now and 30 June 1985, which officers are proposed to be sent overseas, to what locations, and for what purpose between now and 30 June 1985?

Answer—

(1) During 1982-83, 34 officers travelled overseas; during 1983-84, 55 officers; and from July 1984 to October 1984, 17 officers travelled overseas on official duties.

(2) It is proposed to send an additional 44 officers overseas between now and 30 June 1985.

I seek leave to have the information on the details of the officers involved, the destinations and purposes of their visits incorporated in "Hansard".

Leave granted.

Department of Primary Industries Officers Who Travelled Overseas in 1982-83.

Officer	Location	Purpose
R. A. I. Drew	Philippines	Taxonomy of fruit fly for U.S. Department of Agriculture
G. E. Rayment	Fiji	Soil fertility for Fiji Native Land Development Authority
	Indonesia	Present paper at International Conference
S. L. Williams	Japan	Tuna Export Market Study for Queensland Fish Board
H. Holt	Hong Kong Taiwan Japan Korea	Cotton Sales Promotion Mission with Cotton Marketing Board
D. Smith	Thailand	Citrus Pest Management Program for F.A.O.
	China	Australia/China Agricultural Exchange Mission—Biological pest control (Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry)
A. Stoler	Hong Kong Singapore	Identify quality requirements of horticulture markets for Rosevale Trading Company (Queensland)
R. J. Dalgliesh	Cuba	Protozoology study for F.A.O.
G. J. Busby R. T. Cowan	Philippines	Dairy training needs assessment for Australian Development Assistance Bureau (ADAB)
J. M. Hopkinson	Zimbabwe	Tropical seed production for Grassland Management Group
B. Berge	Fiji	Marketing Consultant to South Pacific Commission
D. Hamilton	China	Australia/China Agricultural Exchange Program—Feasibility study on agrochemicals (Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry)

Officer	Location	Purpose
P. N. Thurbon	Nepal	Livestock Development Project for Western Australia Department of Agriculture and Australian Development Assistance Bureau (ADAB)
P. Beasley	Mexico	Conduct Sheep Training Course for GRM International (Queensland consultancy firm)
	U.S.A.	Collect data on sheep breeding developments
A. George	Fiji	Feasibility study on developing horticulture crops for Native Land Development Authority
G. B. McCormack	Thailand	Dairy research needs and marketing strategies for Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR)
L. L. Callow	Kenya	Attend as Board Member meeting of International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases
W. V. Mungomery	U.S.A. United Kingdom Europe	Study tour re pesticide regulations
J. G. Miller	United Kingdom Netherlands Denmark West Germany	Study tour re dairy cattle nutrition and management
Y. S. Chung	United Kingdom Europe	Study tour re animal disease control
K. J. Coughlan	U.S.A. Canada United Kingdom Brazil Netherlands	Study tour re salinity research
P. R. Beal	United Kingdom West Germany Netherlands	Study tour re horticultural research
C. P. Hamilton	Philippines U.S.A. Cuba Jamaica Brazil South Africa Mauritius	Study tour re sugar industry organisation and production control
A. P. Saranin	Hawaii Cuba United Kingdom Denmark South Africa	Study tour re sugar cane and beet analysis systems
B. J. Watson	North and South America	Study tour re new horticultural crops
G. G. White	Austria United Kingdom U.S.A.	Study tour re stored products fumigation
N. C. Gillespie	New Caledonia French Polynesia Hawaii	Study tour re Ciguatera poisoning
I. W. Brown	Hawaii	Study tour re spanner crab fishery
B. Kitchen	Sweden United Kingdom	Visit re dairy milking technology
M. R. Mackinnon	Thailand	To take part in barramundi fishery training course
G. I. Alexander J. M. Barnes	Switzerland Thailand Malaysia	To attend sugar talks and visit agricultural projects
P. Newlands	U.S.A.	Study tour re new computer technology
R. Harty	Canada	Study tour re seed testing

Department of Primary industries Officers Who Travelled Overseas in 1983-84.

R. G. Holroyd	U.S.A. (Hawaii)	To take part in a veterinary workshop
M. C. Cox	Philippines	Visit to International Rice Research Institute
M. C. Cox	Columbia	Visit to obtain new rice varieties
P. S. Brennan	Japan	To take part in wheat genetics symposium

Officer	Location	Purpose
T. Dickson	Japan	To attend soybean symposium and visit soybean research centres
R. G. Henzell	Italy	To take part in workshop on sorghum diseases
P. Moody	U.S.A., Belgium, U.K. and Netherlands	Study tour re soil phosphorus
B. Walker	Cuba and Ethiopia	Consultancy re tropical pastures
D. S. Loch	Cuba	Consultancy re pasture seed
M. Bengston	Malaysia and Philippines	Consultancy re control of grain storage pests
P. Sampson	Malaysia and Philippines	Consultancy re control of grain storage pests
C. W. Winks	China	To lead Commonwealth mission on subtropical horticulture
K. Fitzgerald	Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand	Consultancy re overseas development projects
L. Callow	Sri Lanka, India and Kenya	Consultancy re animal diseases
R. V. Byrnes	Japan	Study tour re intensive livestock industries
I. F. Beale	China	Consultancy re proposed research centre in China
J. K. Leslie	Kenya	Consultancy re collaborative research project
J. W. Ryley	Japan	Study tour re intensive livestock, fisheries and horticulture
B. A. Franzmann	U.S.A.	Study tour re sorghum midge
B. C. Dodd	U.S.A.	Study tour re deciduous fruit
J. Steiner	East and West Germany	Study tour re trace elements in animal nutrition
P. Timms	France and Kenya	Study tour re animal diseases (tick fever)
T. H. Rudder	South Africa	To take part in a World Congress on Sheep and Beef Cattle Breeding
H. F. Olsen	Italy	Study tour re estuarine fisheries
G. I. Alexander	Indonesia	Consultancy re overseas aid projects
G. I. Alexander	Switzerland and U.K.	To accompany Minister to sugar talks
G. I. Alexander	U.S.A., U.K. and Switzerland	International discussions re sugar
J. Barnes	Switzerland and U.K.	To take part in sugar discussions
F. J. Keenan P. J. Ketterer	Indonesia	Control of Foot and Mouth disease outbreak
R. H. Chisholm	Somalia, Sudan and U.S.A.	Consultancy re grain sorghum
G. E. Rayment	Fiji	Consultancy re pigeon pea research
W. Kidston	Singapore, U.K., Netherlands and Italy	Study tour of wholesale markets
B. Woolcock	Korea	Conference re animal disease control
T. Passlow J. Turner	Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand	Consultancy re control of Fruit Fly
D. R. J. Densley	Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya	Consultancy re training needs
N. Paull	Egypt	Consultancy re control of brucellosis
R. Neiper	U.S.A.	To assist in control of fowl plague outbreak
M. McKinnon	India	Consultancy for FAO re inland fisheries
R. Shorter G. Purss	Indonesia	Consultancy re peanut improvement
R. Bygott (Rural Reconstruction Board)	France, Netherlands, U.K., Canada & U.S.A.	Study tour re agricultural lending organisations
B. Peacock B. Brown	Thailand, Malaysia & Singapore	Consultancy re mango research
I. Brown	Vanuatu	Consultancy re coconut crabs
D. Hoffman	Indonesia	Consultancy re cattharal fever
P. N. Thurbon	U.K.	To attend conference on milk production
P. Van Beek	U.K. & Netherlands	Study tour re agricultural extension
R. Shorter K. Middleton	Indonesia	Consultancy re peanut improvement
W. D. Mitchell	Thailand	Study tour re dairy improvement
I. Robinson	U.K.	Development of export markets in U.K.
M. Jorgensen	U.K. & Western Europe	Development of export markets in EEC
J. C. Armitstead	Burundi	Consultancy re cattle dip analysis
I. F. Martin	U.S.A. & Mexico	Study tour re maize breeding
J. K. Teitzel	Malaysia	Consultancy re tropical pasture training course

Officer	Location	Purpose
R. Barke	Hong Kong, Singapore & Malaysia	Tropical fruit and vegetable trade mission
P. Twine	China	Consultancy re entomological problems

Department of Primary Industries Officers Who Have Or Will Travel Overseas In 1984-85

(*Have Travelled Since 1-7-84)

M. Bengston	Malaysia Philippines	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) Research Project
P. Samson	Malaysia Philippines	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) Research Project
D. Hoffman	Indonesia	ACIAR Research Project
B. Peacock	Malaysia Singapore Thailand	ACIAR Research Project
I. Muirhead	Malaysia Singapore Thailand	ACIAR Research Project
R. A. I. Drew	Malaysia	ACIAR Research Project
N. Heather	Malaysia	ACIAR Research Project
L. L. Callow	Kenya Sri Lanka India	Meeting of International Laboratory for Research into Animal Diseases (ILRAD) and develop ACIAR Research Projects
R. J. Dalgliesh	Kenya Sri Lanka	Meeting of ILRAD and assist with development of ACIAR Research Projects
I. B. Staples*	India	Collect grass and legume species for future Queensland evaluation in conjunction with International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (F.A.O.)
R. T. Cowan J. K. Teitzel M. A. Gilbert	Malaysia	Conduct Fifth Regional Tropical Pasture Training Course for S. E. Asia for F.A.O. and Commonwealth Secretariat
R. N. Shepherd*	Philippines	Advise ADAB Project on soil conservation measures, land use planning and research
B. Brown*	China	Demonstrate lychee post-harvest technology
D. S. Loch*	Zimbabwe	Participate and present paper on pasture seed production at an International Conference on behalf of ACIAR
I. Brown	Vanuatu	ACIAR Research Project
R. Shorter	Indonesia	ACIAR Research Project
J. Rhodes K. Houston	Tonga	ACIAR Research Project
K. Middleton	India Indonesia	Present paper at International Conference and ACIAR Research Project
K. B. FitzGerald P. N. Thurbon	Thailand	Develop ACIAR Research Project
R. G. Silcock	Ethiopia	Assist International Livestock Centre for Africa with research planning
G. J. Busby E. V. Sigley	Philippines	Follow up ADAB Dairy Training Course
R. Erskine-Smith	Malaysia Philippines Indonesia	ACIAR and ADAB Project administration in respect to QDPI projects
G. S. Vinning*	Singapore	AGASIA 84 Representation
G. B. McCormack*	Malaysia	AGASIA 84 Representation
G. S. Vinning	United Kingdom Europe	Investigate trade prospects for Queensland rural industries
K. Howard*	Ethiopia	Feasibility study of small feed lots for smallholder farms for Australian consulting firm
A. Diatloff*	Indonesia	Investigate problems in legume establishment for an ADAB project
I. H. Rayner*	Singapore Indonesia	Feasibility study of establishing large scale dairy farm to supply Singapore fresh milk market for Asia Dairies Pty. Ltd.
M. Dredge	Papua New Guinea	For Papua New Guinea Government assist with development of small scale prawn fishing project

Officer	Location	Purpose
D. Woodruff*	Mexico U.S.A.	Attend Tropical Wheat Symposium and visit research centres
J. K. Leslie*	Kenya	Assist with Agricultural Research programming for International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR)
I. Partridge	Solomon Islands	Assist South Pacific Commission with Beef Cattle Training Course
R. A. I. Drew* N. Heather*	U.S.A.	Participate in International Workshop on Fruit Fly Research on behalf of U.S.D.A.
Mr McPherson*	Noumea	On behalf of South Pacific Commission participate in Sixteenth Regional Technical Meeting on Fisheries Development
J. P. Beumer	Fiji	Advise Fiji Authorities on long term research for freshwater eel fishery
B. White	United Kingdom Europe	Investigate trade prospects for Queensland rural industries
J. Woods	Thailand Malaysia Singapore	Representation at Trade Exhibit, Thailand and follow up AGASIA 84
T. Passlow*	U.S.A.	Participate in International Sorghum Insect Pest Workshop
R. L. Harty H. Low	Colombia	Organisation and participation in International Seed Testing Association Workshop
M. L. Tierney	Korea	Participate in Third Annual Science Congress of Asia—Australian Association of Animal Production
L. D. Ward	U.S.A.	Visit research institutes concerned with conservation cropping systems on soil types similar to Queensland
G. D. Smith	United Kingdom Europe	Attend International Conference on Movement of Water and Salts in Heavy Clay Soils and visit research centres
R. J. Baker	Brazil U.S.A. Canada Malawi	Study of tobacco industries
M. V. Mungomery	U.S.A. Canada	Visit Government agencies to investigate methods adopted to minimise problems in use of agricultural chemicals
G. I. Johnson	U.S.A. Canada Europe	Attend Ninth International Tobacco Scientific Conference and visit centres concerned with tobacco disease research
J. K. Kochman	Argentina	Attend Eleventh International Sunflower Conference and visit sunflower research centres
R. D. Berndt	U.S.A.	Investigate legislative and organisational activities for soil and water conservation in the U.S.A.
J. R. Syme*	U.S.A. Canada	Investigate computer based systems at universities and Government Departments
B. Rodda	U.S.A. South Africa	Investigate management procedures at agricultural research stations
N. Kruger	U.S.A. Europe	Study administration of Government plant quarantine services
Y. S. Chung*	Japan	Obtain further practical experience in laboratory work on fish diseases.
B. J. McDonald	Japan	Present paper at Tenth International Congress of Biometeorology and consult researchers on cashmere production
R. J. Houston	U.K. Europe	Attend Seventeenth International Congress of Entomology and study developments in insect taxonomy
M. D. Connolle	U.S.A.	Attend Ninth Congress of International Society of Human and Animal Mycology
T. I. Smeltzer	U.S.A.	Attend International Symposium on Salmonellosis

4. Lower Mary River Irrigation Project

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

With reference to the Lower Mary River Irrigation Project—

(1) How much money has been spent to date?

(2) What is the expected completion date for this project?

Answer—

(1) To 30 June 1984, $8.2m has been spent on the construction of the Mary River and Tinana Creek barrages and the Owanyilla and Copenhagen Bend systems. The Copenhagen Bend system will supply water to farms downstream of the Mary River Barrage. Tenders will be called prior to Christmas for the construction of the Owanyilla pump station and associated pumping plant. When the Owanyilla channel and pump station are constructed, water will be pumped from the Mary River Barrage to supplement supplies in the Tinana Creek Barrage. Tenders will be called in 1985 for channelworks for the Walkers Point section of the project.

(2) As a result of a substantial increase in funding by way of special State grants over a three-year period, construction of the scheme should be completed in 1987 at a cost of approximately $23m.

5. Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme

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

What impact will the State Budget allocations for 1984-85 have on progress and completion of the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme?

Answer—

In the 1984-85 State Budget, $13.1m has been allocated to the Bundaberg Irrigation Project, including $4m of Commonwealth grant. These funds will be used to complete a large section of the Bingera system, to duplicate two of three major siphons on the Gin Gin main channel and to continue the construction of the Isis main channel. Contracts are to be called within six months for further earthworks on the Isis main channel and for some reticulation work in the Bingera area.

With additional funds being allocated as special State grants over the three years up to and including 1986-87, tenders will be called early in 1985 for the construction of Gayndah Weir on the Burnett River and Bucca Weir on the Kolan River. The increased funding will also ensure that the works in the Bingera area should be completed in the next two years or so and that, from about 1987, all efforts will be concentrated on the Isis section of the project.

Provided that funding levels can be maintained after the 1986-87 year, it is possible to foresee that the project will be virtually completed in 1990.

6. Funds for Roads

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

As the NASSRA report of 1984 concludes that an extra $145m over Queensland's current annual expenditure of $620m is needed to maintain the State's road system, will the Federal Budget allocation of $258.8m, under both the Roads Grants Act and the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program, be spent on road improvement and, if not, how will this money be used?

Answer—

All moneys allocated in the Federal Budget are programmed to be spent on the construction and maintenance of roads in accordance with the conditions prescribed by those Acts.

7. **Private Work by Local Authorities**

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

(1) When were the guide-lines, which were laid down by Cabinet for the undertaking of private work by local authorities, last re-written?

(2) What are the latest guide-lines?

(3) Was private industry consulted and allowed to have an input into these guide-lines?

(4) If so, were any of their recommendations included in the guide-lines?

Answer—

(1) In 1982.

(2) The guide-lines briefly provide that—

The carrying out of private works by a local authority is to be supported by a by-law made by the local authority and approved by the Governor in Council;

Except where approved by the Minister private works are to be performed by a local authority solely within its area;

The carrying out of private works is to be for the purpose of gainfully utilising the local authority's plant and work-force which would otherwise be idle, and a local authority is not to build up its work-force or plant for the sole purpose of carrying out private works;

Private works may be carried out by a local authority on behalf of the Crown or a Crown instrumentality, and with the Minister's approval one local authority may carry out private works, for example, line-marking on a road, for another local authority;

The term "private works" does not include the supply of material such as from quarries and hot-mix plants at the point of production, nor does it include the supply of services or equipment by a local authority at the request of the Main Roads Department for the urgent repair of roads or the carrying out of works where the district engineer of the Main Roads Department is satisfied that no other sources of supply are available.

(3 & 4) The guide-lines are at present being reviewed by a committee consisting of representatives of the Department of Local Government, the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development and the Local Government Association of Queensland. The committee is aware of private industry's views on the matter and these will be taken into account in its recommendations.

8. **Nurse Education**

Mr McPHIE asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the recent announcements regarding changes in nursing training in Queensland to provide tertiary qualification for graduates while still retaining a significant clinical content in the training program, to the fact that dates have been announced for the commencement of this training at the Queensland Institute of Technology and the Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education, and to the further fact that excellent facilities exist in Toowoomba for this new nursing training at the Toowoomba General Hospital and at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education—

Is the new training program to be extended to include these Toowoomba facilities and, if so, what is the projected commencement date?

Answer—

The dates announced for the introduction of a degree course in nursing at the Queensland Institute of Technology, and later at the Capricornia Institute of Advanced

Education, are to enable registered nurses to upgrade their qualification to bachelor degree level.

The introduction of basic nurse-training into colleges of advanced education is at present the subject of discussion with the Commonwealth Government at officer level. The present offer made by the Commonwealth of 20c in the $1 to subsidise the transfer of nurse education is totally unacceptable.

I am advised that the location of the proposed schools of nursing has not been decided, but will be determined by my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Education.

9. Inclusion of Sweers Island in Shire

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

With reference to significant concern expressed to me by Mornington Island residents—

(1) Has the Government any plans to incorporate Sweers Island into a local shire and, if so, which shire?

(2) If not, will he take notice of the close ties of the Mornington Island residents with those of Sweers Island and consider its inclusion into that shire as a matter of priority?

Answer—

(1 & 2) It is not the Government's intention at the present time to include Sweers Island in a local authority area.

10. Residential Development, Mount Isa

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

With reference to the inflammatory situation brought about by the Cloncurry Shire Council developing, adjacent to the Mount Isa city boundary, some rural residential blocks of land that will utilise Mount Isa city facilities and as a similar development recommended by the Mount Isa City Council within its boundaries was rejected by the Lands Commissioner—

Will he fulfil his commitment to those councils to arbitrate where agreement is unable to be reached on boundaries and reconsider the Mount Isa City Council request to alter its boundaries to include the proposed development?

Answer—

I am not aware of the development referred to in the honourable member's question.

There has been no recent correspondence on the matter from the Mount Isa City Council. If an up-to-date proposal is submitted, I will have it examined.

11. Cadet Corps Units

Mr HENDERSON asked the Minister for Education—

What has happened to the Australian cadet corps units which operated in many State high schools?

Answer—

Schools have been negotiating with representatives of the Australian Army with a view to determining the future of the cadet units.

The last information to hand suggested that 10 units are continuing activities and that a further 10 units have ceased to exist. Of the units that are continuing, Woodridge State High School is receiving full support from the Australian Army, and the other schools are receiving limited support. No community-based units have been formed.

Representations made to the Commonwealth Government early in the year, to avoid the situation which has now arisen, have been unsuccessful.

12. Teacher aides in State Schools

Mr HENDERSON asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What are the guide-lines used in determining the employment priorities of applicants for teacher-aide positions in State-run schools?

(2) What are the guide-lines to be followed in determining the reduction that each aide will experience when hours are reduced, especially in maintaining an adequate income for those aides who depend solely for their income on their work as teacher aides?

Answer—

(1) The procedures to be followed were set out for schools in the Education Office Gazette in October 1980. The applicants selected for interview meet with a panel made up of the principal of the school, a member of the school staff, and a nominee of the parents and citizens association. This committee makes a recommendation for appointment to the Regional Director of Education.

The committee would be expected to consider such factors as the suitability of the applicant who will be expected to work closely with both teachers and children, interest in children, willingness to accept responsibility, patience and tolerance. All other things being equal, preference should be given to single-income applicants.

(2) Hours of teacher-aide services are reduced generally when the enrolment of the school falls to the extent that the entitlement of that school is reduced. In such circumstances, the principal is expected to take into account all relevant factors concerning the circumstances of the teacher aides before he makes any recommendations concerning changes to employment.

Teacher aides are casual employees, engaged on a sessional basis. There are times when the reduced entitlement can be absorbed by an appropriate reduction in hours for each teacher aide; but there are times when the reduction is such that a teacher aide might not be further engaged. In such circumstances, factors such as the length of service, personal circumstances and interests of the children in the school have to be considered by the principal. As is the case with all employment of a casual nature, it would be unwise for any teacher aide to be reliant totally on her employment as a teacher aide for support.

Because of the complexity of the personal and school situations involved, my department does not set firm guide-lines for such situations. However, the principal is required to take account of all relevant factors in making any recommendation to the Regional Director of Education.

13. Fire Services Levy

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

(1) Under the new fire services levy scheme for 1984-85, how many contributors are there in Queensland in each of the local authority areas under Class A—(i) houses and home units, (ii) vacant parcels of land; Class B—(i) houses and home units, (ii) vacant parcels of land; Class C—(i) houses and home units, (ii) vacant parcels of land; Class D—(i) houses and home units, (ii) vacant parcels of land?

(2) If it is not possible to supply the above information for each local authority, what are the totals for the above categories for the State?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The ALP's thirst for information about the fire services is not surprising, as they have been attempting for months now to hoodwink the property-owners of this State about the Govenment's fire levy reforms. I have no intention of letting the honourable member continue this confidence trick by juggling the figures requested today.

I therefore advise the House that the urban property-owners will contribute a net amount of $48.9m towards the urban fire budget for 1984-85 and not the so-called $90m windfall falsely claimed by the ALP and its fire union friends.

Mr Davis: You should hang your head in shame.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member will hang his head in shame in a minute.

Answer (continued)—

The urban fire levy will be fairly shared among all residential property-owners according to the full-time or auxiliary staffing numbers of each brigade. The balance of the total budget of $62.4m needed to fund the 81 brigades this financial year will be met by commercial and industrial property-owners and a direct contribution by the State Government.

If the honourable member is so concerned about a fair deal for property-owners, he should try to persuade the Hawke Government to lift its miserable 0.8 of one per cent contribution to the fire budget to the same level as the 12½ per cent contribution provided by the State Government. Until this happens, the property-owners and pensioners of this State will continue to subsidise the cost of protecting Commonwealth property from the risk of fire.

I table the figures sought by the honourable member.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman tabled the following figures—

Total of homes, home units and residential land in the four fire brigade classifications.

Class A areas —	Houses and home units	523 211
	Vacant parcels of land	63 105
Class B areas —	Houses and home units	50 432
	Vacant parcels of land	17 449
Class C areas —	Houses and home units	31 617
	Vacant parcels of land	9 000
Class D areas —	Houses and home units	39 540
	Vacant parcels of land	13 464

14. Fire Brigade Boards

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

(1) What are the criteria for determining the classification of fire brigade boards?

(2) How many classifications are there at the present time and is it intended to increase the various classifications of fire brigade boards?

(3) If so, what will be the benefits derived by (a) boards and (b) fire services and fire prevention to the public?

(4) What effect will a reclassification have on the salaries payable to senior officers where stations are reduced in grading?

Answer—

(1) In the past, there have been no defined or fixed criteria for determining the classification of fire brigade boards. Two, and sometimes three, systems of classification have been used. As part of the Government's fire brigade reforms, a new system of classification has been determined by which the classification of each board will be related to the total fire protection risk of its area—in other words, to the level of responsibility of the board.

(2) Until now, six classifications were used for setting salaries of chief and deputy chief officers in those brigades with permanent staff, 10 classifications were used for setting allowances for board chairmen, and eight classifications were used for setting allowances for part-time secretaries.

As an example of the irrelevance of the previous systems and of the lack of criteria, the salary of the chief officer of the Tableland Fire Brigade (with eight permanent staff and 10 stations) was set at the same level as that of the chief officer of the Ipswich Fire Brigade (with 89 permanent staff and 11 stations). Under the new system, there will be 10 classifications ranging from the Metropolitan Fire Brigade to the smaller all-auxiliary brigades, all derived by using identical criteria.

(3) The benefits to be derived from the new classification system will be—

(a) For boards—Forward planning for budgetary manning, appliance and equipment, fire stations and other management aspects will be related directly to the level of fire protection risks within a board's area of responsibility.

(b) For fire services generally—there will be much greater ease of overall forward planning and co-ordination of all aspects of fire service development.

(4) A reclassification of a board will have no effect on the salary currently being received by senior officers. If a downward reclassification occurs, the senior officer will retain his previous personal classification until such time as he achieves a higher salary by promotion or movement between brigades.

Arrangements are to be made to alter existing officer awards to ensure that reclassifications do not disadvantage existing senior officers.

15. Helicopter Service, Surf Life Saving Asociation

Mr BORBIDGE asked the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs—

(1) What amount of Government assistance is made available to the Gold Coast helicopter rescue service operated by the Surf Life Saving Association?

(2) Is he able to make available any additional funding, by taking into account the expanded role the service is being called upon to carry out?

Answer—

(1 & 2) An amount of $106,012 was made available to the Queensland branch of the Surf Life Saving Association by the State Government in 1983-84 for the Gold Coast helicopter rescue service. It is expected that an amount of $155,414 will be provided this financial year as the component on endowable collections for this service. That represents an increase of about 45 per cent.

As a matter of interest, I mention that, last year, the State Government provided an overall figure of $1,378,000 to the Surf Life Saving Association and affiliated clubs. This assistance is far in excess of that provided by Governments in other States of Australia to the surf life saving movement.

I am aware of the strong support given by the honourable members for Surfers Paradise and Southport to the Surf Life Saving Association. I am also aware of the expanded role being undertaken by its helicopter service in addition to its surf patrol work. As a result of those honourable members' personal representations, I am giving consideration to the possibility of making some additional funding available to the Gold Coast helicopter service this financial year. A decision in the matter will be made shortly.

16. Redland Shire Council

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

(1) How many full meetings of the Redland Shire Council have been held in the last 12 months and at how many of these meetings has a councillor declared a pecuniary interest in an item before the council?

(2) On how many occasions has each of the Redland Shire councillors declared a pecuniary interest in a matter before the Chair?

(3) Is he aware that, on several occasions, the council has agreed to alter minutes of meetings to show that a councillor had declared a pecuniary interest and left the meeting when, in fact, that councillor had actually been present?

(4) Does this practice cause him concern and, if so, what action will he take?

Answer—

(1) Twelve general meetings of the Redland Shire Council were held in the period 1 October 1983 to 30 September 1984. At nine of those meetings, one or more members declared a pecuniary interest in a matter before the council for consideration.

(2) During the period in question, the following members declared a pecuniary interest in a matter before the council for consideration on the number of occasions stated—

	Number of occasions	Items
Councillor Benfer	1	1
Councillor Holt	4	2
Councillor Dunstan	3	2
Councillor Genrich	2	2
Councillor Skinner	5	2
Councillor Bengston	6	2
Councillor Fiedler	2	1

(3 & 4) I am informed that it is not the practice of the council to alter minutes in the manner suggested.

17. Radioactive Sand

Mr SHAW asked the Minister for Health—

(1) How many people have received low-interest loans from the State Government to defray the cost of removing radioactive sand from their properties?

(2) What is the total amount of loans granted for this purpose to date?

(3) How much of this amount has been repaid?

(4) What is the total number of properties which have been discovered to have radioactive sand with readings above the acceptable level?

(5) How many of these properties have changed hands since they were first found to have radioactivity?

(6) Why is the area set aside for receival of radioactive sand closed during week-ends?

(7) How much of the returned radioactive sand has been buried, or otherwise disposed of, and where did this disposal take place?

Answer—

(1) One.

(2) $388.

(3) $46.65.

(4) 136.

(5) This information is not available to my department.

(6) The areas set aside are controlled areas at which the disposal of material has to be supervised. They are closed when not staffed.

(7) A total of 24 157 tonnes from the metropolitan area has been transported to the disposal site on North Stradbroke Island.

18. Quality Kitchens Design

Mr R. J. GIBBS asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

With reference to a company known as Quality Kitchens Design, which has its registered office at 101 Lutwyche Road, Windsor, and to the fact that on 30 August I brought certain matters to the attention of this Parliament concerning this company—

(1) Is he aware that in April the company premises were raided by Commonwealth Police on the grounds 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?

(2) Is he aware that company records were confiscated on the basis of tax evasion?

(3) Is he aware that the company was being operated illegally by a previously discharged bankrupt?

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

(5) Is he 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?

(6) 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?

Answer—

(1 to 6) I amplify the remarks that I made yesterday. The records of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs show that the name mentioned by the honourable member is not registered. However, the business name "Quality Kitchens" had been registered but ceased operation on 18 April 1984. A former proprietor of the business name, John Kelly of 101 Lutwyche Road, Windsor, ceased to be a proprietor on 5 April 1984. The remaining proprietor was Peter Anderson of the same address.

A company called Quality Kitchens Pty Ltd was incorporated on 15 June 1984. The registered office is shown in the records of the company as being 101 Lutwyche Road, Windsor. The directors of the company are shown as Peter Anderson and Pam Bushell of the same address.

No complaints have been made to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in relation to the business or the company. However, the affairs of the company are of concern and, as I indicated yesterday, I have caused the Registrar of Commercial Acts to conduct a detailed investigation into its activities, particularly in relation to the question of prepayments for kitchens being held in a trust account. That investigation is still proceeding. However, I do confirm that the company's records were seized by the Commonwealth Police.

I assure the honourable member that any action which is established by the investigation to be necessary to protect the public will be pursued with the utmost vigour.

The honourable member, in his speech in Parliament on 30 August 1984, also referred to the business Video Vision. The business name Video Vision is currently registered at the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. Its proprietor is a company called Rayelg Pty Ltd, which describes itself as trustee of the Video Vision Unit Trust. That company has its address at 254 Waterworks Road, Ashgrove. The principal place of business of Video Vision is, however, 46 Old Cleveland Road, Stones Corner.

Rayelg Pty Ltd was incorporated in Queensland on 3 June 1982. According to the records held in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, the directors are

Harley William Burke and Wayne Richard McPhee, both of 28 Old Cleveland Road, Stones Corner. Mr McPhee is also the secretary of the company.

The honourable member referred to the overcharging and sales methods of Video Vision. However, the matters raised by the honourable member are not matters of company law. They appear to come within the ambit of the Honourable the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, in his administration of the Consumer Affairs Bureau. Accordingly, these matters have been brought to his notice.

19. Weir Construction, Lockyer Valley

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

When is the current program of recharge weir construction throughout the Lockyer Valley likely to be completed and what plans are there for further weir construction in the Lockyer Valley?

Answer—

Under the current program of six weirs, two weirs on Laidley Creek and one weir each on Tenthill and Sandy Creeks have already been completed. Contractors have recently begun work on a weir on Lockyer Creek and it is expected that tenders for a further weir near Glenore Grove will be called during December. The tenders will call for completion of this weir in 1985. This program is expected to cost $2.3m, of which $1m has been spent to date. It is planned to follow that program with a further seven recharge weirs, of which three should be completed in 1985 and the remaining four in 1986.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Report "The Decentralization Project"

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, I refer him to the study entitled "The Decentralization Project", which was commissioned by his department and undertaken and co-ordinated by Professor Harris of the James Cook University of North Queensland. I understand that a five-volume report dealing with the problems facing Queensland's decentralised industries was presented to the Minister's department last May and that its final publication and release have been delayed pending his department's authorisation for the printing of the final report.

I ask: Why has this report not been authorised and released now, approximately five months after its receipt? Will the Minister give an assurance to the House that the report will be made available as expeditiously as possible? Can he indicate when the report will be made available for public scrutiny?

Mr AHERN: The delay in the consideration of the report was due to the need to convene a meeting of the Manufacturers Advisory Committee to consider the matter. Last week I attended that meeting. Consideration was given to the recommendations contained in the Harris report. In the very near future I shall be submitting that report to Cabinet, and I expect Cabinet to make it available for public comment.

Tripartite State Industrial Relations Advisory Committee

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, I refer to the Queensland Government's tripartite State Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, which comprises representatives of Queensland industry, unions and the Government. That committee originated in 1980 and followed on from the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, which was formed in July 1973. The last meeting of the Government's tripartite committee—a very important industrial relations committee—was held prior to the Minister's taking over responsibility for Queensland's industrial relations, which was 12 months ago.

I ask: Why has the Minister not seen fit to call a meeting of that committee, which was designed to assist in maintaining industrial peace, when it can be seen that most of the recent industrial disputation, in which this Government is directly involved, has occurred in the public sector?

Mr LESTER: It is very clear that the Leader of the Opposition wants increased council rates and increased taxes. If the Government had not adopted a positive stand in relation to the local authority dispute, taxes and rates in this State would have increased. I ask Opposition members where they are going with employment.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LESTER: They cannot cop it; that is the trouble. They are not prepared to face up to the employment issue.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr LESTER: If the honourable member listens, I will answer the question.

I tried to have a number of meetings with various groups about safety at the place of work. Industrial accidents cost this State $150m a year by way of workers' compensation payments. Mr Dick Anear and other union representatives walked out of a meeting because they wanted better conditions, increased pay and other benefits. I ask: Where does the Government go? The unions are interested only in better conditions and better pay. They are not interested in the safety of workers in employment; nor is the Australian Labor Party.

Business in Australia; Effect on Economy of Rural Sector

Mr NEAL: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer: Is he aware that the Australian Business Council has stated that business in Australia is static and that there is no improvement in sight?

I also ask: As the rural sector still plays an important role in this nation's overall prosperity, what effect will that industry have on the economy in the next 12 months?

Mr GUNN: I attended the prices and income advisory committee meeting in Melbourne last Friday. A paper was drawn up in conjunction with the Federal Treasurer, who chaired that meeting. The meeting was attended by Mr Hurford, the Minister for Finance (Mr Dawkins) and representatives of the Confederation of Industry and the Business Council of Australia as well as Mr Carmichael, Mr Kelty and Mr Mahon. They all agreed that business in Australia at present is static. There are many reasons for that.

One of the reasons for the burst of confidence in the very early stages was that the drought had broken. Non-farm income rose by 8.3 per cent. Farm income rose by 45.2 per cent. My opinion is shared by the Federal Government. One of the reasons business confidence is down is that the Australian Business Council expects farm income to take a dive of about 30 per cent in the next 12 months, hence the need for Mr Hawke to hold an election as quickly as possible. One thing comes out loud and clear. Australia still depends on the rural sector.

Last night the member for Balonne spoke about that matter at length in his Budget speech. It is expected that farm income will decrease. There is no doubt that the wages pause that was initiated by the Fraser Government gave a burst of confidence. A major part was played by the breaking of the drought. At the meeting last Friday it was made clear that there is no business confidence of any degree for next year. That statement was made very clear last Friday by the Australian Business Council.

Preferred Option in State Schools

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Education——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Education: Has his attention been drawn to accusations that he is not prepared to visit schools and talk to staff members and parents and citizens associations to discuss the so-called preferred option? Does his alleged reluctance to discuss the matter indicate that there is not in fact an option because the matter has already been decided by his officers?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Davis: Dorothy what?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the member for Brisbane Central that he is the Opposition Whip and, as such, should be more responsible.

Mr POWELL: In answer to the question asked by the honourable member for Balonne, I say that my attention has been drawn to statements that have been made by various people, including the president of the Queensland Teachers Union and the president of the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Association. Really, I do not understand their accusations. I have gone out of my way to attend parents and citizens association meetings to explain the review presently being undertaken in the Education Department. It is only a review; at this stage, no decision has been made.

The second part of the honourable member's question implies that the change is a fait accompli. That is not so. A thorough review is being undertaken. I can understand nervousness by the Queensland Teachers Union about a thorough review of Queensland's education system. The negative comments emanating from the presidents of the QTU and the QCPCA do not surprise me. In fact, Mrs Galtos, who is president of the QCPCA, has attended at least two meetings at which I have explained in great detail the preferred option. At both meetings she has been given the opportunity of asking questions, but she has not asked any. Such is her interest!

The Queensland Teachers Union believes that it is the alternative administration of the Education Department. As far as I am concerned, it is not. The Education Department is an arm of Government and, as such, is a responsible employer. Acting responsibly, periodically it undertakes internal reviews. That is exactly what is happening at the moment.

The department's prime consideration is children, not the comfort of individuals. The whole review is designed to consider the psychological development of the child and to ascertain whether a school system can be designed to fit that psychological development.

No final decision has yet been made. When I receive a report from the task force that is conducting the thorough review, that document will be presented to Cabinet. As a result of Cabinet's decision, further action may or may not be taken. That is the way in which democratic government works. As far as I am concerned, elected members of the Parliament will be the ones to make the decision, not unelected union minorities.

Building Industry Portable Superannuation Scheme

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Have any Queensland builders been short-changed by the Builders Labourers Federation, having been forced to sign a portable superannuation scheme as a trade-off for a peace package? Has such a peace package been signed?

Mr LESTER: Consideration should be given to the fact that, whereas in 1963 unemployment represented only 1.5 per cent of the work-force, today it is of the order of 9 per cent. That dramatic increase has been caused by trade unions in this country, supported by the ALP, making excessive demands. In that time, wages have risen sevenfold; taxation has increased forty-fourfold. In addition, there have been increased penalty rates, the 17½ per cent holiday loading, shorter working hours, additional redundancy payments, portable superannuation, and so on. All of those are a recipe for national disaster. Very clearly, it is time that the unions stopped making excessive claims.

Let me deal with the portable superannuation scheme, which is being organised by none other than Norm Gallagher, whose name all honourable members know. He has been to gaol and has gained notoriety in other ways. The portable superannuation scheme has been set up in Melbourne with six union members and two employee representatives as trustees. Mr Gallagher and George Crawford are two of those people.

The board of directors of that trust will consist of two employee representatives and two employer representatives. However, I understand that the chairman of the trust will be Mr Jack Ferguson, the former Deputy Premier of New South Wales, who has a union background. Unless the trust agrees to an audit, none is provided for. That means that $50m per annum or $500m over 10 years will go into the trust and it can be used for literally anything. Yet the ALP and the unions have supported it.

A peace package was to have been part of the deal. The builders who signed the agreement were to be given peace for ever. This is the fifth time that peace for ever has been promised by Mr Gallagher. However, the peace package is now a separate deal, which has not been signed. The employers have signed the superannuation scheme agreement but the unions have reneged on signing the peace package. Because the scheme provides for no employee contributions, it will cost employers $11 per week per person. Who is to say that that will not increase to $45 per week per person? What can the employers do about it?

I suggest to all employers that they do not touch the national Building Unions Superannuation scheme. If they have to get involved in superannuation they should go for the Queensland United Employers Superannuation Trust scheme, the Metal Trades Industry Association scheme or any other scheme that will be based in Queensland and have its money directed back into Queensland. At least Queensland money would be kept in Queensland. I challenge the ALP to support the Government on this matter. Quite clearly the State Government has a clear mandate and would have to seriously consider not awarding contracts to those who insist on the BUS scheme. So it is up to the ALP to work in the interests of employment and to support the State Government in this important move in standing up for Queensland.

Bargara Land Fraud Investigation

Mr MACKENROTH: In asking a question of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, I refer to the answer he gave to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that Detective Mahony had been removed from the land fraud case at Bargara following a report dated 26 October 1982 and I now ask: Can the Minister advise the House whether Detective Mahony has been involved with that investigation since 26 October 1982? If the Minister does not have the information, will he tomorrow supply to the House the dates on which Detective Mahony was involved with this case after 26 October 1982?

Mr GLASSON: I will adopt the latter course. The information that I have already given to the House is the latest information that I have from the Police Department. On that occasion I explained quite clearly and quite definitely the circumstances in which Detective Mahony was taken off the case. Apart from that, I have no knowledge of his being further involved. However, I will certainly find out and inform the honourable member tomorrow.

Bargara Land Fraud Investigation

Mr MACKENROTH: In asking a question of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, I refer to the allegations that I have made in the Parliament that political interference was involved in having Detective Mahony removed from the investigation into a land fraud case at Bargara and I now ask: Was the Minister aware of these allegations before I raised them in the Parliament? If so, how did he become aware of them and what action did he take? Has any other member of Parliament ever raised this matter with the Minister?

Mr GLASSON: I was aware of questions that had been asked by the honourable member and I have endeavoured to find out from the Police Department when and how Detective Mahony was taken off the case. I provided that information to the House. As to the last part of the question, the answer is: No, no other person has raised this matter with me at all.

Tuberculosis and Brucellosis Eradication Program

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the concern in northern areas about the tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication program and the effect that destocking could have on those areas. I ask: What is the present state of the eradication scheme?

Mr TURNER: Because of the problems that have been created in the northern areas of Queensland, I have been concerned about this matter, as has the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter).

First and foremost, BETAC is a national program and has not been instituted by the Queensland Government or by the Department of Primary Industries. It was begun in 1970 with an estimated completion clean-up date of 1992. More than $35m has been spent on the program to the present time, and approximately 98 per cent of herds in Australia have been cleaned. Areas of concern remain in the Kimberleys in Western Australia, in the Northern Territory and, of course, in the north of Queensland.

At the recent meeting in Townsville of the Australian Agricultural Council, I sponsored a motion for the setting up of a committee to investigate the special problems that were arising—the social and economic problems, as opposed to the technical and veterinary problems. I also moved successfully that producer representatives be allowed on that committee so that it was not made up only of bureaucrats. I was successful in having the Cattle Council of Australia, United Graziers Association and Cattlemen's Union represented on that committee.

With that committee, I recently visited many areas of the Gulf country. I was accompanied by members of my department. We saw at first hand the problems being experienced. I admit that producers in that area face special problems in relation to the standard of roads during the wet season, the transporting of stock out of the area, the short mustering season and the need to conduct two musters a year. Rubber vine, too, is causing tremendous problems in large areas of the Gulf. No doubt those problems are being addressed by the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board.

Another area of concern is financial assistance for carry-on funds and restocking. Financial assistance is also needed for fencing. It must be realised that many properties in the Gulf country have in the main relied on harvesting feral cattle, and that for the eradication program to be successful, producers must build fences. That is the only way in which clean herds can be separated from infected animals.

During my recent visit, it became obvious that destocking is of major concern. Many producers are worried that in many areas a successful eradication program will result in complete destocking. I assure the honourable member for Condamine and other people concerned about the program that that is not the Government's intention. It will attempt to fine-tune the program to ensure that producers are not disadvantaged in that regard.

That matter, and other matters that were raised during my visit to north Queensland, will be addressed at the meeting of the Pastoral Advisory Committee on the 15th of this month. They will also be addressed at a national level at the meeting of the committee to be held in November, before a final decision is made by the Australian Agricultural Council.

That is the situation at present, and I thank the honourable member for his question.

Double-deck Cattle Trucks

Mr COOPER: In asking a question of the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs, I refer to derogatory comments made by members of the Opposition about the use of double-deck cattle trucks. Would the Minister care to enlighten those opposite as to the value of double-deck transports to primary producers, particularly those in remote and isolated areas of Queensland?

Mr KATTER: I am very appreciative of the question. I heard the comments of the honourable member for Rockhampton North last night, and I thought that they were misplaced, particularly as he represents an area that is so dependent upon meatworks.

The Government could quite cold-bloodedly close a fair proportion of the beef industry in the Peninsula and Gulf country, where there are approximately two million to three million head of cattle, if it denied producers access to double-deck transports. Producers simply would not be able to transport their cattle to market. One does not have to be a mathematical genius to realise that if double-decker transports are banned, the cost of hauling cattle will be doubled. The Minister was accused villainously last night, if I may use that expression.

Mr YEWDALE: I rise to a point of order. The Minister has referred to statements that I supposedly made in the House. At no stage did I make any suggestions that double-decker cattle transports should not be used. I made direct statements about permits for overloaded vehicles, which are being used on the highways day after day to the detriment of motorists. I did not suggest that these cattle trucks should be taken off the road.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KATTER: There was no point of order, Mr Speaker. That is exactly the honourable member's implication—that double-decks would have to be removed.

Mr YEWDALE: I rise to another point of order. The Minister's statement is incorrect and totally fallacious. I ask that it be withdrawn. I made no such statement.

Mr SPEAKER: I point out to the Minister that, apparently, the statement was not made. Unless the Minister is absolutely certain that it was made, I will have to ask him to withdraw it.

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, I am referring to the statement that the honourable member made again this morning.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Does the Minister wish to withdraw the statement or not?

Mr KATTER: For the purpose of answering the question, I will withdraw it.

The honourable member's implication last night was that the top decks of the transports would have to be removed.

Mr YEWDALE: I rise to a further point of order. I have had the opportunity to read the whole of my contribution in this Parliament last night. I made no suggestion whatever about the removal of the top deck of a cattle transport. The statement is totally false and I ask for its withdrawal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The point has been made and the Minister has withdrawn the statement.

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, I have withdrawn the statement. It was an implication; there was no statement of fact.

To continue with the answer—it was said last night that the overloading provisions were not being applied to double-decker transports. If they were, quite clearly many of them would be overloaded by 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. The hauliers themselves have

said that they are no longer prepared to take the risk. Unless the Government is prepared to move along certain lines, the hauliers said that they will simply remove the double-deckers from the road. They made that decision and asked the Minister to act in one way or another. If double decks were removed, a fair proportion of the beef industry in Queensland would be closed down and, inevitably, one of the meatworks would be closed. It was a very strange statement from a member who represents an area in which a meatworks has already been closed and almost 500 people are out of work for most of the year. The honourable member took a very strange initiative. A similar initiative was taken by the member for Mount Isa.

In addition, the honourable member for Rockhampton North made allegations against the Minister for Main Roads who has done an excellent job in every way in handling a very difficult situation. I must add that if the Minister had imposed the conditions on all double-decker transports he would have broken about 40 or 50 of the hardest-working businessmen in Queensland, and would have closed one or two meatworks.

I applaud what the Minister has done. Like every meat-worker in Queensland, I defend very strongly any action that he took.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Commonwealth Constitution

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (12 noon): I rise to speak on two matters concerning alterations to the Constitution, namely, the interchange of powers and the holding of simultaneous elections. Both alterations are to be placed before the people this year.

No popular demand exists for those alterations to the Constitution. I also point out that the Constitution belongs to the people of Australia. It does not belong to Governments, and it is not the plaything of Australian Governments, which our friends in Canberra seem to think it is.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask honourable members to resume their seats. There is far too much movement in the Chamber.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Constitution is not to be manipulated by a political party that has the philosophy of destroying it. That is the policy of the ALP.

The proposal for the holding of simultaneous elections was defeated by the people of Australia at referendums in 1974 and in 1977. Why must that matter again be put before the people of Australia?

Mr Comben: Who was in power in 1977?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I do not care who was in power in Canberra. The proposal was defeated by the people of Australia, and I am pleased that it was.

I will deal first with the interchange of powers. Why would a centralised authority in Canberra want to have an interchange of powers?

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. It is almost impossible for the Chair to hear the member on his feet. The House will come to order.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Why does a centralised, authoritarian Government in Canberra want to give powers to the States? It would never want to do that under any circumstances.

The Australian Constitution specifically provides for the rights and interests of the Australian people. As a by-product of those provisions, the Constitution looks after the interests of the less populous States and the interests of Australians who live in areas that have the least political muscle. If it were not for the Constitution, Australia would be run exclusively by the people who reside in the conurbations of Sydney and Melbourne. We Australians are supposed to look to the Constitution for help, and I believe that we can.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Windsor under Standing Order No. 123A.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member for Windsor is deliberately trying to prevent me from speaking.

It is claimed that the reason for seeking an alteration to the Constitution as to the interchange of powers is that a number of misunderstandings regarding section 51 placitum (xxxvii) of the Constitution should be cleared up. However, an analysis of the terms of the proposed alteration to the Constitution shows that it has little to do with placitum (xxxvii).

Section 51 begins—

> "The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have powers to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to:—
> "

Placitum (xxxvii) states—

> "Matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law"

However, when one reads further, the proposed alteration becomes very interesting.

Placitum (xxxviii) reads—

> "The exercise within the Commonwealth, at the request or with the concurrence of the Parliaments of all the States directly concerned, of any power which can at the establishment of this Constitution be exercised only by the Parliament of the United Kingdom or by the Federal Council of Australasia."

The Federal Council of Australasia does not exist, but the United Kingdom Parliament still exists.

If the proposed alteration were successful at a referendum, it would be the referendum to end all referendums. Particular State responsibilities could be handed over to the Commonwealth virtually overnight without reference to the people of Australia. I refer to police departments, health facilities, industrial affairs and industrial relations, electricity generation undertakings and a host of other matters. The people of Australia should have a say in whether these areas of responsibility are to be handed to a Federal authority.

Up till now, the people have had that right. Let us hope that they continue to have that right. However, if the proposed constitutional amendments in regard to the interchange of powers are passed, not too many referendums will be held in this country for many years to come. The powers of the respective State Parliaments will be limited. They will become compliant Parliaments, as certain Parliaments are now. There is no doubt that the New South Wales Parliament is a compliant Parliament. It is happy to hand over its control of industrial affairs to the Federal Government. Some States are happy to

hand over their electricity undertakings to the Federal Government, and some States are happy to hand over their railways to the Federal Government. That is provided for already in the Constitution, and, without any reference to the people, Tasmania and South Australia have handed over their railways to the Federal Government. So it is clear that simply by having the people accept these constitutional amendments, the ALP socialists would have their way.

I turn now to simultaneous elections. The first point I make is that the Senate is not a House that is subordinate to the House of Representatives. The Parliament of Australia is the Queen, the Senate and the House of Representatives. That is the order in which they are set out in the Constitution, and they constitute the Parliament of Australia. It is certainly not constituted by the House of Representatives on its own.

The Senate's role is not so much one of a House of review—which, of course, it is—as one of a House that gives minorities an opportunity to be heard. The Senate is elected on the basis of proportional representation—as distinct from preferential voting, which is the basis upon which the House of Representatives is elected. In the House of Representatives it is extraordinarily difficult for minorities to be represented.

Mr Innes: The Senate safeguards the States.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It safeguards the interests of the States, it safeguards minority political opinion and it safeguards minority geographical opinion in the smaller populated areas of this nation.

The ALP's policy is to abolish the Senate, which has been in existence in Australia for over 70 years. The ALP realises that it could not succeed in having the Senate abolished by way of a referendum. However, the ALP is aware that if it puts to the people the matter of simultaneous elections it has a reasonable chance of having that proposal accepted by the people and, despite the fact that that proposal has been rejected by the people on two previous occasions, of succeeding in having virtually a unicameral system in the Federal Parliament. That, of course, is the ambition of the ALP.

The possibility of having a hung Senate is a very real one. The Senate would be manipulated because the senators would constantly be facing the threat of having to go to the people. For some years, elections for the House of Representatives have been held every two years, so that, instead of having an election for half the Senate every three years, such elections would be thrust upon the people every two years. When that occurs, the House of Representatives will be reflected in the Senate and, simply because senators will be looking over their left shoulder or their right shoulder at the possibility of having to face the people under conditions over which they have no control, the power of the Senate will be destroyed.

Simultaneous elections have nothing to do with the saving of money, as has been claimed by Senator Evans; rather, they have a good deal to do with the fact that at present the Senate has a fixed term. Either the Government holds its elections according to the Senate elections, or it suffers the possibility of Senate elections being held separately, with the consequent possibility that the electorate may view the Senate election as a giant by-election. Of course, the Government in Canberra does not want to see the Senate used for the purpose for which it was designed.

Recent changes to the electoral laws have increased the size of the Senate. By doing so, they have also increased the probability of election of only candidates from the major parties. That has the effect of increasing the likelihood of deadlocks in the Senate and a hung Senate.

The ALP, of course, wants the Senate to appear ridiculous. The more it can succeed in doing that, the more it will assist its campaign to abolish the Senate.

Often, the Senate is seen as a major threat to an executive-dominated style of government, which the ALP would like to have disappear from the face of the earth.

Simultaneous elections will reduce the likelihood of partisan majorities that are hostile to the Government of the day. The ALP socialists resent the fact that they have another body that they have to answer to and that the checks and balances are there to stop the ALP going too far.

Simultaneous elections will tend to reduce the number of elections and ensure that, if a hostile Senate does force a Government to the polls through a House of Representatives election, a corresponding election will be held for half of the Senate. If simultaneous elections are held, the ALP Government will win greater control over the timing of elections to suit its partisan convenience. So a Government could win the chance of having a more tractable Senate and one with an increased probability or a partisan majority. Those things should be opposed. Under no circumstances should such a proposal be carried by the people.

The Liberal Party has given notice to the people of Queensland that it intends to lead a "No" campaign on these issues to ensure that the people of Queensland know and understand what is at stake. I ask the members of this Assembly to support the Liberal Party. I ask the Government of Queensland to support the Liberal Party's campaign. The members of the Liberal Party are available to talk to any groups that want to hear the story about the "No" case. The Liberal Party has already been doing that in various ways. As far as my party and I are concerned, the carrying of these referendum proposals will mean the end of the Constitution of Australia. Under section 51 placitum (xxxviii) the Constitution can virtually be changed without reference to the people.

Time expired.

Ciasom Pty Ltd, Marlborough Area Grazing Leases

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (12.10 p.m.): In this Chamber on 8 February this year, I detailed the manner in which a small Queensland company called Ciasom Pty Ltd, with a $20 paid-up capital, had in a short period of 18 months developed its two adjoining central Queensland properties, namely, the "Ten Mile" of 6 868 ha and a "Crystal Waters" of 5 676 ha, to a situation in which it was able to borrow up to $3m from the European Asian Bank Aktiengesellschaft based in Singapore. I also detailed the actions taken over the same period by the Queensland Government that had contributed considerably towards the great windfall for that small company.

Let me quickly summarise some of those actions—

The declaration of the little-used 105 km-long Apis Creek to Duaringa Road, which runs right through the two properties, as a main road.

The immediate allocation of $400,000 to upgrade 7.7 km of the road starting at the "Crystal Waters" southern boundary and heading south.

The appointment of consultants Cameron McNamara to conduct a water resources survey of the section of the Mackenzie River, which included the western boundaries of both properties.

The construction at a cost of over $300,000 of the Laurinel State School on the property of the same name, which is immediately north of the "Ten Mile", for only eight students.

Lest honourable members have forgotten, I remind them that Ciasom Pty Ltd is one of the Bjelke-Petersen family companies with the 20 $1 shares being held by Florence Bjelke-Petersen (a Queensland National Party senator), 15 shares; John Bjelke-Petersen (the Premier's only son and property-manager), 2 shares; and one each by the Premier's three daughters.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I advise the honourable member for Mackay that, under the provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 119 and 120, he is not permitted to impugn the veracity of another member of this House. If the honourable

member impugns the veracity of the Premier in relation to any matter, I shall be obliged to ask him to withdraw the remarks and continue with his speech.

Mr CASEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Premier is the Treasurer of this State. Recently he presented a Budget. I should like to detail some aspects of that Budget and its relationship to Ciasom and other matters.

Honourable members will recall that I mentioned previously the Cameron McNamara study for the Water Resources Commission of the Mackenzie River near the Ciasom properties. Those who have made a study of the development and harnessing of the water resources of this State know the great battle that it takes to get Government recognition of the need for any project. Then comes the fight to have investigations carried out, the queue for a priority, the decision to proceed, the allocation of finance, and then the continuing allocations so that the project can proceed at a satisfactory rate—all very time-consuming. Look at the length of time it took to get the Burdekin project off the ground; look at the delays with the Bundaberg and Eton irrigation schemes.

During the mid-winter parliamentary recess, publicly through the media, I made known several other Government decisions that have considerably helped Ciasom. They were—

The transfer of the company's properties from the Livingstone Shire Council area to that of the Duaringa Shire, with a direct rate saving of over $4,000 per annum, or 70 per cent.

A proposal for a new rural electrification scheme.

The allocation of a further $609,000 for the next section of the road leading towards the Mackenzie River.

Several hundred thousand dollars to the Duaringa Race Club for its new luxury complex.

The transfer of a survey gang from important roadwork on the Bruce Highway near Mackay to carry out survey work for a proposed bridge across the Mackenzie River.

There is one thing of which honourable members can be sure with rich people. They cannot resist the greedy temptation to do everything they can to make more money for themselves, and they will use any opportunity or advantage to do so. Of course, one of the big advantages that this small family company has is that the family head just happens to be Treasurer of this State.

I would therefore like to draw the attention of the Parliament and, through it, the people of Queensland to some aspects of this year's State Budget.

All over the State, farmers and property-holders have battled for years to gain recognition for even very small projects for their areas. Half of the State's local authorities cannot get assistance from the State Government for their town and urban water supplies, and most are years in the priority line-up awaiting approvals.

The present Bjelke-Petersen Government keeps them off its back by trying to blame the Commonwealth Government for not giving it enough money for the development of the State's water resources. To back that allegation, each year it makes out a long list of so-called priorities for the National Water Resources Program supposedly showing the State's key needs.

It was therefore most surprising to see in the Budget papers for the State's 1984-85 Budget funds allocated for what is to be known as the Tartrus Weir on the Mackenzie River. It has never been mentioned before in the Water Resources Commission's annual report, never been seen on the program for national water resources, and never before been included in any State priority listing. That is because it is one of the recommendations of the Cameron McNamara report, completed only after an urgent brief from the Water Resources Commission in about May/June 1983.

The site just happens to be about 35 km upstream from the Bjelke-Petersen properties. It will be a mass concrete structure with a storage capacity of 12 300 ML and an estimated annual yield of 20 000 ML. That will give it a greater capacity than the Bingegang and Bedford weirs upstream on the same river, which supply most of central Queensland's coal mines and mining towns.

It is assumed in the report that it will benefit only about 20 irrigators downstream to the junction of the Mackenzie River with the Dawson River, near Duaringa. The estimated cost of the weir on March 1983 figures (when the costing was done) was $4.5m.

Without the usual hassles, delays, public meetings, deputations, local committees and the other lobbying tactics that have to be undertaken before one can get the State Government to even consider a water development project, the Tartrus Weir is off and away. There is, however, still one major hitch. The decisions to proceed have been made so quickly the Water Resources Commission has not even done its own report on the project or prepared the plans; so that State Government department is now working flat out to get everything ready so it can proceed with construction.

One way to make a great deal of money is to be in the know. Guess who was in the know that the Premier and Treasurer would set aside money in this year's Budget for the hitherto unknown Tartrus Weir! Ciasom Pty Ltd, of course, whose postal address, incidentally, is not Duaringa, as would be expected, but PO Box 141, Kingaroy.

Unfortunately for some people, laws in this State make it obligatory to make public one's intentions, particularly when actions may have some effect on other people. In the Government Gazette of 1 September 1984, only 19 days before the State Budget was brought down, in advertisements under applications for licence under the Water Act 1926-1983 there appeared five for Ciasom Pty Ltd. Two were for the construction of two three-metre-high dams on the anabranch of the Mackenzie River, which runs right through the middle of the two Bjelke-Petersen properties. Two were for two 200 mm (approximately 8 inch) centrifugal pumps, one from the anabranch and the other from the Mackenzie River itself, to irrigate about 400 ha (1 000 acres) of land.

The fifth, however was for a 450 mm (approximately 18 inch) centrifugal pump for water-harvesting from the Mackenzie River. A 450 mm pump will supply a medium-sized township and can produce a heck of a lot of water. In a normal wet year, with a high river flow, the anabranch will fill naturally and the two three-metre dams will provide a non-renewable source of irrigation water for both properties.

The 450 mm pump on the river itself is situated on the Ten Mile Water-hole, which has a 2 000 ML capacity (no small water-hole). Unfortunately, a pump of that capacity would quickly empty such a water-hole and leave nothing for the other property-owners who already have licences to pump from it. However, the Tartrus Weir will have a 1 200 mm pipe outlet to allow water in substantial quantities to be released down-stream to renew water-holes, including the Ten Mile and Mourindilla Water-holes adjacent to the "Crystal Waters" property and with a capacity of 550 ML.

Unquestionably, the published application 19 days before the Budget of the Bjelke-Petersen family for a water licence for a 450 mm pump capable of renewing its own water storages, indicated a prior knowledge that a renewable source was to be available to them.

Unquestionably, Treasurer Bjelke-Petersen has used the resources of this State to feather his own family's nest and give them an advantage not available to other Queenslanders. Unquestionably, the Leader of the National Party Government of this State is greedily using his position and his power for his own selfish purposes.

How much longer will those in his own party blindly continue to follow him? How many National Party voters who are property-owners in this State are awaiting water schemes for their area? I include your area, too, Mr Deputy Speaker. How many of

them have seen the ravages of drought over decades, and sometimes generations, while they waited in vain for a guaranteed supply of water?

Well, I will tell them something. Members of the Bjelke-Petersen family are not waiting. They are not going to join any queue for a priority. Dad has his hands on the purse-strings of this State and he is not hesitating to spend the people's money to make sure they do all right.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Mackay commented that the Premier has hands on the purse-strings of the State in order to provide benefits for his personal advantage. Under Standing Orders, he ought to withdraw that comment.

Mr CASEY: In deference to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw the remark. However, I ask: What sort of a fight did the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, John Goleby, put up for all of those farmers, graziers and local authorities—

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is at his lies again. He is a typical liar—a liar of the highest order.

Opposition Members: Withdraw "liar"

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest——

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I withdraw it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Sit down. He's asking you to sit down.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chamber will come to order. I suggest that the Premier make his point of order on an impersonal basis so that I can accept it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will not cry. However, every week the honourable member takes great delight in attacking my family and my son.

Mr Casey: What is your point of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Premier to state his point of order. I have already asked the honourable member for Mackay to withdraw his personal comments about the Premier. If the Premier wants any further personal comments withdrawn, I ask him to say so.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am leading up to that very point.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Opposition members cannot sit me down. I am leading up to that very point and they will have to cop it. I am taking a point of order.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Chamber to come to order and I ask the Premier to state his point of order. The Chamber will be silent while he does so.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I take it that I have the opportunity to take a point of order? The allegations of the honourable member for Mackay are completely untrue. Anything that has been done in regard to water supplies in that area has nothing to do with my son or the property. The property has ample water supplies through the middle of it. Therefore, what the honourable member has said is completely and utterly untrue. He is adopting the same tactics all the time, but I will promise him that I will not cry.

Mr Casey: What is his point of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Premier——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This being an allotted day, I must call the next honourable member on the list.

Mr CASEY: I rose to a point of order.

Mr NEAL: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourble member for Balonne to resume his seat.

Mr CASEY: I rose on a point of order.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order, too.

Mr CASEY: I rose to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Mackay state his point of order?

Mr CASEY: I will certainly do that. Mr Deputy Speaker, you asked the Premier to withdraw the word "lies" that he used in respect to the allegations that I made. Although he withdrew the word he continued to make the same point. I table the Government Gazette of 1 September containing the applications by the said companies.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Aboriginal Sacred Sites and Heritage Legislation

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (12.22 p.m.): The matter that I wish to raise concerns the recent introduction by the Federal Government of a Heritage Bill.

Mr Casey interjected.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

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

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chamber will come to order.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Joh, he's got you by the short and curlies.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order No. 123A for interjecting unnecessarily in the House.

Mr NEAL: I wish to raise the matter of what the Federal Government calls its Heritage Bill. The first and overriding point is the fact that the Australian Government is a signatory to 2 000 or more United Nations treaties. As a signatory to the World Heritage Commission, the Federal Government, under external powers vested in it by the Australian Constitution, sought to override the wishes of the Tasmanian Government in the Gordon below Franklin Dam issue. The result of the subsequent High Court case is common knowledge. It resulted in the Federal Government overriding the Tasmanian Government and the wishes of the people, which had been expressed in elections and in a referendum on that issue.

As a result of that High Court case, the precedent has been set for the Federal Government to override State Governments in every area of human endeavour. Bearing in mind all of those United Nations treaties, there is no area of State responsibility into which the Federal Government cannot intrude. The House has just heard the honourable member for Nundah speak about this problem.

In regard to the fact that the heritage legislation intrudes into many areas of State responsibility—it allows for areas that are regarded as significant and under some degree of threat to be declared in such a way as to protect them and preserve them from that threat. The definition of those terms is loose and the delineation of the significant areas is vague in the extreme. They are open to whatever interpretation the Minister of the day may place on them.

By virtue of its gross generality and reliance on concepts that are largely subjective, the Bill is capable of being interpreted in limitless ways. No criteria are provided to establish what may be deemed to be significant areas. The Act, which relates to the preservation and protection of sacred sites and objects in accordance with Aboriginal tradition, gives virtually no interpretation of "Aboriginal tradition"

As a result, almost total discretion is conferred on the Minister or an authorised officer.

The definition of "significant aboriginal area" does not include any reference to sacred sites and the definition of "area of particular significance to Aboriginals" is totally open-ended and can provide legislative powers to close off huge areas. In fact, it could result in the permanent alienation of land by way of declaration only.

The powers of declaration can be used to block developmental projects in the States and Territories solely on the basis that there are significant Aboriginal areas or significant Aboriginal objects in the area of development. Projects such as mining, construction of dams, oil exploration, clearing of land, cultivation, housing development—indeed, a whole host of projects—could effectively be blocked simply by means of a declaration by the Minister.

The paramount consideration is that there is a significant Aboriginal area or a significant Aboriginal object in the area of the project. Economic considerations, and even considerations of national interest, are not matters which need to be taken into account. Questions may also be raised in relation to defence.

The Act further states that where the Minister receives an application orally or in writing from or on behalf of an Aboriginal person or group seeking the protection of a significant Aboriginal site, etc., the Minister may initiate action accordingly. In other words, any person can speak to the Minister; he does not have to be an Aborigine. The communication can be made on behalf of an Aborigine or group and that constitutes an application. Presumably the application can be made over the telephone, and the person could come from anywhere, even interstate, and not necessarily have any direct interest in, or association with the area or object for which declaration is sought. The door is open for frivolous objections, which must be considered.

What this all boils down to is that any person, unless authorised under the terms of the Act, may well be prevented from entering upon, or remaining upon, any land, or object designated as significant, even if it were part of his own freehold. This would apply to all land, whether it be private property or land in a town or elsewhere. It also gives strangers a right of entry onto a person's private land, and also an interest in that land.

Let me now talk of compensation for such land. The compensation provisions have hardly any relevance. Compensation is only available in the event of acquistion of property. Furthermore, as no ownership of the land would be expected to pass to the Commonwealth—it would simply be declared—the procedure does not come under the aquisition powers of requirements of the Federal Constitution; hence no compensation is payable.

In a nutshell, the legislation provides for total control of unspecified areas of land regardless of tenure, without acquisition, or compensation payable for it or for disruption to its existing or future usage.

The Bill provides for the declaration to take effect from the date it is published in the Gazette. The Minister shall also, apart from publishing it in the Gazette, "Publish it in such newspapers and other printed periodicals as he thinks appropriate" and "take reasonable steps to notify persons likely to be substantially affected by the declaration, as soon as practicable and in writing of the terms of the declaration"

If a person "likely to be substantially affected" does not happen to read the Gazette, such newspapers and other printed periodicals as the Minister thinks appropriate, or has not collected his mail, he could find that in ignorance he has commited an offence, the penalties for which are, in the case of a declaration in respect of a site, not more than $10,000 or five years' imprisonment, or both. In the case of a declaration in respect of an object, the penalties are not more than $5,000 or two years' imprisonment, or both.

There are further penalties, but I do not have time to deal with them. However, it is significant that the penalties imposed for failure to comply with provision of a declaration of a site or object are twice as severe as the penalties for damage or destruction of sites or objects, in other words property, belonging to the community at large. Furthermore, the onus of proof is on the defendant. He must prove that he did not know of a declaration or must disprove that the area is a significant area or object. Such a system is contrary to the very basis of our system of justice. The legislation will overturn our constitutional protections and give massive power to the Federal Minister.

The Minister and the Federal Government have introduced legislation after consultation with Aboriginal groups, and in response to their requests. It is a matter for grave concern, that, prior to its introduction, adequate time to comment on the Bill was not given to State Govenments, mining and pastoral industries and other interested groups.

Mr Davis: That is not true.

Mr NEAL: It is totally true.

Furthermore, the legislation is apartheid in its approach to the Aboriginal community and divides Aborigines in a major way from the rest of the Australian population. It will create ill feeling between Aboriginal Australians and other Australians.

No part of the huge sums of money made available by the tax-payer to the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Aboriginal Development Commission will be used to actually purchase and, therefore, to establish a value for the considerable areas of land that will be tied up. This will mean that the Aboriginal community will be unable to make decisions made by other Australians. The Aboriginal Development Commission will not, for example, be obliged to purchase significant sites at the cost of funds that could also be used for housing or business enterprise. As a result, the real value of significant sites will never emerge.

Objections to this heritage legislation have been widespread throughout Australia. The Labor Government in Western Australia is paying scant regard to it. It recognises that the legislation has wide, sweeping powers, and knows what damage it can do to the State in the way of stopping projects and losing jobs.

Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.31 p.m.): In the last sitting week, I dealt with certain allegations that had been made against the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby). Since allegations were made against High Court judge, Mr Justice Murphy, that he had said, "How is my little mate?" a second Senate inquiry had been made into the matter, and a Federal prosecutor is looking into it to determine whether or not Murphy should be charged. The Government laughed at the

allegations that I raised, and did nothing about them. No statement has been made in the Parliament by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson), by the Premier or by the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services about the allegations. It seems to me that the Government wants the allegations to go away.

The first matter I raised last week related to a statutory declaration by a Leslie Dyne, which is recorded in "Hansard". It alleges that Mr Luton had said that he had asked the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby) on the telephone to get a detective taken off a case.

The second affidavit to which I referred was made by Mr Luton's son, Francis James Luton. He said that he had driven his father to a property in the Redland shire where he met the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services. The Minister's answer to that was that he had no recollection of the meeting. He did not state that it did not happen; he stated that he had no recollection of it.

Today, I wish to table two futher declarations that I have received since that date. I will read the body of the declarations to the House so that honourable members may understand what is going on. The first declaration was made by Alexander Clarence Judd. It states—

> "That during 1983, in approximately October, I had a telephone conversation with a man who identified himself as Francis Luton. I contacted him re the progress of development in an estate at Bargara Beach where I had purchased a block of land.
>
> During the conversation, Mr Luton divulged to me that he had had a Detective Mahony removed from an investigation of land dealings at Bargara Beach.
>
> Mr Luton told me the detective was harrassing him, and that he'd had him removed by approaching a member of the Queensland Parliament.
>
> He did not identify the Member of Parliament.
>
> In January 1984 I wrote to the Premier of Queensland and expressed my concern about the removal of the detective from the investigation.
>
> In March 1984 I went to the offices of the Queensland Minister for Police and spoke to a Margaret McLaren who directed me to the Minister's staff."

I turn now to the answer that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police gave to me this morning.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Row): Order! The honourable member read from a declaration that he said he will table. Before he proceeds to another subject, I should like him to table the declaration.

Mr MACKENROTH: I table it.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

This morning, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police stated in the House that he had no knowledge of the alleged interference before I brought it to the attention of honourable members. He stated that no member of Parliament had raised the allegations with him.

In January 1984, Mr A. Judd wrote to the Premier and Treasurer, and I will read to the House a couple of paragraphs from his letter. It reads—

> "Also on talking to Mr Luton he told me he had approached a member of the Queensland Parliament and had Detective Mahony of the Fraud Squad removed from this investigation.
>
> I find this removal of any detective at Mr Luton's request extremely disturbing, considering the large amount of money being held by this company, for improvements I have already explained, which I believe we may never see unless extreme pressure is applied to this company to perform.

I now call on your department to reinstate Detective Mahony on this case immediately in the interests of all landowners who purchased land from this company, which is in the vicinity of 200 people if my information is correct."

The replies from the Co-ordinator-General's Department, which I will table with the letter, do not make reference to the allegations contained in that letter.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

The original complaint was made to the Premier on 1 January 1984. In March 1984, Mr Judd went to the office of the Minister for Police, spoke to a Margaret McLaren and made the same allegations to her about a member of the Queensland Parliament interfering in this case. In spite of that, the Minister told the House this morning that he knows nothing about the allegations. I would like to know why his staff did not tell him that the allegations had been made, and why the Premier, after receiving that letter in early January, did not draw it to the attention of the Minister for Police. The letter alleges political interference in a fraud case; that is what must be considered.

Mr Shaw: He said this morning that he knew nothing about it.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is right; he said that he knew nothing about it. If that is so, he is not administering his department very well.

I will now read from a statement by Judith Anne Burr, which I have already tabled. It is more disturbing, because it states–

"During April 1981 my husband and I purchased a block of land from Incentive Programmes Pty. Ltd. at Bargara in Queensland. On the 20th October, 1982, I received a letter from Detective Sergeant P. V. Mahony of the Queensland Fraud Squad informing me that the Queensland Police were investigating the sale of this land. I phoned Detective Mahoney and informed him of my dealings with Incentive Programmes Pty. Ltd. which are contained in a Statement that has been supplied to the Queensland Fraud Squad.

During 1983 I wrote to Detective Mahoney to enquire as to how things were progressing. He phoned me and during the course of our conversation he informed me that he had been transferred from the Fraud Squad investigation into the Bargara land case and stated that in his belief it had been through political interference. When I questioned him on this he informed me that Mr Francis Patrick Luton knew someone in the Queensland Parliament."

That is further evidence that there was political interference in the removal of Detective Mahony from the investigation.

The Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby) made a number of contradictions at the press conference that he called as a result of matters that I raised in the House on Wednesday, 19 September 1984, in the Matters of Public Interest debate. The Minister for Police will not answer any of these allegations in Parliament. He simply wants to hide behind a report dated 26 October 1982. The Minister for Police has told the House that he will make a statement in this place tomorrow. Hounourable members will find out then that Detective Mahony was working on the case after 26 October 1982, and that in March and April, when he was making some investigations into the case, the alleged political interference took place.

It concerns me that a member of the Queensland Parliament can interfere in a Fraud Squad investigation and have a detective removed. It is about time that the Premier of Queensland ordered a complete investigation into these allegations. I will not let the allegations drop. When I first raised them, I raised allegations that someone had brought to my notice. I am now firmly convinced that the allegations are true, because a number of matters contained in those allegations have been confirmed.

On 18 September, this is what was stated on Channel O news—

"Sources within the Police Department confirmed to Eyewitness News tonight that some pressure had been brought to bear to halt a certain Fraud Squad investigation."

Channel O news was not prepared to identify the source of that pressure. That was 18 September.

Yesterday, the Commissioner of Police said that there was no pressure. He has changed his tune. The Government has put pressure on the police to shut up. It is about time that a thorough and proper investigation was conducted into the whole matter.

Women

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (12.41 p.m.): On numerous occasions, I have been asked by individual women and women's groups to express my thoughts on women's issues. I address this speech to those many women, and I shall attempt to include all aspects of the questions that have been asked.

I begin by quoting the words of Christian Bay, which give food for thought. He said—

> "The more people are enabled to take control over their own lives and achieve independence from bureaucratic or corporate programming . the more they will become capable of achieving authentic growth towards wholeness, autonomy and a realistic insight into one's own needs and those of others . . we must expect more people not only to take charge of their own lives, but to achieve a clear insight into their own authentic 'inner nature's' basic need priorities, so that their most salient wants may truly come to serve their needs."

The point that I am making is that, although we are women with some similarities, first and foremost we are individuals, and we must not allow ourselves to be lumped together with an anonymous mass sisterhood. Even identical twins, the closest of biological sisters, are more easily recognised by the individuality of their personalities than by physical appearance. A key element of Western democratic philosophy should always be the right to individual freedom and choice in all aspects of endeavour.

Most of what is said to date about women is said about them as members of the work-force rather than as individuals with the right of choice. Much of what is said is based on a negative attitude, an "us versus them" attitude of the militant working-class masses against a suppressive upper-class male management. Women are put forward as competitors against males for places in the work-place, yet so far, the spectre of women competing against each other has not been considered. In all these images of women struggling to the top, women are considered only from a single dimension, that of the ambitious career person.

That is where much of the present thinking falls short, because women can, in fact, be likened to a precious stone—I like that analogy—multifaceted with different emotions, needs, urges, desires and ambitions radiating out from a centre that is the indiviual. As no two individuals, or stones, are the same, so no two women are the same. Perhaps that accounts for the complexity of the female character, which for centuries men have complained is irrational and confusing. I have no need to fully explain these facets, as honourable members know what I mean when I mention just a few.

Consider a woman's need to be protected and secure, which co-exists with her fierce protective instincts towards her children; add the yearning for motherhood, which co-exists with the need for freedom and recognition in the wider world; then add the intangible romantic desire to be beautiful and the will to work at it with make-up, clothes and diet, which are the antithesis of her need to be efficient, practical and level-headed. I could go on. Often, women have been accused of not knowing what they want. That is because invariably they need a complex combination of things at any one time.

The continuation of discrimination on the grounds of sex, marital status or pregnancy must cease. However, there is a limit to the extent to which a convention or an Act of Parliament can eliminate that discrimination.

It must be made clear that, to change people's attitudes, understanding, time and education are needed, but if a Government relies solely on legislation to enforce change in social attitudes, is it really working within the confines of a democratic philosophy? It has been stated that true equality between groups that are different can be attained only by providing for the differences.

Even though the Queensland Government does not have set, laid-down legislation on women's affairs, it has a policy, a philosophy, that stresses a commitment to the equality of opportunity in the range of all human activity. I feel that management opposition will be reduced when aspiring female executives assert themselves more and when management sees the enlightened self-interest of harnessing the talents of people, regardless of sex. Australia has a huge investment in the education of our women. We would be squandering that investment and 50 per cent of our talent, creativity and energy if discrimination against women were perpetuated.

I am not by any means advocating that women should be left to battle on alone. What I am saying is that we must have policies that give people choices. Governments should be careful about making value decisions about what people should and should not do. It is up to society to work these things out, as it did in the two World Wars when women were recruited to do civilian work previously performed by men. When the boys came home many women went back to doing domestic chores but, even so, an irreversible adjustment of thinking had taken place and many women remained in the paid work-force. However, they were paid less than men for doing the same work. That situation is changing rapidly.

Education, contraception, labour-saving devices, material aspirations and the transformation of the family into many different forms have changed the earlier social pattern to the extent that women of all ages now seek paid employment at equal rates and with equal opportunity for promotion. Every effort should be made to clear the way for women to have the same employment opportunities, access to finance and professional credibility as men. But, at the same time, tax incentives should be available for those women who may prefer not to enter the work-force.

Part-time work is often referred to disparagingly by those who claim to advance the cause of women, but it is a legitimate way for a woman to balance her home and working life and, if anything, should be encouraged and extended. The point I am making is that we cannot be treated in a single dimension, that is, the ambitious career dimension. The speeches and decisions so far have been made in this light. Just because we are women does not mean that we are all the same and should be herded in the same direction. The present Federal legislation denies our individuality and has us, as oppressed sisters, fighting for a single cause.

The Federal Government denigrates the woman who chooses to stay home and impart her own standards and values to her children and to closely guide their upbringing. The Federal Government overlooks the fact that many of those women make up the voluntary charitable work-force in organisations, such as Meals on Wheels, that perform such an important role in our community.

Oppression comes in many forms. We hear so much from women's organisations about the oppression of women. In my case, at 15, when I entered the work-force I was oppressed by natural shyness—something that probably would not be noticed today. At 18, when I married, I was oppressed by the inexperience of youth. At 21, and raising two children alone, to save money was a real problem. At 24, I was oppressed by a lack of higher education. Now, at 37, with a university degree and teaching qualifications, and being a politician, I still find that some things oppress me. My greatest oppression is probably the fact that there are only 24 hours in a day. If one looks for oppression, one will always find it. If one looks hard enough, one will find more and more oppression. It does not seem to be the answer that one needs to look for oppression to claim that special legislation is needed to combat that oppression.

I am concerned that the negative "them versus us" attitude being fostered by those who have decided that they know what is best for us will lull many of us into looking for someone to blame for our lack of success, rather than positively, even cunningly, coming through the back door if we find the front door closed.

Life is full of barriers other than sex barriers. There are age barriers, cultural barriers and physical barriers, that is, being too tall, or too frail. They are all there if we look for them, and cannot legislate for all of them.

I make a short comment on affirmative action. In the Unites States, affirmative action programs incorporated principles of positive or benign discrimination or reverse discrimination. In this context, affirmative action was defined as giving preferential or compensatory treatment to members of racial, sex, ethnic or other groups. It has included the setting of quotas in employment and education. The quota system involves preferential treatment in hiring, promotion or admission to an educational institution. I warn people in our society to be very careful not to adopt the American model, a model that is already largely discredited.

Time expired.

Asian Immigration; Professor Blainey's Comments

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (12.52 p.m.): As the member of this Assembly representing the most cosmopolitan electorate in Queensland, I raise my concern at the dangers of increasing racial intolerance resulting from the current so-called immigration debate. On the basis of newspaper reports of Professor Blainey's comments, it appears to me that his argument may be reduced to four premises. First is his belief that the Hawke Government is accepting too many Asians and turning its back on traditional sources of Australian immigration, particularly from Britain. Secondly, Blainey contends that the pro-Asian and anti-British policy is out of step with public opinion. Thirdly as a consequence of being out of step with public opinion—and Blainey now leaves his role as an historian and becomes a sociologist—he sees increasing racial intolerance with the likely possibility of racial conflict. Finally, Blainey pinpoints the major source of public antagonism, which is the widespread concern that Asians are taking jobs from Australian citizens.

Any investigation of the four arguments would reveal little, if any, evidence to support those dangerous, divisive and racist conclusions. The argument of pro-Asian and anti-British changes in policy by the Hawke Labor Government does not stand up to any objective analysis. In the Whitlam years from 1972 until 1975, 17 per cent of arrivals were from Asia. From 1975 to 1983, during the Fraser regime, 31 per cent of arrivals were from Asia. The figures for the period from July 1982 to December 1983—they are the most up-to-date figures I have been able to obtain—shows that the Asian content was 28 per cent.

I shall now demolish the assertion that the Hawke Government is anti-British in its immigration policy. The number of people from Britain and Ireland applying to emigrate to Australia declined dramatically from 137 112 in 1980-81 to 53 057 in 1982-83. For the first nine months of 1983-84—again the latest figures I have been able to obtain—the number of applicants in the United Kingdom fell to 13 202.

Mr Tenni: They don't want to come here.

Mr FOURAS: Of course they do not want to come here. There are no jobs here.

The number of visas issued to people from the United Kingdom by the present Labor Government under Hawke is much higher than it was under the Fraser Government. The British people are not coming here because of the lack of employment opportunities, which is extremely unfortunate.

Unfortunately Professor Blainey is correct in suggesting that public opinion is opposed to the current rate of Asian immigration. There is no doubt at all about that. A

predominant number of people in our society are opposed to Asian immigration. The question is whether a Labor Government—a Government of conscience—should meekly give in to racist sentiments and return to the White Australia policy of our past. It was a despicable policy.

Let us consider our post World War II immigration policy. We were then about populating or perishing. It was our desire to populate this large continent. Skilled workmen were hand-picked to ensure that our nation was made great. Migrants came here wanting to belong and wanting to contribute. They made a great contribution. More than half of the migrants after World War II came from outside Britain. They came from countries such as my own—Greece—and Italy. If the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services were to cast his mind back to public opinion at that time, he would remember that people from Greece and Italy were not totally accepted. In fact, they were not wanted. Anybody who knows anything about migrants knows that we were not accepted at that time. We gained acceptance because we proved ourselves to be good Australian citizens. If the Indo-Chinese—the Vietnamese—were given the same opportunity, they would also prove themselves. That is a very pertinent point.

Consideration should be given to why more Asians are coming to Australia. At the time of the Vietnam war the Fraser Government, with the support of the Australian Labor Party, agreed to take refugees. That was a humanitarian stance. The action of the Fraser Government to bring in refugees was not prompted by changing public opinion. However, Professor Blainey has stated that public opinion must be behind such action. There is no way in the world that public opinion was behind the bringing in of Asian refugees. The nation is being told by the racists opposite, by people from some elements of the National Party, the League of Rights and the Returned Services League, now that Australia has brought in all these refugees, they should not be allowed to be reunited with their families. That is appalling!

I am amazed that members of the National Party go along to Vietnamese communities and tell them the Labor Party is a communist organisation and that the refugees should vote for the National Party because it is against communism. Not one member of the National Party has stood up and supported the Vietnamese in their hour of need, which is now. The Vietnamese have been made the scapegoats of the community. Because of what has happened, they cannot get jobs.

Statements about Asianisation by Blainey, some elements of the RSL, the League of Rights and people such as Michael Hodgman—that despicable Liberal—are fostering a climate in which racist actions can occur. If the economic recession worsens, big problems will occur. Blainey is saying to the society that it is losing jobs because of the Vietnamese. He is using the people of one nation as a scapegoat. In the past, that happened to people to whom I am very close, because I also am a migrant. What is happening is that the Vietnamese are being blamed because somebody else loses a job. If there is a continuation of the current climate, which is allowing extremist racist groups to increase racism in the country, the prophecies of those opposite will be self-fulfilling. If the community continues to allow the Asian migrants to be used as scapegoats because of the claim that they are taking people's jobs, the prophecies of social unrest and of increased racism and other problems in our society will be self-fulfilling. Obviously the immediate sufferers in the Asian immigration debate are the Asians. They are suffering very much. The Asian migrants are the new scapegoats in the Australian society.

In regard to lack of jobs—after the Aborigines, Asians are the second most unemployed group in this nation. I am a firm believer in the benefits of immigration because I believe it causes a net increase in jobs. That is supported by facts. Because migrants need housing and purchase consumer goods, they cause job increases. However, the racists jump onto the Blainey bandwagon. He is an eminent historian but a lousy sociologist, which is unfortunate. "The Courier-Mail" has given Professor Blainey a column and I suggest that it give people with a different viewpoint, such as me, an opportunity to debunk the myths and the misrepresentations that he has made.

I am concerned that the immigration debate will inflame racial attitudes. That would not only affect the Vietnamese but would also have a flow-on effect to other non-English-speaking migrants. That that situation be not allowed to develop is important. The Vietnamese have not been the only ones to suffer in this debate; the whole matter has been passed on to all non-English-speaking migrants, which is unfortunate. In the last few months since the debate began, I have had more racist comments made to me than in the seven years that I have been a member of Parliament. The debate has allowed racists to come out of the woodwork; it has allowed them to rationalise and justify what they are saying; it is allowing pure racism to rear its ugly head.

The time has come for those members opposite, who get the Asian votes by saying that the National Party is anti-communist and that members of the Labor Party are communists, to support the rights of these people and support a policy that is humane and Christian and opposes discrimination against these people. Australian involvement in the Vietnamese war was caused by the philosophies and policies of people like those opposite. The refugees should have been allowed to come here and they should now have the right to be reunited with their families.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

CLEAN WATERS ACT

Motion for Disallowance of Regulations

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (2.15 p.m.): I move—

> "That the regulations pursuant to the Clean Waters Act, dated 17 May 1984 and tabled in this House on Thursday, 23 August 1984, be disallowed."

It is not the intention of the Opposition to take up a great deal of the time of the House in debating these regulations. Members will understand that, in order to bring the public's attention to these increases, the only option which presents itself to members is to move for the disallowance of the regulations.

Under normal circumstances, the Opposition would not be opposed to a fair increase in charges. It would be quite ridiculous to suggest that charges never be increased. They must be adjusted to a level which maintains viability. It is quite reasonable to expect that income from charges be maintained at a level which offsets Government costs in performing a service to one section of the community. The public should not be subsidising polluters. The question then arises: Is the reason for the increases under discussion that the cost of administering these licences has risen sharply? The reasons for the increases given in the annual report of the Water Quality Council are very strange indeed. It suggests that they are catch-up increases. Because there was a wages and prices pause, the suggestion is that the Government is now entitled to catch up on the losses it incurred during the pause. I can well imagine what would be the Government's reaction if the unions were to suggest that they receive the same sort of catch-up that the Water Quality Council is suggesting is its entitlement. So, is the reason for the increases that the cost of administering the licences has risen sharply, or is this just one of many increased charges that a more honest Government would have included in the Budget?

It may be, and I must say that I would be particularly pleased to hear the Minister say so, that it had been decided to increase Government surveillance of people polluting our waterways and that the increased revenue was necessary to fund this work.

Unfortunately, that is extremely unlikely. The reality is that the Government has no particular concern about the cost of administering the system or its relationship to the income being received from licence fees, nor has it any intention of increasing surveillance of polluters or further restricting their activity.

In my opinion the truth of the matter is that the Government has looked at all areas of its activities with the aim of increasing its revenue. It has looked at the Clean

Waters Act and other Acts and said, "These were not increased last year, (or, in some cases, were not increased by a large margin last year), we can raise more revenue by increasing fees here."

If we look to the statements of Government Ministers and the Premier to find the reason for the increases, we are told that there are no increases at all. The Premier's Budget statement claims no increases in charges. "The Courier-Mail" article headed "Budget at a Glance" on Friday, 21 September 1984, said, "No rises in taxes or charges".

Most people would believe that means that they will pay the same charges as last year. It is incredible that what is meant is that the charges have been changed by regulation—outside the Budget. More to the point, it is dishonest. It is deceitful. It is more the type of sales line one expects from a sideshow alley con man than a statement from a State Treasurer.

The regulations we are debating are just one relatively small example of increased charges, but they are clear and irrefutable evidence of the absolute fantasy of Government propaganda. That Government members can continue to mouth this propaganda knowing, as they must, that it is an outrageous lie, leaves me astonished. Have they no pride in their credibility?

The Government and its Ministers continue to claim that this Government not only fails to introduce new taxes but is not increasing charges or is keeping charges to the inflation rate, or, according to one Minister, is actually reducing them. This is not true, as is instanced by the regulations we are debating. The increase in charges here is, in fact, well in excess of the inflation rate. I do not make the claim that, so far as fees for licences to discharge water under the Clean Waters Regulations are concerned, what has been proposed by the Government is grossly excessive. The adequacy or relevance of the fee is not the point at issue. At the same time it must be said that it does this State no credit that industry is able to purchase a licence to pollute.

If we are forced to accept the argument that such pollution is inevitable and that counter measures are to take a considerable time to apply, the fees for such licences should be high enough to give the greatest possible encouragement to these firms to find more satisfactory alternatives.

It is an unfortunate fact that, in most instances, firms dump their wastes into drains and streams because that is the cheapest and most convenient means of disposing of unwanted products. The Government has a responsibility to tip the economic scales in the other direction, and so provide a strong economic incentive not to pollute. It is regrettable that this Government has clearly demonstrated that it has no intention of providing these economic sanctions.

It is notable that 476 licences to pollute are presently in force. Although most of these licencees are no doubt doing their best to improve the situation, the latest report of the Water Quality Council indicates that some are not. One cannot help but get the impression from reading the report that some of them treat the matter as a joke. I quote the following from the report on page 4, under the heading "Inspection and monitoring of premises"—

> "Whilst the great majority of licensees comply with their effluent discharge conditions, a disappointing aspect of the inspection process is that inadequacies identified at some premises by the inspector, who visits only perhaps every two months, should in many cases be found by occupiers or their staff who are on site every day."

The report is virtually saying that every time an inspector makes a visit he finds that conditions attached to the licence are not being met.

The report continues—

> "It is a requirement of discharge licences that effluent quality be monitored sufficiently frequently to ensure that it complies with licence conditions. If licensees

> fail to correct obvious inadequacies it will be necessary to impose a much more frequent mandatory interval for sampling and analysis, with resulting increased operating costs."

Clearly those people are making no effort to co-operate, yet there have been no prosecutions under the Act. There seems little point in the recommendation of the Water Quality Council for more frequent inspections if firm action involving penalties does not follow for the non-co-operators.

The council's suggestion will mean greater expense for the reasonable licencees instead of the bandits who irresponsibly pollute our waterways. When I am speaking on the subject of the report of the Water Quality Council, I must say that I am amazed to see in the list of new licences to pollute the name of Iwasaki Sangyo Aust. Pty Ltd for a holiday resort at Yeppoon. This is absolutely disgraceful and inexcusable. The jewel in the Premier's development crown, the Iwasaki resort, that we were told would be bigger and better than Disneyland, has a licence to pollute before it takes in its first guest.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Goodness me, don't knock it again.

Mr SHAW: I point out to the Premier and Treasurer that the report submitted by the council on his behalf said that it has issued a licence to this company to pollute the waterways. Before construction is completed, the firm has admitted that it cannot construct in such a way so as not to pollute the waterways. That is a disgrace.

If this new resort cannot afford to establish itself on a proper standard, something is radically wrong. The polluter's licence to Iwasaki should be withdrawn immediately.

The increases that we are debating today have the sole aim of increasing revenue. Members must consider the justification for these increases against the Government's statements that it does not need to raise extra revenue and is not, in fact, doing so.

Honourable members will recall that the Premier and Treasurer has said repeatedly that, as the result of the National Party Government's economic management, this State is so flush with funds that it has not, and will not, increase taxes. In the Government's thinking, charges and licence fees are somehow different from taxes.

The statements by Ministers on the question of increases in charges have been inconsistent. They have also been dishonest, as is demonstrated by the increases under discussion.

I draw the attention of the House to statements made by the Acting Premier (Mr Gunn) about the proposed Budget. He was quoted in "The Courier-Mail" of 10 September 1984 as saying—

> "The Government would not introduce new taxes or increase charges which were tied to inflationary movements."

I ask honourable members to compare that statement with what is really happening, and these regulations are an excellent example.

Under regulation 13 (i) to (vi), over the last two years the increases in charges have ranged from 25 to 26.8 per cent. The average increase in every regulation under the Clean Waters Act is 25 per cent. Although official figures indicate that the inflation rate in Queensland is higher than that in most other States, the most pessimistic reports would not indicate that, since June 1982, Queensland's inflation rate has been running at 25 per cent.

In moving for the disallowance of these regulations, the Opposition does not challenge the right of the Government to make regular and fair increases in charges for the services that it renders to the public. Instead, it challenges the honesty and integrity of the economic statements by the Government and the claims of Ministers about the Government's attitude to tax increases. These regulations are a good example of the difference between Government propaganda and fact, and they are not an isolated or

extreme case. An examination of the increases to charges imposed by the Government over the last five years shows that increases well above the inflation rate are usual. Many examples illustrate that far more unjustified increases have been imposed than those contained in the regulations under debate this afternoon.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (2.27 p.m.): I support the comments of the member for Wynnum in his opposition to the increased charges in the regulations under the Clean Waters Act. The increases give the lie to the Government's statement that it does not increase charges or taxes in Queensland. This is the only Government that I know of that introduced a mini-Budget on the Saturday after the Budget was brought down in Parliament and before it was debated by the House. The Government has probably set a world record.

The staff of the Water Quality Council of Queensland has been reduced by one in the past 12 months. However, over the past two years, the fees and charges have been increased by an average of about 25 per cent. I can see that the Minister's adviser is nodding his head the wrong way. In the 1983-84 financial year, because of the wages pause, the Government did not increase its charges. I can see that my friend over there says that it is not true.

I will quote from page 2 of the twelfth annual report of the Water Quality Council of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1984, which was tabled in Parliament yesterday. Under the heading "Staffing", this appears—

> "At 30th June 1984, the establishment ot the Water Quality Section was 41. This represented a reduction of one on that at June 1983."

The Minister's adviser did not agree with me when I said that charges have increased by 25 per cent. I turn now to discuss a number of those charges.

The Queensland Government Gazette of 19 May 1984 states that the fee for an application for a licence for wastes discharged from premises to water shall be, for each 100 cubic metres per day or part therof, $39, which has been increased from $31. That is an increase of 25.8 per cent, or $8. The minimum fee is now $156 and it used to be $123, which is an increase of $33, or 26.8 per cent. The fee for an application for a licence for each overflow drain has been increased from $62 to $78, which is an increase of 25.8 per cent.

A local authority shall be charged one composite fee for its applications for licences that will not exceed $6,690. That fee used to be $5,350. That is an increase of 25 per cent. The aggregate of the application fees payable in respect of any number of discharges from any premises at any one location will now not exceed $4,750. That figure used to be $3,800. That is an increase of about 25 per cent. My friend is not nodding his head any more because these are facts contained in the Government Gazette and in the report of the Water Quality Council of Queensland.

The fee for an application for the review of a decision of the council under section 24 (4) of the Clean Waters Act has been increased from $780 to $975. I do not know how the department makes its calculations, but I am sure that the increases are not in the range of 5, 6 or 7 per cent, which was the inflation rate of the last two years. In its report, the Water Quality Council states that it was required to increase its charges because the Government Chemical Laboratory is now charging the council for its services that were once provided free of charge. The council has also increased its charges to overcome a cash flow anomaly that has existed in the Clean Waters Trust Fund for a number of years. Those statements appear in the council's annual report.

I can go on about the 25 per cent and higher percentage increases in some of the charges that are levied by this supposedly non-taxing and non-increasing-charges Government; a Government that never increases any costs, that never hits small business and is always concerned for the small operator in the community.

The regulations set out that the fee for the variation of any condition attached to a licence shall be $200. It used to be $160. The fee for wastes discharged from premises

to water shall be $63 for each 100 cubic metres per day or part thereof. It used to be $50. The minimum fee shall be $252. It used to be $200. For each overflow drain, the fee shall be $185. It used to be $148. Anyone can work out that the increases are not of the order of 5 or 6 per cent.

The aggregate of fees payable in respect of one location shall not exceed $7,570. The figure used to be $6,050. A local authority shall be charged one composite fee not exceeding $10,630. It used to be $8,500. That increase of $2,130 represents an increase of approximately 25 per cent. My friend over there is not nodding his head any more.

The fee for a duplicate licence shall be $63. It used to be $50. That represents an increase of 26 per cent. The fee to accompany notification under section 32 of the Act shall by $475. It used to be $380. That, too, represents an increase of approximately 25 per cent. The fee payable for perusal of any register pursuant to section 26 of the Act shall be $25. It used to be $20. That represents an increase of 25 per cent.

I do not want to have to highlight any further increases. The point I make is that it is about time that the Government was honest with the people of Queensland. The Government should tell the people the truth. It is increasing its fees accross the board by 25 per cent. Yet it claims that it does not increase any fees at all. On the one hand the Government claims that it is intent on keeping costs down; on the other, it is sneaking increases through by way of the Government Gazette instead of announcing them in the Budget, in which they should have been announced. I see no reason why in the future Opposition members should not continue to highlight the increases in charges that this Government sneaks in through the back door.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (2.32 p.m.): I support my colleagues who have exposed this Government's deliberate policy of increasing costs at a rate above that of inflation. I have compiled a table of increases applicable under the regulations. Later I shall seek leave to incorporate it in "Hansard"

The honourable member for Lytton dealt in detail with the increases that are set out in the regulations. The increase in the charge applying to the discharge of wastes is an increase of 25.8 per cent. In contrast, the Consumer Price Index increased by 17.4 per cent. In other words, the differences between the increases is 8.4 per cent.

The increases set out in the regulations are as much as 3.8 per cent to 4.7 per cent per annum over the increases that occurred in the CPI for the same period. In other words, the Government has imposed, on businesses, costs far in excess of the inflation rate. That comment applies not only to the application fees but also to the annual fees, where again the increases are above those of the CPI over the same period. The increases in annual fees are from 3.9 per cent to 4.3 per cent per annum above those in the CPI. The Government's policy is a deliberate one and it is having a detrimental effect on the livelihood of business in this State.

Government members profess that they are helping the sugar industry. The milling side of the industry will be severely affected by these increases, which, as I have said, are higher than the increases in the CPI. That is what Opposition members are setting out to expose.

We oppose these increases in charges and shall call for a division to force Government members to stand up and be counted and to show whether or not they are prepared to increase costs at a rate above the ordinary inflation rate. The Government's policy will drastically affect the profitability and stability of businesses in Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Bundaberg said that he would be seeking leave to incorporate a document in "Hansard". Will he describe the document?

Mr CAMPBELL: I had intended going through the table in detail; however, the honourable member for Lytton did so quite well. The table that I have compiled sets out the old charges, the new charges, the percentage increase, the percentage increase of

the CPI and the extra increase above that of the CPI. I seek leave to have it incorporated in "Hansard", Mr Deputy Speaker, and if I am not permitted to do so I will go through the figures.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see no reason why the document cannot be incorporated.

Leave granted.

CLEAN WATERS ACT

INCREASED APPLICATION FEES MAY 1984

Application Fees	Old (May '82)	New (May '84)	% Increase	% Increase C.P.I.	Extra Increase above C.P.I.
	$	$			
Wastes discharge (100 m³/day)	31	39	25.8	17.4	8.4
Minimum fee	123	156	26.8	17.4	9.4
Overflow drains (each drain)	62	78	25.8	17.4	8.4
Maximum	3800	4750	25.0	17.4	7.6

Increase in charges above C.P.I. increase 3.8%—4.7% per annum.

INCREASED ANNUAL FEES

Wastes discharge (100 m³/day)	50	63	26	17.4	8.6
Minimum fee	200	252	26	17.4	8.6
Maximum fee	6050	7570	25.1	17.4	7.7

Increase in charges above C.P.I. increase 3.9%—4.3% per annum.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (2.35 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contribution. The costs of running the Water Quality Council have not increased sharply. Honourable members raised a number of matters relevant to the operation of the Clean Waters Act. Those matters are not related to the increase in fees covered by the regulations. The Estimates of the Department of Local Government are to be debated next week. At that stage honourable members will have an opportunity to raise any matters that they wish to raise. Obviously, I will respond to honourable members' queries during the course of the Estimates debate.

The regulations made under the Clean Waters Act 1971-1982 and tabled on 23 August 1984 provided for an increase in fees chargeable under the Act. The fees in question cover such matters as the issue and renewal of licences for the discharge of wastes into watercourses and other miscellaneous fees payable under the Act. On average, fees have been increased by approximately 25 per cent.

The current increase in fees is the first in two years, and honourable members will note that the increases are generally in line with the rate of inflation. Fees were not increased last year because of the wages pause that applied at that time. Honourable members will appreciate that, under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, it is the duty of the accountable officer of each department to review fees regularly with a view to seeing that, so far as possible, they match the costs of operation of the functions in respect of which they are charged.

I might mention for the information of honourable members that licence fees chargeable under the Clean Waters Act make up only 32 per cent of the costs of administering the Act, the balance of the expenditure being met from consolidated revenue. In determining fees payable under the Act, regard is had to the ability of industry and local authorities to pay.

I am sure that honourable members will appreciate the improvements that have been effected in the water quality of the rivers and streams within the State, and this is largely due to the activities of the Water Quality Council.

I commend the officers of the Water Quality Council for the work that they have done. Honourable members need look only at the Brisbane River for an example of the improvement that has been effected in the water quality of rivers. The Queensland Government is proud of that achievement. Similar remarks can be made about every other stream in this State. Some members in this Chamber would recall when the Brisbane River was used as a sewer, to the extent that everybody was tipping effluent into it. Some attempt had to be made to keep rivers and streams free of pollution.

Mr Vaughan: You don't prosecute too many, though?

Mr HINZE: As the Minister, I do not go round prosecuting businesses if it can be avoided. I would rather sit round a table and say, "You have done something—"

Mr Vaughan: They keep on doing it.

Mr HINZE: Obviously, it has been effective. All honourable members know that it has been effective. If something happens to indicate that it has a desired effect—

Mr Vaughan: It has not.

Mr HINZE: If somebody tapped the honourable member on the shoulder and said, "Don't drive so fast", he would quickly knock off a few kilometres an hour.

I consider that the increase in fees provided for in the regulations are reasonable and that the motion for disallowance of the regulations should be negatived.

Question—That the motion (Mr Shaw) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 26		NOES, 45	
Burns		Ahern	Knox
Campbell		Alison	Lane
Casey		Austin	Lester
Comben		Bailey	Lickiss
Eaton		Bjelke-Petersen	Lingard
Fouras		Booth	Littleproud
Gibbs, R. J.		Borbidge	McKechnie
Hamill		Cahill	McPhie
Kruger		Chapman	Muntz
Mackenroth		Cooper	Newton
McElligott		Elliot	Powell
McLean		FitzGerald	Randell
Milliner		Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
Palaszczuk		Glasson	Stephan
Prest		Goleby	Stoneman
Price		Gunn	Tenni
Scott		Gygar	Turner
Shaw		Harper	Wharton
Smith		Henderson	White
Underwood		Hinze	
Vaughan		Innes	*Tellers*—
Veivers	*Tellers*—	Jennings	Harvey
Warburton	Davis	Katter	Neal
Yewdale	Warner, A.M.	Kaus	

Resolved in the negative.

BUILDING ACT

Motion for Disallowance of Regulations

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (2.48 p.m.): I move—

"That the regulations pursuant to the Building Act, dated 21 June 1984 and tabled in this House on Thursday, 23 August 1984, be disallowed."

In the previous debate I said that the reason that the motion for disallowance of the regulations had been moved was not that the Opposition opposes the right of the Government to impose reasonable charges for the services that it renders but rather that it exposes the hoax that has been perpetrated on the people of this State by the false claims made in the Budget documents. The Opposition does not intend to waste the time of the House by going over much of the argument that was voiced in the previous debate, nor does it intend to divide the House again. The point has already been made and the Opposition has clearly established that the members on the Government side are aware of these increased charges and fully support them.

Mr Campbell: And the Liberals.

Mr SHAW: And more importantly that the members of the Liberal Party support the somewhat clandestine manner in which these charges have been increased outside of the Budget.

The Government's argument that these increases reflect the inflation rate is somewhat fallacious. I note that in the previous debate the Minister argued that the increases were in line with the inflation rate. I find that somewhat suprising. The Minister is saying that over the last two years the Queensland inflation rate was 13 per cent. The increases under regulations that are not presently under debate—I am sure most members are aware of them—have been considerably in excess of that rate; up to 50 and 100 per cent. Even allowing for the fact that Queensland has had a higher inflation rate than those in other States, for a Minister to suggest that that has been the State's inflation rate is very difficult to understand.

I also want to refer quickly to the claim that the Queensland ecomony is extremely buoyant and that the Government was in fact reducing charges. That claim has been made by several Government spokesmen. The opportunity to reduce charges does exist. One has only to look at the annual report of the Nominal Defendant (Queensland), which members received in the past few days. On the occasion of the receipt of the previous report I referred to the buoyant position of the Nominal Defendant Fund and the tremendous amount of money that it was holding. It is interesting to look at the revenue that the fund receives as a result of charges, and the use to which that money is being put.

It is timely to recall the comment made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition that the Treasury of this State seemed to see itself as a merchant bank and was carrying out functions other than those which would usually be expected of a Treasury Department. His argument, which was well advanced, was that the funds were not being used in the best way to promote employment but rather were being invested in speculative ventures on the short-term money market in order to raise funds.

Bearing that in mind, it is appropriate to look at what is happening to the money held by the Nominal Defendant Fund. I do not intend to labour the point, but the report states–

> "Of the total fund of $48,142,357.48 as at 30th June, 1984, $33,157,591.35 has been invested by the Corporation in loans to Governmental and semi-Governmental Authorities in various parts of Queensland, and the balance of $14,984,766.13 is held at the Treasury Department. The substantial increase in this balance is due to the continuing lack of demand from the traditional borrowers. However, these moneys are placed in the short-term money market awaiting allocation."

That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday.

So approximately $33m has been invested in loans and $15m has been invested in the short-term money market this year. The Treasury Department is more or less using that money as investment only funds. It is an interesting exercise to total the funds being used in that manner. Over recent years the expenses of that Government instrumentality have averaged $3.5m. The annual cost of administering the fund over the past four of five years has been about $3.5m. The premiums imposed on motorists

through their registration fees bring in about $5.5m every year, so the fund receives more than it spends each year. The interest on the $68m that has been invested brings in a similar amount each year, so the fund receives about $11m each year.

That is a very clear example of one area in which, if the Government were serious about wanting to do so, it could reduce charges. Heaven knows, there is nobody more overtaxed than the motorist and, although the premium is only $3, it could be reduced to only $1, or even cut out entirely because the fund is in such a buoyant state that it could live on its accrued revenue.

Unlike the regulations under the Clean Waters Act, I am unaware of any relationship between the cost of administering the building regulations and the revenue received, and I hope the Minister can enlighten me. We as an Opposition accept that the cost of administering regulations should be borne by the people whom they affect, but it is fair to say that, as in the previous instance, it is not a matter of opposing the increases as such but a matter of opposing the dishonest way in which the Government has said that it has not imposed any fee increases at all. It is fair to say that this is another example of a revenue grab. It highlights what the Leader of the opposition referred to as the fraud in the State Budget.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (2.56 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I call the Minister.

Mr CAMPBELL: I will take only a minute. I believe that the motion has to be seconded.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no specific provision for the seconding of such a motion. If the honourable member wishes to speak, I will call him before the Minister sums up.

Mr CAMPBELL: I am speaking to again expose the Government's deliberate policy and to seek leave to incorporate a table in "Hansard" once again to show the increases. Under regulation 4 (1), the fee payable to a chairman, for a meeting of more than four hours' duration, was $83.50. That is to be increased to $128.50, an increase of 53.9 per cent. The increase in the Consumer Price Index was only 38.2 per cent, so that the new rate represents an increase of 15.7 per cent above the rate of the increase in the CPI.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Clerk of the Parliament has pointed out to me that there is provision in the Standing Orders for a seconder to such a motion. I therefore will allow the honourable member to second the motion.

Mr CAMPBELL: In seconding the motion, I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for realising that such a young member could have some knowledge of the Standing Orders.

Under the old scheme the members' fee for a meeting of more than four hours was $58. It has been increased to $89.50. That represents an increase of 54.3 per cent. Again, the increase in the CPI was 38.2 per cent. The new rate represents an increase of 16.1 per cent more than the increase in the CPI. We are accusing the Government of increasing charges on business and ordinary people to the extent of 3.9 per cent to 4 per cent per annum above the increase in the CPI. I want it recorded that that is the deliberate policy of the Government.

I seek leave to have the table incorporated in "Hansard"

Leave granted.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Regulation 4 Sub-Regulation (1)

MEETING FEES

	Old (July '80) $	New (June '84) $	% Increase	% Increase C.P.I.	Extra Increase Above C.P.I.
Chairman (meeting more than 4 hours)	83.50	128.50	53.9	38.2	15.7
Member (meeting more than 4 hours)	58.00	89.50	54.3	38.2	16.1

Increase in charges above C.P.I. increase—3.9% to 4.0% per annum.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (2.57 p.m.), in reply: Fees imposed under the Building Act cover the cost of determining objections and appeals and the cost of dealing with applications for variation of the Standard Building By-laws. The regulations made under the Building Act 1975-1984 and tabled on 23 August 1984 provided for an increase in fees chargeable under the Act. The fees in question cover such matters as the lodgment of objections against decisions of local authorities on applications for building permits, the making of applications for variations of the Standard Building By-laws and the lodgment of appeals to the Building Advisory Committee against determinations on such objections and applications. The regulations also prescribe a fee for the lodgment of an objection to the Building Industry Complaints Tribunal against the failure of a local authority to decide a building application within the prescribed time.

On average, fees have been increased by approximately 10 per cent. The current increase in fees is the first in two years. Honourable members will note that the increases are less than the rate of inflation. Fees were not increased last year because of the wage pause that applied at that time.

Honourable members will appreciate that, under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, it is the duty of the accountable officer of each department to review fees regularly with a view to seeing that, so far as possible, they match the cost of operation of the functions in respect of which they are charged.

I consider that the fees prescribed by the regulations in question are reasonable and that the motion for disallowance of the regulations should be rejected.

Motion (Mr Shaw) negatived.

DENTAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 471) on Mr Austin's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (3 p.m.): The Opposition agrees with the proposed amendments to the Dental Act. However, I wonder why the Minister for Health needs to amend the Act again through the provisions of another Bill that will be debated later today.

The Bill deals mainly with the registration of dentists from outside Queensland, whether they be from interstate or overseas. I can see nothing wrong with seeking the registration of dentists before they work in Queensland. I know that in some industries, such as the real estate industry, people are registered with Government authorities even though they do not operate in Queensland. I see nothing wrong with requiring people to be resident and operating as dentists in Queensland before they register. I also see

nothing wrong with requiring dentists to meet the standards of Queensland-trained dentists. I agree with the Minister on that amendment.

I hope that the legislation has not been introduced to stop the registration of dentists, which will mean that dentists already operating in Queensland will be able to increase their fees even more. I think that dentists charge too much now. The Government must ensure that dentists coming from overseas meet Queensland's standards and that dentists who apply for registration from outside the State will operate in Queensland.

The Bill also deals with increased penalties. Because the Dental Act has not been amended since 1973, the Opposition agrees with those increased penalties.

The Bill also makes provision for the formation of dental companies. Similar legislation relating to doctors was agreed to by the Labor Party when it passed through the Parliament.

The Opposition supports the Bill. Some of my colleagues wish to raise a number of other matters.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (3.3 p.m.): The debate on this Bill gives me the opportunity to raise a number of matters of particular concern to my electorate. At present, many people in the community are concerned about the way in which professional people are ripping off ordinary people. I refer particularly to solicitors and doctors. However, the dental profession has been overlooked in this regard. Recently, one of my constituents complained bitterly to me about how much he was charged by a dentist for his services.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Would it be fair to say that your constituent had his fangs removed?

Mr DAVIS: I would say that that is well and truly what happened; he probably had them ripped apart, to such a degree that he is still complaining and moaning.

Mr Mackenroth: The Minister should put some teeth into the legislation.

Mr DAVIS: I think that it needs more than teeth.

This constituent visited the dentist. His treatment included four X-rays, one scale and polish, one root filling and one extraction. The all-up price was $387, and a few miserable cents.

An Opposition Member: Were there any injections in that?

Mr DAVIS: There were no injections; I have listed what appeared on the bill.

Mr Casey: Would you say that when he got the account, he got the real pain?

Mr DAVIS: I do not think that I can take any more of these one-liners; they are really killing me.

I have to consider the pain that my constituent suffered from the dental work and also when he received the bill of $387. Because of my personal association with him, I know how much he suffered.

For one hour's work, the cost was $200. That is not bad by any standard.

An Opposition Member: Do you have a vested interest in this matter?

Mr DAVIS: I have a great vested interest in this matter.

Because I believe that justice should prevail, I took the matter up with the Dental Association. However, I ran into a brick wall. The secretary or other officer of the association was not very helpful. I requested that he give me a scale of charges, but I was told that the association did not issue a scale of charges. I asked whether, like doctors, dentists have schedule fees. He said that dentists had no schedule fees and that they can charge what they like.

Mr Elliott: You know what is going to happen to you.

Mr DAVIS: The honourable member for Cunningham should worry about his soil erosion and his broken-down property; I will worry about the dentists. The honourable member for Cunningham is a silvertail and to him expense is no object. He goes about with his chequebook and he is loaded with money—most of it obtained by way of subsidy from the Government. He can afford to pay for the best dentists in Australia. My constituents are the battlers of this world. The honourable member for Cunningham might regard a bill of $387 as being low. No doubt he goes to the crack doctors and dentists and can afford to pay what they ask. I am worried about the constituent in my electorate who is being ripped off by dentists. Incidentally, recently I saw the honourable member at the Dental Hospital. I did not intend to mention that. I thought that he was trying to rort the means test.

This constituent of mine, who is not eligible for free dental treatment, was forced to visit a private dentist, and he was ripped off to the tune of $387.

The worst part of this whole sorry episode is the fact that the Dental Association would not answer the questions that I put to it. The association was quite insulting.

When a patient receives his account from a dentist he finds that the account does not show the words "filling", "root filling" or "X-rays"; all it has is a list of numbers. The patient has to find out what those numbers mean. When he gets to the bottom of his account and sees the sum of $387, he gets a shock.

Mr Stephan: Who wrote that?

Mr DAVIS: Obviously, the honourable member is not interested in his constituents. I am concerned for mine, particularly the constituent involved in this incident. On behalf of this constituent, I am talking from the heart. I suppose that highlights the difference between members of the Labor Party, who are concerned for the working class, and the silvertails and bushies on the Government side.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Will the honourable member for Brisbane Central please define "silvertail" for me so that I can determine whether the comment is unparliamentary?

Mr DAVIS: I shall withdraw the remark, Mr Deputy Speaker, as it is insulting the silvertails. I do not have time to worry about the rabble on the Government side. You were quite right in calling me to order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Obviously, the Dental Association was not interested in the matter that I drew to its attention. It is nothing more than a club. It would not provide me with a scale of charges. It said that a dentist could charge what he liked.

The very next day, the president of the Dental Association telephoned me and, when I told him what the charges were, told me that my constituent had been overcharged. Of course, he did not like having to say that. He suggested that every person who visits a dentist should obtain a quote, just as a motorist does when he takes his car to a service station for work to be carried out on it. In other words, he suggested that a person should visit a dentist, open his mouth and obtain a quote. I said to him that it would be a good idea if a scale of charges were displayed at a dentist's surgery. I was told that nothing could be done about that.

I am sure that many people have experienced problems when they have tried to obtain a set of upper or lower dentures. One of my constituents complained that he was charged $1,000 for dental services, whereas the quote from another dentist further down the road was about $600. There is another $400 that has gone down the drain.

Until a few months ago I was more keen on dentists and not dental mechanics doing certain work. To become a member of the dental profession, a person must undertake a great deal of study. Even though dentists only fit the dentures made by

dental mechanics, they should be given a fair go and allowed to make that extra cop. However, after what happened to one of my constituents, Mr Acting Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): I am the Deputy Speaker.

Mr DAVIS: I am sorry. Sometimes honourable members get carried away with titles. Mr Deputy Speaker, I certainly would not demean your high office.

It is about time that price control was introduced in Queensland. If it is good enough to control workers' wages, it is good enough to control dentists' fees, particularly dentists such as the one who ripped off one of my poor unwary constituents to the tune of $387.

Mr Vaughan: Have you had any trouble with them?

Mr DAVIS: I am talking on behalf of a constituent. I said that I would raise that matter at the first opportunity.

I have one tip for anyone who needs to visit a dentist. No-one should tell his dentist that he is a member of Medibank Private or a medical benefits fund. The prices will go up if the dentist knows that a person is a member of such a fund.

Mr YEWDALE (Rockhampton North) (3.12 p.m.): I wish to refer to a serious problem confronting the people of central Queensland. It relates to the Rockhampton Base Hospital Dental Clinic. Recently, a supporting mother of three children who resides in my electorate found it necessary to take her 10 or 11-year old daughter to the Rockhampton Base Hospital for an examination of her mouth and teeth. The mother was concerned that her daughter's teeth were distorted. An appointment was made. The girl visited the dentist, who said that he would refer her to an orthodontist. The girl's mother went through the hospital process in the normal manner. When she went to make an appointment to see an orthodontist, she was surprised to be told by the young lady behind the counter that an appointment would be made, but that it would be four years hence. If anybody was told that story in another context, he would say that it was not feasible or practicable that a person would have to wait four years to receive orthodontic treatment. One could imagine how a 10 or 11-year old girl would feel when she was told that she would have to wait four years to have her teeth rectified. One could imagine the damage that would continue to occur during those four years.

The mother and child were flabbergasted. The mother asked me whether I could provide any assistance. Because of my concern for the family, and particularly because the mother wanted the orthodontic work to be done, I spoke to officials at the hospital. The statements that had been made to me were reaffirmed. I cannot be positive about the present situation in Rockhampton. However, I believe that one orthodontist is practising in the city. One orthodontist was working sessions at the base hospital. I do not know whether he is doing that work now.

I wrote to the Minister about this matter. I also spoke to him privately about it. He was sympathetic. I suppose that anybody would be sympathetic if the child of a supporting mother required orthodontic treatment.

In the past, an insufficient number of persons were trained in the dental profession. Those who were trained in that profession either entered private practice or were offered a better life-style and better income by practising as a specialist.

The Minister indicated that his department had advertised overseas—I think he mentioned South Africa and another country—in an endeavour to build up the ranks of orthodontists in the State. That had some merit. If the position has not altered, the Minister, even though he may be relatively new in the portfolio, and his predecessors must share the blame for inadequate long-term planning.

The supporting mother to whom I refer was told that, if she took her daughter to a private orthodontist, there would still be a fairly long waiting period, but at the end

of the treatment she would be faced with a bill of several hundred dollars. She is eligible under the means test to have free treatment at the base hospital. It is ridiculous that the waiting-time should be four years. I have not taken the trouble to ascertain the position in the rest of the State. It would be a worthwhile exercise to check with members from other areas whether the waiting-time for orthodontists is uniform throughout the State.

I appeal to the Minister. If the circumstances have changed since he made his comment to me, well and good. If the circumstances are still the same, I ask him to tell us what the future holds for those requiring orthodontic treatment not only in Rockhampton but right throughout the State.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (3.17 p.m.): I intend to make only a short contribution to the debate. By the charges they levy, dentists are ripping the public off. Statements have been made—one was as recently as yesterday—about the failure of the accord initiated by the Hawke Government some 18 months ago and agreed to Australia-wide. Of course, such statements are false. Contrary to arguments put by Government members, the accord is still working very well. An integral part of the accord was the call made by the Prime Minister for restraint not only by the trade unions but also by professionals such as doctors and lawyers. His comments apply to dentists as well. We ought to be thankful that, over the last couple of years, the frauds and the out-and-out crooks and thieves in the medical profession have been exposed, as they deserved to be. Regrettably, that arm of the law, if I might put it that way, has yet to extend to the dental profession's charges for fees and services.

My good friend and colleague the member for Brisbane Central made the pertinent point that charges ought to be displayed in dental surgeries, clearly visible to people as they walk in. If he speaks to me later, I will advise him of a very good dentist in Fortitude Valley who does exactly that. His charges are fair and he provides an excellent service. He enjoys an excellent professional name and a profitable practice. He conducts his business in a very reputable manner.

Mr Milliner: Mr Davis could leave his teeth there overnight.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I do not know whether that would be physically possible for the member for Brisbane Central, but I have no doubt that people on the other side of the Chamber could. They certainly lack bite in the comments that they make in Parliament.

It is high time that the Minister and the Government approached with an air of political maturity the ongoing battle between dental technicians and people within the dental profession who see themselves as being qualified. In common with the member for Brisbane Central, until a couple of years ago I shared the view that, because people go to university and devote themselves to their study, they are entitled to reap the full rewards. In this day and age, those who complete the course of dental technican—dental mechanics, as they are still referred to by some people—serve time in indentured apprenticeships. The product that they turn out is in no way inferior to that provided by a qualified dentist.

A comparison of charges reveals that, if a dental technician were legally able to supply a set of false teeth, he would charge approximately $250 or $300, whereas the charlatans from the profession charge up to two and a half times that amount. In fact, I have heard of $1,000 being charged for a set of false teeth. That is an absolute scandal and disgrace and a blight on the community and on the Government which allows that to go on.

Dental technicians are willing and able to provide such a service to those in the community who are not in the upper income-earning bracket and cannot really afford the prices charged by dentists. However, if a dental technician is caught providing that service, as happened recently, he will be heavily fined and, if he refuses to pay the fine, as also happened recently, he will spend time in the Brisbane Prison Complex at Boggo Road.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: He was certainly threatened with gaol. In fact, only recently I spoke to one dental technician who did spend time in the Brisbane Prison Complex because he refused to pay the fine.

I am saying to the Minister that it is high time that he gave this problem very serious consideration. Surely in this so-called State of milk and honey in which people pay the lowest prices for every item in Australia, barring those essential commodities such as eggs, milk, cheese, bread and anything else that I could name, and surely in this State of low taxation—that also is baloney—something constructive can be put forward so that people can be told that if they come to Queensland they can be provided with a good set of false teeth at a reasonable price. I do not say that in jest because it is a very important issue to those thousands of people in the community who need dental treatment and false teeth. The Government has a responsibility to act accordingly to stop the current rip-off and ensure that qualified dental technicians can provide false teeth to people at a reasonable rate.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (3.23 p.m.): I can only agree with the statements made by the honourable member for Rockhampton North about the very long waiting time for orthodontic work at the South Brisbane Dental Hospital, which is in my electorate. Some time ago I had the privilege of joining the Minister at the opening of those very fine facilities, which are most pleasing and well done. Recently I was contacted by a widow who had taken her son to the hospital where he was told that he needed three fillings. He was told to return in six months' time, when one of those cavities would be fixed in a half hour appointment, and that he would have to wait a further six months for the next appointment. I checked with the South Brisbane Dental Hospital and was told that that was the current policy. I am aware that the hospital has vacant chairs and I am sure that dentists could be found. I accept that there is a shortage of orthodontists in Queensland and, indeed, in Australia, but surely there is not such a pressing shortage of dentists. This 18-year-old boy will have to go to the hospital three times at six-monthly intervals to get three fillings done. In the meantime the cavities will be getting worse.

As I said, I know that the hospital has vacant chairs, so I urge the Minister to be fair dinkum about providing dental services for those who cannot afford to pay a private dentist. Obviously a widow who has children going to high school and university would be in that needy category. That a person has to wait six months for a filling and a further six months for another filling is absolutely despicable. Queensland is a long way short of providing dental services for those in need.

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (3.25 p.m.): I agree with the statement made by my friend and colleague the member for Chatsworth regarding the Bill. As he said, the Opposition does support the Bill.

I want to place on record my appreciation of the excellent work done by the School Dental Service. Unfortunately, it is running into a problem with specialist services. Attached to the School Dental Service is an orthodontic facility but, unfortunately, there is a fairly long wait before children can see an orthodontist. In my area schoolchildren requiring orthodontic work have had to wait for an extremely long time for treatment.

The people involved in that field in the School Dental Service have been extremely helpful and co-operative, but the service is understaffed. I realise the difficulty in obtaining specialists to work in the program. When people graduate from university, enter private practice, do post-graduate work and qualify as specialist orthodontists it is obvious that they would want to remain in private practice. There is obviously a demand for specialists, such as orthodontists, who can make more money in private practice than in the School Dental Service. I pay tribute to the excellent job done by orthodontists in the service, and I would like the Government to provide more money so that that specialised service can be provided more readily for schoolchildren. Obviously, if orthodontic problems

can be corrected early, people will have far less trouble with their teeth in later years. I hope that the Government will do everything possible to provide these much-needed facilities in schools.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (3.27 p.m.): I want to raise a few points for the Minister's consideration and/or comment. First I want to deal with the hoary old question of X-rays which surfaces from time to time. I refer particularly to the amount of radiation that people can be permitted to absorb in their bodies, particularly in their teeth. There is no system of recording the amount of radiation to which a person is exposed. If members are regular visitors to their dentists, they will know that these days dentists seem to want to take one, two or more X-rays each visit, but no record is kept, even though such a record is kept in other places at which people are exposed to X-rays. I bring that point to the Minister's attention. I know that it is a vexed question and one that is difficult of solution, but it should be tackled, particularly with the increased amount of radiation to which people are exposed these days.

The other point I wish to raise relates to dental technicians dealing direct with the public. As was pointed out earlier in the debate, a number of dental technicians have been succesfully dealing direct with the public for quite some time. I am not carrying a brief for the private dental technicians here, but I did notice that a year or so ago one of their leaders joined the National Party in an attempt to persuade the Government to allow dental technicians to deal direct with the public. We will not know how successful he was until the Minister, who is now a member of the National Party, makes a decision.

I propose that the dental technicians employed in the public hospital system be allowed to deal direct with public hospital clients on a trial basis. That would be one way to immediately diminish, in quite a radical fashion, the waiting-lists in our hospitals for dentures, particularly for pensioners. Those waiting-lists are extraordinarily long. I know that it can and probably will be argued by the Minister that the waiting-lists would be shortened if pensioners wanting dentures did not double book. They have one set in their pocket and one in their mouth, so to speak. But that is not the best solution to the problem of long waiting-lists. The Minister should allow dental technicians employed in public hospitals—they are directly under his control—to deal directly with hospital clients. That would free dentists to get on with the work for which they have been specially trained. If that idea proved successful, we as a Parliament could consider allowing those in private practice associated with private dentists greater freedom in dealing directly with the public.

There is another matter that one could describe as a problem. Perhaps the Australian Dental Association could address itself to it. At present some dentists are purchasing dentures in Singapore and Hong Kong. They take an impression here and send it to Singapore or Hong Kong, and the dentures are made up there and flown straight back to the surgery. The dentist fits the dentures, not at the Singapore or Hong Kong price but at the Australian price. That has been the practice for some time, although I would not say that it is widespread. However, individual, reputable dentists are doing it.

The ADA and the board could address themselves to that matter, not so much to ban the dentures, because they are probably just as good as the ones made in Australia, as to require dentists to charge much lower prices for those dentures instead of creaming the profit off the top. Dentists regard dentures as the cream of their business. Dentures provide the extra money that makes the business worth while.

Dental technicians argue that the lower prices they would charge would justify their dealing directly with the public. It they were allowed to deal directly with the public, they would have to agree to some type of price maintenance or control.

The Opposition spokesman referred to the success of dental health clinics. During the last election, the Labor Party espoused the idea—it is now party policy—that the dental health clinic service should be expanded to include the lower grades at secondary school. The service has been very successful. It is an excellent Federal Labor Government program that was adopted by the State Government through a former Minister for

Health (Dr Edwards). It has been an excellent service and has helped markedly in raising the standard of the teeth of Queensland children.

The use of fluoride in Queensland could improve teeth, particularly those of young people. Fluoride can be absorbed from tablets or paints, or directly through treatment of the water supply. Queensland has the lowest rate of fluoridation of water supplies of all States in the Commonwealth. I suggest to local authorities and others in the community who are responsible for decision-making that, from time to time, they reconsider the new evidence about fluoridation that is continually coming to the fore.

I do not suggest that the State Government should impose blanket fluoridation across the State. People at the local level should consider the issues and the benefits, debate the pros and cons and implement fluoridation if they favour it. For many years, evidence has been mounting in support of the case for fluoridation.

It breaks my heart when I see so many children throughout the State with bad teeth. Every time I see a child with bad teeth I think that if it had been given fluoride tablets, or if the water had been treated, it would have healthy teeth. I am led to believe that, later in life, a good set of teeth helps with general health and well-being.

I have mentioned the various aspects of fluoridation for the benefit of those who may care to undertake the odious task of reading "Hansard".

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (3.34 p.m.): I should say that the Bill is necessary, because about 11 years have elapsed since the last review of the Act. I should also say that I am not entirely convinced that qualifications are a matter of great moment. Perhaps the real problem is over-competitiveness in the dental profession.

The Minister pointed out that the State has no control over immigration. Some obligation rests on any Federal Government to ensure that people who come here, regardless of their professional skills, might be able to contribute something. People should not arrive here and become recipients of benefits because no work is available for them. However, occupations other than dentistry must also face competition for employment, and I do not see any reason why dentists should be in any different situation.

The amount of traditional dental work has diminished greatly, mainly because of the widespread acceptance of the fluoridation of water supplies by Government authorities and the dental therapy work that is carried out on primary school children.

I would like to enlarge on a couple of matters mentioned by the member for Ipswich West. I know that, when my children were growing up, public fluoridation was not available and they were given fluoride tablets through most of their growing years. My oldest child is now over 20, and none of my children has needed a filling.

However, it is fair to say that orthodontic work has cost me a small fortune. I was able to afford that treatemnt, which cost thousands of dollars. I have great sympathy for those in the community who cannot afford to have such work carried out on their children's teeth. Because of a malformation of the mouth or other problems that could have been corrected in the growing stage, many people are disadvantaged in later life.

Just as other workers need to retrain if they wish to remain in employment in this age of increasing technology, dentists also must accept the changes that have occurred in their profession. The dental profession must not be allowed to over-service or apply professional time to roles that can be carried out satisfactorily by semi-professionals such as dental technicians and dental therapists. That is very important. It is easy to convince oneself that a dentist is needed for everything, but that is not true.

The public is entitled to the benefits of improved public health services that are brought about by Government initiative and at public expense, but should not have to pay for services that are not required. I relate those remarks to health services generally, not only to dentistry.

Notwithstanding my comments, it is important that the viability of the Dental School of Queensland be protected. Reasonable opportunities for Queensland graduates from that school must also be maintained. However, I can add a couple of riders to those comments.

There should be, quite justifiably, a reasonable expectation of an income that is commensurate with the skills of the practitioner and the effort required to obtain the qualification. However it should be remembered that the training is at public expense and not at the expense of the practitioner. Graduates should not expect an income level that, unfortunately, members of the medical profession generally enjoy at present. I must admit that this is a particular hobby-horse of mine. I am sure that it has annoyed the Minister for Health, as a engineer, that the medical profession has always had an expectation of incomes that are considerably above the level of incomes of people employed in most of the other professions. That has certainly annoyed me. For the life of me, I cannot see what the justification is for that. I have always argued that members of the other professions, particularly engineers, probably are worth just as much money as those in the medical profession.

People who are admitted to this country, and those who will be admitted in the future, must not be discriminated against. The decision to admit them is beyond the control of the ordinary Australian, and there is no reason why they should not have equal opportunity.

Certainly, I believe that no professional group can be held at fault for attempting to improve its status in relation to that of other professional groups. However, I join with those people in the community who object to dentists taking unto themselves the title of "doctor" Whether that is right or wrong, most people equate that title with the medical profession. The move by the dental community to adopt the title started many years ago. It is totally undesirable and it leads to a certain amount of confusion. It also leads to an unreasonable expectation of what members of the profession should earn.

To take the matter further—many academics will argue that the title, even when used in the medical profession, really means "teacher" and that even a medical practitioner has no right to use the title. It is contended that it should be reserved for academia. Be that as it may, it is widely accepted in the medical profession. Perhaps the dental profession, by adopting the title, is engaging in one-upmanship. The idea began in America and it is not suited to Australia. I hope that more and more people will speak out against it.

One of my colleagues referred to the role of the dental technicians. I realise that there are two sides to the argument. Many people argue—I have heard it argued in this Chamber—that once a dental technician is given the right to practise in his own right he moves his charges up according to the market at the time. Whether or not that is true—I think it has an element of truth in it—there exists a de facto operation of dental technicians in this State. Anyone who drives round Brisbane or any other major city will see the technicians' signs displayed. The operation exists ahead of the law. I suggest that the Government should recognise the situation and introduce reasonable controls to regulate the operation of dental technicians.

Most of these matters have been touched on by previous speakers. Since the 1970s a spectacular improvement has been made in the dental health of children in Queensland. To be fair, I believe that dental health in this State rates pretty well with that throughout the rest of Australia.

Mr Underwood: Fluoride toothpaste has had an effect.

Mr SMITH: Of course.

As I have said before, many aged and disadvantaged people are bypassed by the present system.

I am disappointed that an extension of the school dental service into the secondary schools has not occurred. It was always my understanding that such an extension was part of the original deal. I am aware of the arguments concerning Federal funding, but, in spite of those arguments and the problems concerning funding, the South Australian Government has been able to extend its school dental service into secondary schools. It has managed to do that very efficiently.

Many people are critical of the operation in South Australia. All sorts of arguments were put forward as reasons why the service should not continue or should be reduced. It was claimed that the service was overstaffed, overfunded, overcostly and over-servicing its patient population.

The South Australian Government examined the matter. A review was carried out by David E. Barmes, Chief of the Oral Health Unit of the World Health Organization. The South Australian Government gave him certain terms of reference. His report is quite a bulky document. I have the final two pages, which contain recommendations and options. Instead of reading them, I seek leave to have those recommendations incorporated in "Hansard".

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind honourable members that they should not seek leave to incorporate documents that the Chair has not seen, as the Chair cannot really be certain of the content of those documents. On this occasion I shall allow the document to be incorporated in "Hansard", but on future occasions the Chair would like to see the documents before leave is sought.

Leave granted.

Review

of The South Australian

School Dental Service

David E. Barmes

Chief

Oral Health Unit

World Health Organization

June 1983

1. Terms of reference

At the request of Dr J. Cornwall, Minister of Health for South Australia, this review was undertaken according to the following terms of reference:

(1) Enquire into and report to the Minister of Health on the appropriateness of the School Dental Service to continue the provision of dental care to children in South Australia.

(2) Examine and report on the quality of care that has been provided by the School Dental Service.

(3) Examine and report on the effectiveness of school dental care and the efficiency with which it has provided.

(4) Examine and report on the management of the School Dental Service with particular reference to:

(a) Previous planning of resources;

(b) The efficiency with which the programme has been administered.

(5) Report on the financial implications of recommendations.

(6) Any other matters relevant to oral health services in South Australia.

6. Recommendations and options

There is only one overall recommendation upon which all subsequent recommendations and options depend. That recommendation is that a standing committee be established with membership that ensures adequate representation of the private sector, the public sector, the training bodies and consumer groups. The authority of the committee should be such that its decisions are binding on all elements of the health sector, public, private or personnel production, which are responsible for their coordinatated implementation. The first task of the committee should be to set measurable goals in terms of health, population coverage and personnel production as a framework for the subsequent decisions they will take on the components needed to achieve these goals. The committee should also be responsible for monitoring goal achievement and for modifying goals and programmes accordingly.

All of the following specific recommendations and options are dependent on that single overall recommendation and are submitted in the hope that they will first be subject to study and decision by the standing committee which would then be responsible for defining the ways and means by which each decision will be implemented. It is recommended that:

1. the S.D.S. and all other public sector oral health services existing at present under SADS, whether serviced by public servants in school facilities, or in the Adelaide Dental Hospital, or in other public health structures, or by private practitioners remunerated by SADS continue with certain modifications indicated by subsequent recommendations.
2. these services be extended at least to secondary schools, but also as possible to tertiary and other identifiable educational centres, institutions for the handicapped, a broad spectrum of industry and the elderly, the priority for these extensions to be structured by the committee, perhaps with gradual extensions on several fronts involving both the adult public health facilities and the S.D.S.
3. in extensions to secondary schools provision be made for coverage of the unemployed, unless they are adequately covered through the Adelaide Dental Hospital and satellite clinics, and to the elderly a system of domiciliary care be further developed.
4. private practitioners be involved in the S.D.S., if possible even in primary school, but certainly in secondary school services and in all of the other extensions envisaged, to the extent that further full-time posts for dentists would not be required in the SADS, and be funded, preferably, on a sesssional basis, though capitation might be an alternative; the changing pattern of oral disease disfavours the fee-for-service mechanism.
5. all involved personnel should be subject to clearly defined quality control measures of the type which exist in the S.D.S. at present.
6. as orthodontics would be the major role of private practitioners in the S.D.S. and as their role in other services and private practice itself will change even more towards procedures which have become increasingly the province of specialists, a large programme of retraining be established and the whole policy of general or specialist practice be reviewed in the light of stark reality.
7. as the role of the therapist has changed and will change further, the curriculum for therapists and hygienists be blended to produce one auxiliary at that level for employment either in the private or public sector and in all of the service extensions envisaged, provision be made for retraining according to that blended curriculum and for the modified roles envisaged and the policy of operative intervention for either hard or soft tissues be carefully reviewed.
8. the school dental clinic change gradually to a school health clinic and, as it applies to secondary school, be extended in its role as a community health centre, the dental therapist/hygienist working in these clinics and centres to extend their role to function as health, rather than purely oral health personnel.
9. all of these curriculum and training changes be integrated with all other oral health personnel training within one facility, possibly the Adelaide Dental Hospital in view of the reduced numbers which will be needed and subject to policy decisions by the standing committee on types and numbers to be trained.
10. data be collected on the oral health of adults as quickly as possible to give a firmer base for forward planning.

11. an ongoing data base of the type that is available from the S.D.S. be developed by requiring all personnel, private and public, delivering oral health services to use standard record forms which are precoded and can thus be sampled for summarization according to a standard computer programme.
12. a non-intervention based system for monitoring effectiveness and efficiency of oral health services be developed in consonance with the requirements of the changing oral health status.
13. a clear mandate be given in terms of resource limitations within which the standing committee can establish a variety of funding mechanisms by which the fundamental changes recommended can be funded, taking into consideration both savings in terms of lower ratios of personnel to population as well as in terms of intergrated training and extra public costs due to extension of services.
14. collaboration be established with WHO within the provisions of the International collaborative Oral Health Development Programme.

Mr SMITH: I suggest that management and adminstration should be upgraded to enable the extension of the school dental service. Perhaps that will help to reduce costs and make it more attractive for the Government to move into the secondary area. I am not entirely satisfied that it is not possible to use private dental practices on a contract basis if it is possible to move into the secondary area. It is a fact of life that the dental profession is underemployed. That cannot be ignored. Those people need not necessarily become employees of the Government. However, it could be quite an attractive proposition for both the dental practitioner and the Government to use them in that particular way.

I will not speak at length about the following matter because the Minister knows my feelings on it. The School Dental Therapists Training Centre in Townsville will exit its final graduates in 1985. I indicate to the Minister again that it is a great shame that that facility will not be further used. It was erected and equipped at considerable cost. It is a great shame that such a facility located so far away from Brisbane will be abandoned. I accept that at present there is an over-supply of graduates to service only the primary area. I would have thought that for very little additional cost it would be possible to keep that facility going in the hope that at some future time the Government would see its way clear to expand into the secondary area. It would have been much easier to move off again from that base.

The girls who are trained in the north are certainly much happier working in the north. They are used to the climate and the people. It cannot always be guaranteed that people who come from places 1 000 miles and more from Townsville will be happy working in the north. The additional cost to produce the same number of graduates in the north would not have been all that great.

One of the arguments advanced by the Minister is that additional mobile units will be made available to service areas in the north, including Townsville. Again, it is a matter of the climatic conditions in that part of the State. Even the most modern air-conditioning units are incapable of coping with the temperatures that prevail in north Queensland for about four months of the year. One might say that that is just too bad. It means that the working environment of mobile units would be suitable for only two-thirds of the year. For that reason alone, whenever possible, a central facility that can be properly maintained at a comfortable temperature is a very good investment and is entirely justified in the northern areas of Queensland.

Mr BAILEY (Toowong) (3.50 p.m.): I shall speak briefly in support of the Bill. Although the Opposition was somewhat contradictory in its attitude towards the Bill, it seemed to basically approve of the initiatives taken by the Minister. Although the Opposition is generally very critical of the professions, it did not make any derogatory remarks about the dental profession. I am very proud to say that many competent, professional dentists who practise in the electorate of Toowong are highly respected by the medical profession.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Is that why you have such lovely capped teeth?

Mr BAILEY: None of my teeth are capped. I understand that the member for Wolston has a great deal of trouble, since all of this teeth have been replaced as a consequence of his pugilistic pursuits not only outside this place but in it as well. I have not had the replacement problems that he has had.

There is no doubt that the dental profession must have the undying respect of the community. It is one of the few professions that have attempted to work itself out of business. I found it interesting that the member for Ipswich West should, in an aside, refer to fluoride toothpaste when the Brisbane City Council, the members of which I am sure must be followers of the Flat Earth Society, have not allowed the introduction of fluoride into the Brisbane water supply. The Labor Opposition commends the use of fluoride in the water as one of the principal reasons why we suffer from so few dental problems! I wish that the Opposition could communicate that to Alderman Roy Harvey and his merry men. Perhaps then the children of Brisbane could have the same benefits as those enjoyed by children in rural and provincial electorates.

Mr Underwood: Are you aware that a number of Country Party shires do not have fluoridated water?

Mr BAILEY: It is a selective process. I am talking about a million people, yet the Brisbane Labor City Council pays no regard to the arguments advanced by many people, including the member for Ipswich West, for the use of fluoride. I am talking about this patch, and it does not matter who does it.

Dentistry is a successful profession. It has done a great deal for the community. It is working itself out of a job. The member for Townsville West implied that unnecessary work was done. That allegation has been directed at the medical profession also. It is an unfair accusation against the dental profession. Even though the member for Wolston claims that I have capped teeth, I am one of those fortunate not to have dental problems. One of the reasons I smile as often as I do is that I am quite proud of the natural teeth that I have.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It was the lovely television smile over the years that completely threw me.

Mr BAILEY: It is not the first thing that has thrown the member for Wolston. If I were him, I would not be very concerned about it.

The accusation has been made that the School Dental Service seems to have been reduced and that there is not the same emphasis by the Government on that service as there once was. As the member for Ipswich West so accurately pointed out, the problems of dental decay have been reduced enormously by fluoride and by the heavy pressure of the dental community on ensuring that our children have better teeth. It is patently absurd to accuse the Government of reducing the scope of the School Dental Service. Fortunately, the need for it has been reduced by the care of teeth at an age when decay can be prevented.

It was interesting to hear the member for Townsville West on the subject of whether the term "doctor" should be applied to the dental profession. I confess that he skimmed round it briefly. However, we have doctors of theology, doctors of music, doctors of economics and doctors of psychology. He made the point that most people tend to associate the word "doctor" with the medical profession. Nothing is much closer to the medical profession than the dental profession. Those who have worked for so many years to acquire the skills in wet-finger dentistry have surely entitled themselves to the right to be known as doctors if they are so inclined. It is a way of separating the charlatans from real dentists. I commend the Minister for his introduction of the Bill.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (3.55 p.m.): I agree totally with the theme put forward by the member for Toowong in the first part of his speech. As has been conceded by

speakers from the Opposition, the reason why there is competition in the dental profession is that its members have been at the forefront of working themselves out of business.

The Australian Dental Association, including its Queensland branch, has been at the forefront of education campaigns—strong publicity campaigns—over a number of years. Those campaigns dealt with fluoridation, brushing technique and other matters to ensure that as little decay as possible takes place. The result has been a dramatic improvement in the quality of dental health in the community generally, in particular in the quality of dental hygiene among young people.

I part company with the member for Toowong and indicate that I agree with what one or two of the members of the Opposition said when they spoke about the use of the title "doctor". The word "doctor" is associated with a particular part of the health delivery service. Honourable members know that it is a term reserved for higher degrees, for people with PhDs and for some people who have a doctorate in theology. Apart from the particular use by a general practitioner, the title has been reserved for people with higher degrees. The proposal that Australia assume the American disease—I suppose even the German disease under which everybody is called "doctor" — of extending the title "doctor" to dentists and to veterinary scientists, if it is not aligned with higher degrees, is nothing more than snobbery and a sales pitch. There is nothing wrong with the use of the title by a person who has gone overseas and obtained higher qualifications which involve the right to use the title "doctor", but I personally object if it is used for no other reason than a sales pitch and false personal kudos.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Even the bone-crackers do it.

Mr INNES: Yes, that is right. Even people such as chiropractors use the term. I think that is quite wrong.

Despite what I have said, I believe that Dr Blewett should be called "Mr Blewett PhD" so that the public of Australia is not misled as to his apparent qualification for the position that he holds.

I take objection to the strand in a part of the speeches of the members for Wolston and Brisbane Central. Their use of the terms "charlatans", "rip-off", and "white-collar criminals" for anybody who has a professional status is instinctive.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: We did not say that. That is incorrect.

Mr INNES: It is so instinctive that the honourable member does not even know he is doing it. It is the traditional response. In fact, it is exactly the same response that was exhibited very recently when the Federal Government's health agencies found that they were not getting convictions for medi-fraud. The Government suggested that something was wrong with the system. It would not accept the obvious fact that the overwhelming majority of the members of the medical profession are honest and that there is no fraud to pick up. The facts are that the policing system cost more than what was recovered under it. That happened because the Labor Party is obsessed with this preoccupation that the majority of people with qualifications are dishonest.

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr INNES: Exactly. That case of the doctor in Western Australia who filled in the wrong form and was accused of fraudulent practice is a classic example. That is exactly what is wrong with the campaign against medi-fraud.

Mr Lickiss: It is because they have an inferiority complex.

Mr INNES: The Labor Party has a compulsive and destructive inferiority complex.

Mr Underwood: The Fraser Government produced the first document on medi-fraud.

Mr INNES: One is not saying that people who have committed offences should not be prosecuted; but to set up an entire structure on the presupposition that the majority of people are bad is wrong. A general practitioner in my electorate was taken to task in a routine investigation because his rate of performing a particular service was the lowest in the State. The dreaded computer had disclosed that he did fewer of this service than anybody else in the State, and he was questioned about it. Even the fact that his cost to Medicare was the lowest in the State was questioned. Because an enormous structure has been set up to investigate medi-fraud, this sort of thing occurs. Because the majority of people are honest, and the vast majority of dentists are honest, those in the system have nothing to do.

The proposal by the member for Townsville West and by others is that the services that are presently available should be extended. How far are these services to be extended? An extension essentially involves moving away from necessary services to those services that could not be suggested to be absolutely vital.

So we have the suggestion that orthodontic work should be available to anybody as part of the health delivery system. I do not believe that. This idea that if a person, such as some Labor leaders, wants her breasts lifted, her stomach stapled, or her prominent teeth reduced, it should be done at public expense is taking the philosophical views of members opposite much too far. Treatment should be available for cavities, the pain and perhaps the more exotic conditions associated with bad teeth, but it should not be there at public expense for people with cosmetic blemishes.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Like Andrew Peacock.

Mr INNES: I do not know what treatment Andrew Peacock received, but whatever it was the general public should not pay for it.

A line has to be drawn between what is essential and should be provided as part of the publicly funded service and what is a matter of personal inclination. Only 15 years ago people went through life with prominent teeth or with a bite that was slightly out of kilter without any problems at all. They coped with it, and coped with it well. The idea that whatever is available should and must be available at public expense is what leads to the present runaway taxation situation which is part of the stupidity of modern public life.

The Bill, which proposes to tidy up procedures of registration, is a good one and will be supported by the Liberal Party. There are problems with regard to registration anomalies which the Bill seeks to correct. The dental profession at large has provided a very good service to this State, and no doubt will continue to do so. The Minister will receive our support in these improvements to the registration scheme.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (4.3 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I particularly thank the honourable member for Chatsworth for his understanding of the Bill and the feeling that he showed for its contents. Unfortunately, that cannot be said of a number of his colleagues, who took the opportunity to engage in what I call a dentist-bashing exercise.

It concerns me that whenever a profession is mentioned in this House the Australian Labor Party tends to engage in what I call profession-bashing. I recall, as the honourable member for Sherwood quite correctly stated, that when Dr Blewett, or should I say Mr Blewett PhD, first came to office he engaged in a rather dreadful exercise of trying to portray to the general public that the vast majority of medical practitioners were ripping off the system. He set up a band of what I call Blewett's bandits to run round Australia examining doctors' surgeries and inquiring into patients' private activities. In fact, only as recently as a week ago a personal friend of mine was visited at her home at night in relation to an injection that her child had received at the local clinic.

For all the efforts that Dr Blewett has made to supposedly uncover all the fraudulent doctors in the system, I understand, as the honourable member for Sherwood correctly

said, that the amount of money he has been able to recover from the number of court cases that he has been able to mount has not covered the salaries of the people he sent racing round the community uncovering these massive frauds.

It concerns me when members use the broad brush right across the dental profession and say, "Of course, because one person has had a bad experience with a dentist, all dentists are robbers or crooks." I find that quite offensive. Perhaps the leader of the campaign was the honourable member for Brisbane Central. I am a little disappointed that he is not present to hear my response. I am reliably informed that when he operated a service station the hourly rate he charged for repairs was far in excess of the rate charged by any of the local dentists. When a person goes to a dentist for an extraction, at least he knows whether the tooth has been left in or pulled out. I understand that the quality of some of the work the honourable member did was a little dubious. People in glass houses should not throw stones.

The honourable members for Toowong and Sherwood said quite correctly that the dental profession is one of the few professions or trades that has worked actively to put itself out of business. Honourable members have said that the Australian Dental Association actively supports dental hygiene programs both publicly and privately in schools. It supports fluoridation of water supplies and, more importantly—and this has not been raised today—it was one of the active, strong supporters of the school dental health program that operates in schools throughout the State. That deserves acknowledgement.

At the time, some disruption occurred in the Australian Dental Association about whether or not the program should be supported. In my opinion, the ADA bit the bullet. It said, "We will cop flak and criticism from our members, but we will support the school dental program that the Government is about to introduce." The ADA supported the program actively. The results today are quite evident. The proof of the pudding is in the eating: a significant reduction has taken place in dental caries in schoolchildren throughout the State.

Honourable members may recall that, some months ago, a report appeared in "The Australian" concerning dental health in Australia. The report was presented by a group of academics from, I think, the Australian National University. Basically, the report concluded by saying—

> "God help anyone in a State other than Queensland, because Queensland is the only State in Australia that has mounted an effective campaign against dental caries in school children."

That report was not commissioned by the Queensland Government. It was commissioned independently.

Mr Underwood: You know why? If you go to the other States they would say that Queensland has the best socialist dental scheme.

Mr AUSTIN: It has nothing to do with whether it is a socialist scheme or not. It is to do with the fact that the Queensland Government has been dedicated to the program in a way that no other Government has been, and I include the socialist Governments that say that they spend a fortune on this and that. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The services offered by the Queensland Government are better than those offered elsewhere in Australia.

I quite correctly raised the matter of orthodontists, as did a number of other honourable members. I have no direct answer to the problem that is and apparently has been evident in the community for some time. The Government did its best to try to resolve the problem but, as an honourable member said quite correctly, simply no orthodontists are available. Even in the private sector, as honourable members would know if they have had to refer their children to private sector orthodontists, there is a considerable waiting-list. To try to resolve the problem, this year I got the department to offer two scholarships in orthodontics at the University of Queensland. Obviously

the students would have been bonded to the Government to work in the dental service. Unfortunately the university rejected the offer of two scholarships and simply offered one orthodontic position at the university.

I can do very little to encourage the university to change its stance. The Government offered the scholarships. It has also sought orthodontists overseas. It has advertised for sessions in our dental hospitals for orthodontists, but the response to the advertisements for sessions has been minimal. It will be a matter of time before the problem is resolved.

As all honourable members should know, it seems to be very popular today for children to have some sort of structure on their teeth. That seems to be fairly fashionable, and I do not suppose that that can be the sole cause of the demand, but there seems to be an inclination towards this aspect of dentistry.

Mr Underwood: Why did the university reject the scholarships?

Mr AUSTIN: It simply said that it rejected the application for the two positions. No reason was given.

Mr Davis: You are a Minister of the Crown; you should know.

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member for Brisbane Central might like to learn that the university is a separate statutory authority. It looks after its own business. It is not like the honourable member who tries to look after everybody else's business but his own.

As the honourable member for Townsville West said, matters relating to dental technicians raise vexed questions, and there are points for and against. The Bill does not concern itself with those questions, and I want only to say that the Government is concerned about the viability of private dental practices in smaller country towns. If dental technicians are given chair-side status and the opportunity to perform the prosthetic work, in a large number of smaller one-dentist country towns the dentist will pack up and leave. That would not do anyone in Queensland any good, because it would mean the depletion of dental services in country areas. I do not know the answer to the problem, and I can say only that the Government is giving it consideration. It has received submissions from dental technicians and from the Australian Dental Association.

When I became Minister for Health, I was concerned about the substantial delays in prosthetic work at a number of the State's dental clinics. Those delays existed for a number of years. The Department of Health directed much work into private practice to reduce the delays. Honourable members can check with the clinics in their electorates, but I can tell them that the delays in prosthetic work have been reduced substantially. I am interested to hear from honourable members of any undue delays in that regard.

I am unaware of the delays occurring in the South Brisbane area, and my officers are also unaware of them. In fact, they find it difficult to believe that the delays are occurring, and I ask the honourable member for South Brisbane to write to me and explain the circumstances. I do not doubt the story of the member for South Brisbane, but I do doubt the story that he may have been given. I will certainly investigate the matter.

The honourable member for Townsville West spoke about the dental clinic in his area, and I think that it is worth responding to his comments. He wrote to me about the matter, and I will read into "Hansard" my reply to him so that all honourable members are aware of the position. The letter reads—

"Dear Mr. Smith,

In 1974, with the goal of achieving dental health for all Queensland's Primary School Children a planned expansion of the School Dental Service was undertaken. An important aspect of School Dental Service operations is that treatment is delivered, wherever possible in static or mobile clinics within the School environment. As part of the programme School Dental Therapist Training Centres were established in Brisbane and Townsville. The capacity

of these centres was such that School Dental Therapists could be trained quickly enough to achieve coverage of the State in a reasonable time. Presently, the Service has achieved virtual coverage of the State's Primary Schoolchildren and treatment has been offered to Pre-school Children 5 years of age and over.

The capacity of Training Centres, so necesssary in the early days of expansion of the Service, is now considerably in excess of what is required to maintain the service at full strength. Already one section of the Yeronga Training Centre has been transferred to the South Brisbane Hospitals Board and is being utilised as an out-clinic under the control of the South Brisbane Dental Hospital.

The new South Brisbane Dental Hospital, opened on 5th July, 1984 together with the Yeronga Dental Clinic (referred to above) have replaced the old South Brisbane Dental Hospital. These are not School Dental Service Facilities, being under the control of the South Brisbane Hospitals Board and provide treatment to eligible means tested patients. These facilities operate within the previously existing staff establishment numbers of the old South Brisbane Dental Hospital.

You will be aware that the Townsville Hospital Dental Clinic is a relatively new multi-surgery clinic which provides treatment to eligible means tested patients.

I wish to assure you that the decision to close the School Dental Therapist Training Centre Townsville will in no way downgrade the service available to the 4,500 children who presently rely on the centre for dental care. Arrangements are in hand to provide mobile clinics and staff to ensure continuing dental care for these children to the same high standard as that available at the Training Centre. Incidentally, over the last few years as student intakes have declined, mobile clinics have taken over the dental care of schools such as Garbutt and Heatley. The children of these schools previously were treated at the Townsville Centre.

Yours sincerely,

BRIAN AUSTIN,
Minister for Health"

I think that answers the question adequately.

The fact that the Government has had to scale down the training of dental therapists probably represents the greatest success story in the history of Australian dental care. It is unfortunate that the Government had to close a training centre, and the one that closed was in Townsville; but, on the positive side, it really is a success story of health care in Queensland. The program was started by my predecessors, not be me.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to officers of the Dental Board, the Australian Dental Association and my department for the many meetings that were held. This Bill is a result of those meetings.

I thank honourable members for their support of the Bill.

Motion (Mr Austin) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 14, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Austin, by leave, read a third time.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 472) on Mr Austin's motion—

"That the Bill now be read a second time."

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (4.18 p.m.): The Opposition has no objection to the Bill, as the amendments, although important, are fairly simple ones. The Opposition

agrees with the Government's intention to extend the powers of the Chief Nursing Officer to cover institutions, sections and branches under the direct control of the Department of Health, such as psychiatric hospitals, "Eventides", maternal and child health services and so on. As Queensland has a Chief Nursing Officer, it is necessary that that person cover all areas of nursing under the control of the Health Department.

The only other provisions in the Bill deal with penalties. As I stated in the debate on the previous Bill, Opposition members are not opposed to an increase in penalties that have not been increased for some considerable time. When penalties are provided for in legislation, it is usual to increase them when that legislation comes before Parliament.

I realise that I could enter into a debate on Medicare quite easily, but I shall leave that until the Health Department's Estimates are debated. That will be the time to canvass the Medicare funding of hospitals.

As I have said, members of the Opposition agree with the Bill.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (4.19 p.m.): I rise to deal briefly with nurses, the training of nurses and the victimisation of nurses in certain hospitals.

A review should be carried out of the employment of nurses, their engagement, their dismissal, the marking of exam papers, decisions as to whether they should continue from one level to the next and decisions as to whether nurses should be even allowed to sit for exams. The whole management of nurses from their initial training, through their employment to their dismissal should be reviewed.

In Ipswich, a number of serious instances of victimisation of nurses have occurred. Some were rectified. In relation to one instance, unfortunately the Minister went overseas and Dr Edwards took over his role. The result of the investigation that was carried out and the action that was taken was not as good as it could have been. I am sure that if the present Minister had been in charge, he would have done a better job.

A system of employment similar to that advocated by the Ambulance Review Committee should be instituted. In other words, nurses should be employees of the system as a whole, in the same way that public servants are employees of a system as a whole. They should be employed by a regional office so that they can be transferred round the State from hospital to hospital. That happens with employees of the Transport Department or the Main Roads Department.

Under the present archaic system, if a nurse falls out of favour with a matron or with one of the friends of a matron who provides reports on junior nurses and nurses in training, she can fail her examinations, not be allowed to sit for examinations, or be dismissed. That is something that happens frequently. It has happened in Ipswich. From time to time complaints are made to me by nurses and by parents of nurses. However, recently the situation has not been as bad as it was.

A more modern approach to the employment of nurses should be adopted. The matter that I have outline relative to the ambulance service should be examined. Nurses should be employed on a State public service basis so that if there is a conflict of interests they can be transferred to another hospital. Many of the nurses who failed their examinations in Ipswich have done very well at other hospitals throughout Queensland. There have been infamous cases in which nurses had the audacity to marry or to fall in love with a wardsman or a doctor. In such circumstances they failed their examinations. The hospital can argue that, because a girl has fallen in love, her studies have fallen away accordingly. However, I do not believe that that is always the case.

The present archaic system needs to be modernised so that right throughout our education system people become more independent and are taught to think for themselves and to adopt a more professional approach to their job than the old militaristic style that is practised in some hospitals. Reform is needed. It is a massive task. I hope that the new Director of Nursing will see that as one of her main aims when she takes office.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (4.23 p.m.): I rise in this debate to ask the Minister a question about the proposed changes to the Hospitals Act. Three or four years ago, when the same Act was before this Assembly, the Minister stated that he would be fair in the appointment of persons to hospitals boards. He immediately forgot about democratic action. Democracy did not even apply. He overturned a decision of the democratically elected Brisbane City Council of its appointment to the board.

Mr Austin: You're on the wrong Act.

Mr DAVIS: It was the same Act. The appointees to the board were all members of the Liberal Party.

Now that the Minister is a member of the National Party, will the future criterion for appointment be that a person must be a member of the National Party? The Opposition and, I am sure, the people of Queensland would like to know the criterion for the appointment of the chairman of the board and its members.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (4.24 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I do not want to respond individually to members who have raised parochial interests. The honourable member for Ipswich West has had discussions with me about the matters that he raised. The honourable member for Brisbane Central has raised a similar question on a number of occasions. I have told him that I always understood that the Governor in Council appoints the best person for the job. I imagine that the Governor in Council will always appoint the best person, irrespective of his political beliefs.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: If the honourable member checks "Hansard", he will find that they are the words that I used.

I am delighted that honourable members support the Bill. From the comments of the State secretary of the Queensland Nurses Union that appear in the press from time to time it could be believed that every nurse in Queensland dislikes the Queensland Government and me. That is simply not true. I have the greatest respect for the vast majority of the members of the nursing profession. Unfortunately, a few nurses are attempting to downgrade the profession. For many years the profession—and I refer to it as such—has fought very hard indeed to have itself regarded as a profession. A couple of people now at the helm of the union are determined to turn the nursing profession into another Builders Labourers Federation. That is dreadful.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What a ridiculous statement. You don't even believe it yourself. Why are you laughing?

Mr AUSTIN: Mr Jones is so inept that he could not even rig the union election. There has to be another ballot.

I repeat that I have the utmost respect for the vast majority of the members of the profession. I hope that the denigration of the profession ceases and that members will stand up and be counted and oppose people such as Mr Jones.

Motion (Mr Austin) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Austin, by leave, read a third time.

NURSING STUDIES ACT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 473) on Mr Austin's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (4.28 p.m.): Quite a number of Acts are involved in the Bill, and I will not read them out. I was pleased to hear the Minister say in his reply to the second-reading debate on the Hospitals Act Amendment Bill that he regarded nursing as a profession. He then furthered his personal vendatta against the Queensland Nurses Union.

Mr Austin: Not against the union.

Mr MACKENROTH: Against Denis Jones, because he was the Minister's campaign director.

It is a shame that the Queensland Nurses Union has to suffer because of the fight between Denis Jones and the Minister. The union is doing a very good job for the nursing profession in Queensland. It is because of the union's actions that nursing is regarded as a profession and that nurses are not regarded as the Florence Nightingales of the hospital service. It is about time that the Minister began dialogue with the union, particularly about additional staff in hospitals. Whenever the nurses attempt to talk to the Minister, the answer they receive is, "Talk to the hospitals board." When they go to the hospitals board, it says, "We will talk to you, but we cannot give you any decision. Any decision must be made by the Minister." If the Queensland Nurses Union adopts the approach of the Builders Labourers Federation, it will be because the Minister forced it to do so. It was the Minister who this year forced the Queensland Nurses Union to call its first ever strike.

Mr Austin: What about New South Wales and Victoria?

Mr MACKENROTH: I am talking about Queensland and about the fact that this year was the first occasion on which the Queensland Nurses Union called a strike. That occurred because the Minister for Health failed in his responsibility to deal with that industrial union in a proper and responsible way.

The number of nurses provided for in the Budget certainly is not sufficient to fill positions in Queensland hospitals.

Mr Austin: Don't fire all your bullets before the Estimates.

Mr MACKENROTH: That will be for the Estimates.

When the Minister speaks about nursing he should restrict his comments to the point and forget about his personal vendetta against Denis Jones. The Minister should try to do something sensible and honest for Queensland nurses.

Recently I attended a rally of Queensland nurses. Had the Minister been there, the little bit of hair left on his head would have been quickly removed because they would have scalped him. They know that he will not deal with them. It is about time that the Minister forgot about his fight, got on with his job and dealt with people such as those in the Queensland Nurses Union. That would help get the nursing profession working well in the State's hospitals and put an appropriate number of nurses into the hospitals.

The legislation before the House is not opposed by the Opposition. The proposal to make the Chief Nursing Officer the deputy chairman of the Nursing Studies Board is a good idea and is not opposed. The second part of the legislation deals with the diplomas that will be given to those who complete tertiary courses. More nurses should be allowed to undertake those tertiary studies. That brings me back to the argument that is always put up by the Government, that everything that has to be done in

Queensland has to be done by the Federal Government. This morning the member for Lytton said that he wondered why the State Government was needed at all because every time somebody speaks about a matter in Queensland, the members of the Queensland Ministry state that it cannot be done because Canberra has to do it. The Government needs Canberra to do this and that. If the Government wants Canberra to do everything, why is the State Government not abolished? It is about time that the Government took some responsibility and started to do something in Queensland. It should not rely on Canberra to do every single thing that needs to be done in this State.

Queensland needs to take a big step forward in the tertiary education of nurses. Although that big step forward will not be taken this year, the Opposition hopes to see it next year.

The other amendments simply deal with the way in which fees are paid to boards, and the Opposition does not intend to oppose that.

That is all that I have to say on this matter, other than that the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (4.35 p.m.): I wish to raise the matter of nurse education for psychiatric nurses. In this State and in other States, psychiatric nurses are not in favour of college-based education, which is supported by the Queensland Nurses Union.

Phychiatric nurses have a special and quite different role to play from general nurses. For their own particular reasons, general nurses have decided that they want college-based education and, for their own reasons, psychiatric nurses want their training to be hospital-based. However, they also want that training to be improved and upgraded and they want recognition on the State's statutory authorities. They are not being given that recognition. Instead, within the Division of Psychiatric Services, there is a deliberate policy of confrontation with the Hospital Employees Federation in the field of psychiatric nursing. Such a policy is not good for the welfare of the inmates, the nurses or the system.

I understand that the last intake of psychiatric nurses in the hospital-based course will begin training later this year, and that there will then be a gradual introduction of a residential-type care-worker program as was introduced earlier into places such as the Challinor Centre.

A confrontationist attitude was also adopted in relation to the shorter working week when unnecessary dislocation occured at our hospitals. On that subject, I must comment on the question of voluntary labour. On every occasion on which work has stopped at the Wolston Park Hospital, where a number of my constituents work, the Minister and others have made official statements in the media that volunteers were running the hospital. The people concerned were not volunteers. My understanding of the meaning of the word "volunteer" is that a person is performing a service without payment, out of a sense of duty. But the people referred to by the Minister were paid quite handsomely to do their so-called voluntary work. That must be remembered when reference is made to industrial problems within the psychiatric nursing profession, particularly when the problems are caused by the attitude of the department, the Minister and the Government to the psychiatric nurses union and its members.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (4.38 p.m.): The Opposition spokesman (Mr Mackenroth) has indicated that, basically, we have no objection to the Bill, but I welcome the opportunity to make what I hope are a few timely remarks.

It was suggested earlier this afternoon that Opposition members are always opposed to the professions. But the nursing profession is one to which we have attempted to give every encouragement. I certainly hope that the Government encourages professionalism in nursing, because that is the only sensible attitude that can be adopted.

I am not certain about the Government's attitude to tertiary training. I have seen some press statements, but I am still not really certain whether the Government's attitude is that tertiary training is desirable or that it will come anyway and, therefore, the objective might be to hold it back as long as possible. I sincerely hope that it is not the latter.

It was suggested to me that programs overseas, notably in the United States of America and Canada, had to revert from tertiary training to hospital-based training. I did some research on that and found that the suggestion was basically not true. There were certainly problems with some early tertiary programs that lacked the very important practical component. Some of the graduates from those courses were certainly not up to the standard of the really good hospital-based graduates.

There were other problems. It was suggested that immense problems were caused when some States attempted to run tertiary and hospital-based programs in parallel. This State has to decide which direction it will take. I hope that it is the tertiary program.

Having said that, I indicate that I am greatly concerned that there is a conflict between this Government and the Federal Government. I am not here to make political capital out of that conflict; rather I am here to warn of a potentially grave danger. As the Minister well knows, there is now a virtually agreed program for the implementation of the tertiary program throughout Australia. The Minister should also be aware of the drastic shortage of suitably qualified people in Australia to act as instructors, lecturers and tutors when the program gets fully under way in about 1987, with large numbers of students.

New South Wales has got off to a flying start, and much could be said about that. Queensland has an opportunity to progress in step with the remaining States. If the dispute between the State of Queendland and the Commonwealth persists for too long, the directors of the tertiary institutes in Queensland assure me that Queensland will not be able to attract the necessary staff to train people entering the tertiary program.

I simply wanted to place on record some cautionary remarks to show how vital it is that agreement be reached so that Queensland does not in any way fall behind the other States in the main thrust of the tertiary training program for nurses.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (4.41 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I am delighted that all parties support the legislation before the House.

In summing-up on the debate, I should point out to people who read "Hansard" that the Health Department Estimates will be debated in the near future. On reading this debate, it may appear to them that many members have no interest in these matters. During the debate on the Estimates, members can engage in a more wide-ranging debate on areas of concern. At that time I expect many honourable members to contribute to the debate. I thank honourable members for curtailing their comments on this legislation.

I must refer to the remarks made by the honourable member for Chatsworth about the Queensland Nurses Union. I deal with a number of trade unions in the hospital industry. I should say that the Health portfolio has dealings with more trade unions than any other portfolio. Generally, I have no difficulty in dealing with the vast majority of trade unions or their representatives. When I have a meeting with trade union representatives in an office or elsewhere, and discussions take place, it can generally be guaranteed that if statements are made outside the meeting they will bear a fair resemblance to what transpired at the meeting. However, I could be forgiven for thinking that some of the statements made after meetings I have had with the Queensland Nurses Union were made about a different meeting.

I am not the only one to have that difficulty. As a result of many Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission hearings, the industrial commissioners have had cause to bring to account the secretary of the Queensland Nurses Union for making statements outside the commission that bore no resemblance to what transpired in the

proceedings before the commission. It is very difficult to deal with people who do not seem to honour person-to-person commitments arrived at in talks at meetings. I emphasise that I do not have much difficulty in dealing with other unions, but I seem to have great difficulty in dealing with the nurses union.

Mr Mackenroth: Perhaps I could act as peace-maker.

Mr AUSTIN: I do not think that that would help. From time to time, I find the honourable member for Chatsworth to be provocative.

Once again I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate, and I look forward to their contributions to the Estimates debate.

Motion (Mr Austin) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 32, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Austin, by leave, read a third time.

JUDGES' SALARIES AND PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 19 September (see p. 687) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (4.48 p.m.): The Opposition supports the Bill. I begin by saying that I have read the fifth report by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal that was presented to the Parliament recently. I reiterate that the Opposition has no objection to the recent increases that have been granted to judges of the Supreme Court and District Court of Queensland. Following the recommendations of the tribunal, the increases across the board, apart from that for the Chief Justice, have been 16.5 per cent, which is basically in line with the increases in the cost of living. The tribunal, under its guide-lines, recommended an increase of 12.5 per cent in the salary of the Chief Justice. That increase makes the salaries of judges in Queensland comparable with those paid to judges in other jurisdictions in Australia. It puts Queensland judges on a par with them.

I am sure that all honourable members share the opinion that, if members of the legal profession are to be attracted to the bench, the salaries must be commensurate with their responsibility. It is feasible that lawyers practising at the bar can in most cases make a more handsome living than they can by sitting on the bench.

I have been critical in the past of the work capacity of members of the Queensland bench. I cannot completely retract those comments at this stage. I often think that the backlog of cases in the courts could be alleviated by a little more effort on the part of some of the judges.

I do not find myself in agreement with the Attorney-General, who, from time to time, has stated that the appointment of additional judges will totally solve the problem. I realise that in the past he has recognised the need for some changes to be made to court procedures. Some of those procedures are being looked at at the present time. I do not expect miracles overnight; I realise that making changes to the legal system can be a very protracted process.

Just as the Australian Labor Party has a tribunal to examine its affairs, the Government should have a tribunal to examine the whole manner in which the system of justice in this State works. Such a tribunal should furnish reports on its activities.

Although such a duty might not be totally within the ambit of the Law Reform Commission, that body could be asked to look at the legal system in Queensland.

I have said that the Opposition supports the Bill. There is one point, however, on which I should like clarification from the Minister. In his second-reading speech he said—

> "The object of this Bill is to enable any number of reports to be furnished by the tribunal from time to time and for judicial salaries to be adjusted in accordance with those reports."

As I have said, I have no objection to the legislation. I realise that the period in which the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal makes its determination—that is, between 1 July and 31 August each year—imposes some limitations upon it. However, I hope that the intention as set out in the passage that I quoted is not that increases in judges' salaries or pensions will occur on a number of occasions during the year. The Government should adhere to acceptable standards and ensure that increases in judges' salaries and pensions, like those granted to all members of the community, are made only once a year. If the intention is to grant judges increases two or three times a year—that may be an exaggeration—it will certainly throw a different light on my thoughts on the matter. So I would appreciate clarification from the Minister on that point.

Members of the Opposition recognise the wisdom of the legislation, and have no objection to it.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.53 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Opposition spokesman for his comments. I take his point in regard to the appointment of additional judges. I agree whole-heartedly that that is not the be-all and end-all in reducing delays in court hearings.

I have made it quite clear that my intention is to restructure the Justice Department. I am getting very close to doing that. Earlier this year, I said that it was my intention to appoint a director of prosecutions, and I have Government approval to follow that course. Similarly, I shall be making announcements in relation to the office of the Solicitor-General and I shall be considerably upgrading the role of the Crown Solicitor.

I agree whole-heartedly with the Opposition spokesman that many avenues are open to allow the reduction of the backlog that inevitably occurs in court hearings. I point out, however, that the situation in Queensland compares very favourably with that anywhere else in Australia.

For that, I am appreciative of the services rendered by the Prosecutions Section in my department. All honourable members should be appreciative of the role played by all those people who are involved in the court system. I include people who are involved in prosecutions, public defence and private practice. I certainly appreciate the role that they play.

The Law Reform Commission is presently examining the procedures and the powers of the courts, particularly those of the lower courts. I am looking forward to obtaining its advice also in that area. The recent introduction of computers in the Supreme Court will continue to be of assistance not only in the area of courts but in the total areas of justice.

The honourable member referred to my second-reading speech in which I said that the object of the Bill was to enable any number of reports to be furnished by the tribunal from time to time and for judicial salaries to be adjusted in accordance with those reports. In the past, some difficulty has been experienced.

I appreciate the honourable member's comments that the salary level of Queensland judges has been brought more or less into line with that of judges in other jurisdictions. The other States are about to amend the salaries of their judges. Once again, Queensland salaries will be thrown out of kilter. That matter has concerned the Government and the tribunal. The tribunal has been required to bring down its recommendations prior

to the recommendations and increases in other jurisdictions. I would envisage that a report will be received from the tribunal in the first half of next year, if it considers that that is necesary. By and large, I would expect that I would be looking for a report annually.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It would be a one-off report.

Mr HARPER: That is correct.

If inflation gets away from the Government and the community once again, massive escalation in prices takes place and inflationary pressures are brought to bear. Although I hope that it does not happen again, it may well be appropriate that, rather than wait for a 12-month period and have a massive increase, the tribunal will bring in a report perhaps after six months to take account of abnormal inflationary pressures. It would certainly be my hope, and, I believe, the wish of the tribunal that after overcoming the first minor difficulty to which the honourable member referred by interjection, the practice of furnishing one report annually would be retained.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Harper, by leave, read a third time.

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 19 September (see p. 688) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (5 p.m.): Again the Opposition has no objection to the legislation. In fact, the Opposition welcomes it. It has been called for on numerous occasions, and not just by the Opposition. It would be fair to say that, at some time in his political career, every member would have been acquainted with circumstances in which a person who, having been found by the tribunal to be at fault and been ordered to recompense the complainant, although not blatantly refusing to meet the order, has failed to do so. No legal action has really been available, apart from action which would have cost the complainant a large amount of money.

I am pleased to be able to say on behalf of the Opposition that the measure is welcomed. Those associated with the various consumer organisations in the State would welcome it also. The effect of the Bill is that, if a person fails to comply with the order of the Small Claims Tribunal after a case has been proven, the referee's order may be filed with the Magistrates Court and enforced as a judgment of that court. I repeat that many people have lost out because of the legislation's having insufficient teeth.

The limit for disputes between traders to be heard by the tribunal has been increased to $1,500. I am concerned to an extent. I am informed that a number of disputes between traders have found their way to the tribunal in the past. I wonder whether any figures are available on the number of such actions. Although basically I have no objection to disputes between traders involving amounts up to $1,500 being determined by the Small Claims Tribunal, I cannot help but feel that, if a great number of the disputes are to be dealt with, the effect will be to delay those basic claims, if I might call them that, that have concerned us in the past. Does the Minister expect a backlog as a result of this move?

I welcome the move to have oral examinations heard close to the residence of a debtor. As the Minister pointed out, that will minimise travelling expenses. I do not want it to appear as though I am going in to bat for the small crook—and there are many of them in the community—but the result will be that not as much money will be expended by people having to attend oral examinations. My concern is not so much for the person complained about as with the effect on the family and children if the money spent in that way results in a shortage of family funds.

I could canvass many aspects of this subject in this afternoon's debate. However, I do not propose to do so at any length. We are dealing with a very important piece of legislation. Many amendments have been made to the Small Claims Tribunals Act. However, once the Parliament agrees to the amendments, the legislation to a large degree becomes the responsibility of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. Many matters that I have spoken about over the past few weeks have come immediately within his responsibility.

My mentioning this case is not meant as a bagging of the company involved. In fact, I will preface my remarks by saying that the past dealings that I have had with this company have always been very cordial. By and large the company enjoys quite a good business reputation throughout Queensland. I refer to the new and used car-dealers, Zupps. I wish to highlight to the Parliament, to the Minister and to his colleague the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) what recently happened to one of my constituents. Because that constituent travels by train, one morning he parked his car at the railway station car-park. When he returned in the afternoon the car that he had left in excellent condition in the morning had been virtually written off by another car that had smashed into it in the car-park of the station.

Subsequently damages claims were filed in the legal system. Apparently the vehicle that had caused the damage was driven by a young fellow. He had inspected the vehicle at Zupps. In order to try to make a sale to him, Zupps had allowed him to take the vehicle away and keep it overnight so he could assess it. In the course of being a little excited with this new toy he tore through the car-park and wiped out the car belonging to my constituent.

The vehicle from Zupps was uninsured. Apparently the policy of that company is that its cars on the show-room floor and its demonstrator models are not insured. That caused all sorts of dramas. I forget the exact legalese that is appropriate in this case, but when the case went to court, damages were awarded against the young fellow who rammed into my constituent's vehicle. On the very same day the magistrate who sat in judgment on the case in Ipswich ordered my constituent to meet Zupps' court costs. I had the particular legal term in a letter, but unfortunately I do not have it with me. To me that provision seems to be very, very archaic.

In fairness to Zupps, I wrote a letter to the company and pointed out that I was extremely unhappy about what happened. As a consequence of that represenation, the company instructed its solicitors to desist from the action that they were bringing against my constituent.

Because he should be aware of the matter, I am quite happy to make these particulars available to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General next week when I return to the House. In my humble way I see it as being one of those loopholes in the law that needs to be closed. After I present the matters to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General he can ascertain if my analysis is correct. In speaking about forms of consumer protection, I hope that the Minister can find some way to prevent that sort of thing happening in the future. Perhaps new and used car-dealers should be compelled to take out a form of insurance to ensure that the sort of case that I have outlined is not repeated.

As I have said, the Opposition has no objection to the Bill and is quite happy to accept it.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.10 p.m.): I rise to indicate that the Liberal Party supports the Bill. When he was Attorney-General, the leader of the Liberal Party introduced the first small claims legislation. The operations of the tribunal have been watched with interest. They have developed like everything in life, have been an undoubted success and have provided a very necessary adjunct to the legal services of the State.

From time to time the financial limit of the jurisdiction of the Small Claims Tribunal has to be increased in line with inflation. Of course, that involves a departure of a significant order with the inclusion of traders as well as consumers. That is a significant difference. Two different views can be taken of that departure.

The basic motivation for the introduction of the Small Claims Tribunal was to overcome the problem of the person who had little money and was pursuing little money. It was not designed to enable people with money to have access to a subsidised legal system. The emphasis was very strongly on the consumer. The basic idea was that a person should not be denied a legal remedy, albeit a remedy of a new type in a new type of tribunal.

The legislation now includes traders, some of whom may indeed be of very modest means. When I say that, I am talking about the very small businessman, and his situation is something of which the Government should be mindful. Of course, this amendment opens up the forum to people of much more substantial means. Therefore something which began as a system to give to those with few resources access to a court type of tribunal so that they could pursue their lawful claims is being extended to give to people of very substantial means, because of the small amount involved, a means to pursue their claims. I think that that part of the legislation will have to be watched to see to what extent demands are taken up by people who in fact have substantial resources. I understand and accept that there is a problem for small-businessmen in the country, including primary producers, because in bad years any dollar saved is a benefit.

Clearly the overall operation of the tribunal has been a success, although there are people who, after the event, realised that they would have preferred a jurisdiction from which there was a second bite at the cherry. People have to realise that the tribunal is a one-stop jurisdiction. Its basic intention must never be forgotten. It must not be expanded willy-nilly so that it becomes an automatic place of recourse for any person who wants a type of justice system below whatever is the bench-mark of the upper limit of the jurisdiction.

The use of the forum by traders will need to be monitored. Perhaps the Minister could ask those presiding over the tribunal to monitor the situation to assess the patterns of use by traders.

The proposed change in relation to the enforcement of judgments is welcomed without reservation. On a number of occasions in this House I have advocated that the Government should take over and assist in enforcement proceedings. The matter of access to civil proceedings generally is a burden which will be undertaken by the person involved, and the recovery of any amount of money must be a matter that remains between the parties. We will never move to the situation in which the Government will underwrite all legal relationships or dealings between two private parties. However, it is completely proper not only in the Small Claims Tribunal but in civil litigation generally that the Government should provide some free services in the enforcement of judgments.

Filing costs will be involved, and an oral examination will be allowed. If we stay within the area of filing costs and enforcement, the bailiff system, it should be underwritten by the State, because enforcement involves the execution of a judgment of the court, up to the point of whether or not the defendant has money. Certainly that should be so in the lower order of claims. Not infrequently a person who pursues his rights for $100 or $120 desperately needs the money. He is then faced with enforcement proceedings which involve visits by the bailiff at, I think, $15 a time, often with nil results. So that the person is involved in the further expenditure of $15, and another $15, until half the amount is aborted in the cost of trips by bailiffs, sometimes chasing people who specialise

in avoiding their lawful debts. And there are such people. When such a person is finally found, it frequently happens that whatever assets he has are in his wife's name because he is a professional avoider of debts. Visits by bailiffs to enforce court judgments should be made at Government cost. The Minister should consider having a bailiff or other agent of the court attempt to serve the judgment and ascertain the asset situation, with costs being borne by the Justice Department or the Government.

The Liberal Party supports the assistance given to people who go to the Small Claims Tribunal to enforce judgments. I invite the Minister to consider the extension of that principle to civil litigation, certainly for the lower order of claims.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (5.17 p.m.): It was fascinating to listen to the honourable member for Sherwood. He can look back to the good old days when the Liberals said that the original legislation was good. The Liberals are now supporting the Bill to amend it. Even members who were not in the House when the original legislation was introduced by Sir William Knox, know that the Liberals considered it to be fairly good legislation. It certainly produced some good, cheap and effective justice for the average person with a small debt. However, at the time, it was criticised by Labor members because it was a toothless tiger, because it had insufficient enforcement procedures. Why were those changes not part of the original Liberal legislation? The honourable member for Sherwood is having two bites at the cherry—two bob each way. That is a typical Liberal action to which we in this place have become used. That is exactly the type of action that we expect from Government members.

The Opposition agrees with the concept of the original legislation and the general thrust of the Bill, but experience has shown that the original legislation was a toothless tiger. Today, only the honest people pay awards made by the Small Claims Tribunal. Honourable members have heard many instances in their electorate offices and seen many in the press of people who avoid claims brought against them in the Small Claims Tribunal.

On one occasion I had paid a bond of $350 on a flat. When I left it, it was in spotless condition. My future wife and I cleaned the place out beautifully. When I said, "May I have my bond back?", the landlord said, "No." He turned over every chair and inspected everything until he found some dirt in the bottom of the shower and said, "I am keeping your bond."

Mr Simpson: You know why that was; you never used the shower.

Mr COMBEN: I have not caught any bad habits from the member for Cooroora. People can tell how often the member for Cooroora uses the shower when they get close to him. He smells like a rat.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. That is unparliamentary. I find it offensive and ask that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr COMBEN: I withdraw the remark. The honourable member for Cooroora does not smell like a rat; he looks like one.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Windsor will withdraw that remark, too.

Mr COMBEN: I withdraw both remarks, Mr Speaker.

Six months later, my future wife and I managed to get a warrant of execution over our former landlord's land. It was only when the bailiff told him that his place would be auctioned that we got the money out of him. But we were among the few lucky people who had enough money to pursue our claim.

The problem with the Small Claims Tribunals Act at present relates not to oral examinations or garnishee orders but to the failure of the bailiffs to do their job properly. This Bill removes the fees on oral examinations, and they will now be conducted by a referee. However, that course of action is already possible at some expense, because the

order of a referee can be changed into an order of a magistrate. That type of remedy can be pursued quite easily, but it is, of course, relatively expensive.

The major problem is that bailiffs do not do their job properly. The only real method of gaining satisfaction is by securing a warrant of execution over land. Generally, bailiffs are not performing properly in two areas, and there is a deficiency in yet another area. I will briefly comment on that.

Having worked as an articled clerk, I can say from experience that some bailiffs will go to a front door and say that they have a warrant of execution to serve. They explain that it will be satisfied by the seizing of chattels other than a person's tools of trade. Of course, if any of those items are under hire purchase, the bailiff cannot seize them. The bailiff then asks whether the items are under hire purchase, and the person who is to be served immediately says that that is so. The bailiff then goes away empty handed and the person who was seeking a few hundred dollars receives no satisfaction. Bailiffs should be supervised by the Department of Justice.

Bailiffs are also slow in the service of warrants. On a couple of occasions, I have purchased a bottle of Scotch for a bailiff and explained that I wanted a particular warrant served. Once the Scotch was handed over, the warrant was served very quickly—for example, at 6 o'clock the next morning. That is what bailiffs in Queensland are doing at the moment.

I concede that they are overworked and that they must serve warrants all over the city and throughout the State, but they should be supervised in their attempts to enforce the judgments of the Small Claims Tribunal. That supervision should be in the hands of the tribunal. The tribunal is a caring body that looks with interest at the consumers' complaints that are brought before it, and its members are sympathetic. I believe that they would supervise bailiffs so that justice is done. At present, justice is not done.

Bailiffs present a greater problem in the satisfaction of judgments in the remote areas of the State. I know that my colleague the member for Mount Isa, who is not in the Chamber this afternoon because he is attending to constituency work, agrees with me on that point. He said that in western areas of the State there are delays of seven or eight months in the service of warrants or the seizing of chattels under a warrant by bailiffs.

Because of the lack of remuneration for bailiffs travelling long distances, there is no encouragement to perform their work quickly. As the member for Sherwood said, it costs $15 to get a bailiff to attempt to serve a warrant. That might be correct in the Brisbane metropolitan area, but in areas such as Quilpie and Winton, it costs hundreds of dollars each time that the satisfaction of a judgment is sought. One must bear in mind that the judgment may be worth only $200 or $300. It is not right that the people of the west should be discriminated against in such a fashion. The attention of the Minister should be drawn to that problem.

The Justice Department should handle fees paid to bailiffs. Although the Bill goes a little way towards improving the Small Claims Tribunals Act, there is room for further improvement.

In the Minister's second-reading speech, he said that document-filing costs and other expenses associated with oral examinations would be met by the Department of Justice and not by the parties.

As I understand it, fees that are paid into court go to the Justice Department. The Minister has said that no fees will be payable, so I do not understand why he should be saying that they shall be met. It seems that the Minister is saying that the Justice Department will put its hand into its own pocket. It will not do that. Obviously it is merely a case of waiving fees. Often it is argued that the cost involved in collecting small fees exceeds any profit that might be made.

Finally, I suggest that free search facilities should be provided to anyone who is seeking details concerning a defendant's or a judgment debtor's motor vehicle. Far too

often, the only assets that can be obtained by way of warrant of execution are either the defendant's house or his motor vehicle. It is easy enough to search in the office of the Registrar of Titles to ascertain whether the defendant holds any land. However, it is very hard to obtain information concerning the other one large asset that many people own, namely, the motor vehicle. Say a defendant or judgment debtor does not own land. The judgment creditor has no easy method of determining whether the person he is chasing actually owns a motor vehicle or has title to it. Some method should be provided by which the State Government, which controls both motor vehicle registration and execution of judgments, could tie those two aspects together and, in a small claims matter, say. "We are supervising the satisfaction of this judgment. We know that the defendant has a motor vehicle. The bailiff, under our supervision, will go out and obtain judgment by way of seizing the motor vehicle for auction if necessary."

The Opposition's shadow Minister has done an excellent job in presenting the Opposition's thoughts on the Bill. I certainly agree with all that he said.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

EDUCATION (SUBORDINATE INSTRUMENTS RATIFICATION) BILL

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to ratify and confirm certain regulations made pursuant to the provisions of the Education Act 1964-1984 and a certain Order in Council made pursuant to the provisions of the Grammar Schools Act 1975 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982 and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Powell, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (5.29 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This is a brief Bill to ratify certain regulations made under the Education Act 1964-1984 and an Order in Council made under the Grammar Schools Act 1975 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982.

As honourable members will see, the Bill seeks ratification of these subordinate instruments because they were not, as required by the primary legislation, tabled in Parliament. The regulations are amended as a consequence of the Budget each year, so that the altered rates of payment receive formal approval, firstly, from the Governor in Council and then from Parliament. As the Bill states, the regulations in question were approved on 23 February 1984 and published in the Gazette on 25 February 1984. They should have been tabled in Parliament within 14 days, but this procedure was omitted through an administrative oversight in my department.

The failure to table the regulations was drawn to my attention by the Committee of Subordinate Legislation. As a result of this advice, and the confirmation that the tabling process had indeed been overlooked, my officers conducted a review of other subordinate instruments and found that an Order in Council authorising the Brisbane Girls Grammar School to borrow $800,000 in December 1983 had also not been tabled.

The procedures involved in the preparation and processing of subordinate legislation in my department have been reviewed and have been tightened to ensure that there is no recurrence of these omissions. I assure honourable members that there was no intention on anybody's part to circumvent Parliament. The procedure of tabling subordinate

legislation is a well-established one. The failure to table these instruments was a result of human error.

The regulations and Order in Council are included as schedules to the Bill and honourable members will see that they are routine instruments of government. Their approval and ratification by Parliament in this Bill are essential as the various allowances concerned have been paid either in full or in part and the money borrowed by the Girls Grammar School.

During drafting of the legislation, certain questions arose as to the precision of expression used in the Order in Council. Although it was not suggested that the method of drafting such instruments has been incorrect, we accepted the proposal that opportunity should be taken to alter the Order in Council in two respects for the purpose of clarity.

New regulations 50 and 51 are now being drafted to implement the changes contained in the 1984-85 State Budget, and it will be necessary for the current regulations, which are the subject of this Bill, to be ratified, and thus be legally existent, before we can process the new regulations. I am sure that all honourable members will agree that these regulations exist solely for the benefit of parents of schoolchildren throughout the State and that their quick implementation is a matter of concern for both sides of the House.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Smith, adjourned.

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Wheat Marketing Act 1978-1983 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Turner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.34 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Honourable members will be aware that a series of wheat-marketing schemes has operated for many years under complementary Commonwealth and State legislation. A new wheat-marketing scheme to replace the one expiring this year has now been negotiated between the Commonwealth, the States and the wheat industry. The Commonwealth has introduced the legislation which is necessary on its part for the implementation of the scheme. Legislation is in the process of being drafted in the various States to cover the complementary provisions which must be enacted by the States to enable full implementation of the complete scheme.

Some details of the proposed State legislation are still in the process of being resolved in consultation with the wheat industry in this State, but I expect to be in a position to bring another Bill before this House to cover this State's requirements in the near future. In the meantime, however, it is necessary to amend the existing legislation—the Wheat Marketing Act 1979-1983—to make specific provision for the fixing of the home consumption price for wheat for flour-milling, so that new arrangements in this regard can operate from the beginning of October. The Bill presently before the House is designed to do just that.

I would stress that this Bill is not designed to cover the whole range of measures involved in the complete new scheme. That Bill will come later. At present, the home

consumption price for wheat for flour is set under a formula which, for various reasons, has led to the setting of the price for this wheat at a level which is quite out of line with the world market situation.

The new formula which has been devised, and which has been agreed to by the Commonwealth, the States and the wheat industry, should overcome the difficulties experienced with the old formula. In essence, the new proposal will enable the Australian Wheat Board to fix the home consumption price quarterly instead of annually and base the price on average export prices plus a margin to cover additional costs involved in servicing the domestic market. Because some wheat which is initially sold at the home consumption price is subsequently exported in the form of flour and other wheat products, it is necessary also to provide for rebates on such wheat. This is covered in the Bill.

I do not propose to go into detail at this stage on the whole range of new wheat-marketing arrangements proposed, since I shall be covering that when a Bill providing for the complete package is introduced at a later stage. I would reiterate, however, that the new scheme has been agreed to by all States, the Commonwealth and the wheat industry. The Bill also has full industry support and is merely designed as an interim measure to cover the home consumption price pending completion of legislation for the complete scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

SUGAR ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Sugar Acquisition Act 1915-1982 in a certain particular."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Turner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.37 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Sugar Acquisition Act is the legislation under which the Queensland sugar crop is acquired and marketed. This piece of legislation, which was introduced in 1915, has been amended only once. Honourable members will recall that it was amended in 1982 to ensure the continued effective management of the marketing sector of the sugar industry. That amendment empowered the Sugar Board to:

Conduct research into the quality of raw sugar;

Pay mills' transport allowances for special shipping arrangements;

Make interim payments to mills and bonus payments to growers; and

Enter into agreements that will facilitate the disposal of sugar.

In introducing that amendment to the House on 22 September 1982, my colleague the Honourable Mike Ahern, then Minister for Primary Industries, indicated that it would be advantageous for the Government to review the sugar industry's legislation. It was expected that such a review could be completed before the sunset clause in the amending Bill took effect on 31 October 1984, and to this end discussions took place with industry leaders to establish appropriate terms of reference.

Shortly after the passage of the amending Bill through the Queensland Parliament, however, two factors intervened which in the opinion of both sugar industry leaders and

the Queensland Government made it necessary to defer the commencement of that review. Firstly, the Commonwealth Government instituted an Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into the sugar industry. Clearly the outcome of that inquiry and the Commonwealth Government's attitude to its findings and recommendations could have significant implications for a review of sugar industry legislation.

One such matter was the question of continuation of the embargo on the import of sugar into Australia. Honourable members will be aware that, despite the recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission, I was successful in persuading the Commonwealth Government of the wisdom of continuing that embargo.

In addition, negotiations commenced to try to reach a new International Sugar Agreement. At the first conference in Geneva, it became clear that, if an agreement could be achieved, the regulatory mechanism would almost certainly be different from that which had operated under previous agreements. It seemed probable that such a change might also require changes to Queensland sugar industry legislation to enable the industry to fulfil its international obligations in the most efficient and equitable manner possible.

Both Government and industry leaders were in full agreement that it would be pointless to commence a major review of sugar industry legislation until the outcome of those negotiations became clear. Unfortunately, despite protracted negotiations over a period of 18 months, it proved impossible to negotiate a new agreement on terms acceptable to the industry or to the Government. Those honourable members who followed the progress of the negotiations will be aware of the serious—indeed, I think I may say disastrous—consequences which would have been visited upon this great industry had Australia accepted the terms which were proposed.

I am, however, pleased to be able to report that a major review of the sugar industry has now been commenced. At the unanimous request of the Queensland sugar industry associations, the review is taking place in two phases. Firstly, the industry itself is conducting its own internal review as a first step in a process of maximising economic efficiency, which is essential if the industry is to retain its internationally competitive position as a major world sugar-producer and exporter. This review has the support of the Queensland Government, which will meet half the cost associatied with it. A sum of $175,000 has been earmarked for this purpose over the period 1984-85 to 1985-86.

At the conclusion of this internal review, the industry proposes to make recommendations to the Government regarding the nature of any legislative changes that it considers desirable to secure an efficient, economic climate for the future. At that stage, and if it proves necessary, the industry will advise the Government regarding any outstanding issues which it believes should be the subject of a formal inquiry.

In order that this entire review process can take place without disruption to the present legislative arrangements and to allow adequate time for full and detailed consultation with all sections of the industry, the Queensland sugar industry associations have unanimously requested—and I stress unanimously—that I should recommend to Parliament that the sunset provisions contained in the Sugar Acquisition Act be extended. I am happy to accede to this request.

I believe that the industry initiative in undertaking its own review is commendable and deserves our full support. Accordingly, I propose through this amendment Bill to extend the sunset provision of the Sugar Acquisition Act until 30 June 1987. This will allow the full sugar industry review to be completed and ensure the continuation of the sugar board's current administration, marketing and financial arrangements until that time.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

MEAT INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Meat Industry Act 1965-1983 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Turner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.43 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The purpose of this Bill is to rationalise the combined Commonwealth/State meat inspection system by making provision for the appointment of Commonwealth meat-inspectors to undertake certain meat inspection duties presently performed by State officers at abattoirs registered for export.

The combined meat inspection system has operated in Queensland within registered export premises for a considerable period with State inspectors administering Queensland requirements relating to domestic consumption as well as undertaking basic meat inspection procedures on behalf of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth policy is for the Export Inspection Service to be the sole meat inspection service but the Queensland Government, after extensive discussions and consultation with the meat industry, has decided that this would not be in the best interests of Queensland.

Representations have also been received from livestock-producers and meat-exporters in relation to the payment of both an export inspection fee and a State inspection fee on the same animal when slaughtered in an export abattoir for domestic consumption. It is proposed that, as part of the rationalisation plan, State inspectors be withdrawn from export abattoirs and, in return, the Commonwealth Export Inspection Service will perform meat inspection duties on behalf of this State in these establishments.

Therefore the main purpse of the Bill is to provide for the appointment of Commonwealth meat-inspectors under the Queensland Meat Industry Act in order that they may legally carry out these functions. The duties that they will be required to perform, in addition to basic meat inspection, include monitoring carcass classification, including pig fat measurements, monitoring standard carcass regulations used in weight basis transactions and monitoring the accuracy of hot carcass weighing scales. They will also be required to enforce State requirements in relation to electrical stimulation of beef and ribbon-branding of beef and lamb, and to issue certificates for meat sent onto the domestic market from export abattoirs.

In order to administer legislation on behalf of this State, provision will be made for Commonwealth inspectors to have adequate power to direct meatworks' management and employees to take certain actions, to obtain evidence and, if necessary, to prosecute offenders who breach State law. However, honourable members should note that any authority given to Commonwealth inspectors under the Meat Industry Act and Regulations will apply only to operations conducted at export abattoirs.

It is our firm intention to monitor the performance of the Commonwealth inspectors in these delegated functions. To this end an appropriate administrative mechanism will be devised to maintain ongoing consultation between State and Commonwealth officers.

I would also like to assure honourable members that the rationalisation proposals will not affect State activities in export abattoirs relating to research or disease control operations such as monitoring for the prevalence of brucellosis and tuberculosis under the national eradication scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

HEN QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Hen Quotas Act 1973-1981 in certain particulars and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Turner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.47 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

It is now 11 years since the Hen Quotas Act was introduced in 1973 in an endeavour to bring stability and order into the egg industry. This it has done. Growers in the industry have experienced a marked increase in profitability accompanied by a reduction in the extent of costly and unwanted surplus production.

I am pleased to say that the industry in Queensland has adjusted well to the requirements of the hen quota scheme over these years. It has, of course, been necessary to amend the Act from time to time as industry policy has developed and as specific deficiencies in the legislation have become apparent.

Some of the other States have not been able to administer their quota schemes with the same success as Queensland has. The holders of hen quotas in Queensland range from a few very large quota-holders to a large number of small quota-holders. Over the past five years the number of quota-holders has declined from approximately 340 to 273. This has largely been due to the operation of a controlled transfer scheme which has resulted in the reallocation of over 50 000 hens to small quota-holders. That policy has reinforced the viability of many smaller quota-holders.

It is essential that the egg industry be viewed as a broadly based one, which is primarily composed of family owned and operated enterprises. The build-up of smaller quotas is an essential element in this broadly based industry philosophy.

The amendments proposed in this Bill are directed towards the objectives and will enable a more flexible approach to small farm build-up through the controlled transfer scheme. The seasonal pattern of production and demand for eggs is quite marked and it has become increasingly necessary for the industry to vary quotas during the year to cope with those variations. seasonal reductions of quota have applied in most areas for about five years during the period August to January. That has been necessary to cope with lower demand and higher productivity during this period.

The Hen Quota Committee has found it necessary to increase the overall levels of quotas to respond to increasing sales and requests from the industry for increased self-sufficiency in the north of the State. The committee, with my support, has adopted policies that have advantaged the smaller quota-holder in these allocations. However, some of these policies have been the subject of challenge on appeal, and it is desirable that the legislative position be clarified.

The purpose of the amendments is to effect changes which will meet the objective of maintaining a broadly based egg-producing industry. To this end, measures are being introduced to prevent further undue concentration of ownership within the industry. That is in accord with industry policy. It will also enable the development of policies

to cover future growth in the industry where such growth is of a sustained or permanent nature.

There has been some confusion in that area and it is now proposed to establish criteria to deal separately with growth as distinct from seasonal variation. The Bill therefore proposes to alter the concept of an egg-producer's adjusted hen quota by distinguishing two types of adjustment. The first type of adjustment will be a long-term adjustment, which will relate to permanent growth in the industry in terms of hen numbers required. The second type of adjustment will be a short-term adjustment, which will relate to temporary adjustments necessary to cope with seasonal variations in demand, either upwards or downwards.

I anticipate that most quota variations which a quota-holder will experience will be of the latter type, that is, seasonal variations related to the fine-tuning of hen numbers according to demand conditions. The actual method of application of these adjustments will be specified in regulations. It will of course be necessary for any adjustments of a long-term nature to be applied only where growth can be clearly established to be of a permanent and sustained nature.

Growers in the industry have demonstrated their capacity to increase the productivity of their flocks through better management and through use of improved layer breeds. Clearly these factors will also need to be taken into account in any allocation of growth.

I have recently taken steps towards having a new basis for the allocation of basic hen quotas prescribed for the 1985 season and beyond. The new basis will serve as a bench-mark against which any future short-term adjustments will be made. I would stress, however, that no grower's basic hen quota will be reduced as a result of this change and no grower's current entitlement will be affected. This initiative will simplify administration of the scheme and make it more easily understood.

The Bill also provides for a limit on the ownership of quotas. It is proposed to set a limit on the number of quota hens in which a person may acquire an interest. Such a limit is currently applied by the Hen Quota Committee and the proposed amendments will merely reinforce that policy. Of course, the rights of people who already hold quotas or have an interest in quotas beyond this limit will be protected. To assist the committee in determining a person's interest in a quota, the committee will be empowered to require a person to produce or supply records or relevant information.

The Bill also provides for the making of regulations concerning transfers and amalgamations. This is desirable to prevent overconcentration and speculation in the industry. As I mentioned previously, the controlled transfer scheme has been of significant benefit to the industry in enabling the reallocation of surrendered hens to small quota-holders to assist in small farm build-up.

It is proposed to extend this scheme to give greater flexibility for small growers to increase their flocks. At the same time, marginal producers will have a greater incentive to cease poultry-farming and remain on their land as at present. The scheme will operate in a manner similar to that in the tobacco industry. A more flexible restructuring policy is seen as desirable in the current industry environment. Procedures for assessing the number of quota hens in a flock of hens and pullets have been widely accepted in the industry, although they have not been previously specified in the legislation.

The Bill will allow for the formal defining of a hen for the purposes of the Act as being one which has commenced to lay or has reached the age of 26 weeks, whichever occurs first. This definition has been applied by the committee since the inception of the hen quota scheme.

It is also proposed to nominate methods by which hen numbers in a flock may be assessed. Any such assessment method will be developed along lines currently accepted in the industry.

The Bill also contains the necessary regulation-making powers to facilitate the implementation of the provisions that I have outlined. Some other changes of a mechanical nature have been included.

The policies and objectives of the hen quota scheme which this amending Bill seeks to endorse are generally not new, and have been well debated within the industry. I am confident of their acceptance. I am also confident that the Bill will go a long way towards satisfactorily resolving some of the uncertainties in the administration and operation of the present scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

TORRES STRAIT FISHERIES BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to promote the good order, management, development and welfare of the fishing industry, to provide for the protection, conservation and management of the fisheries resources and to implement the provisions of the Torres Strait Treaty in the Torres Strait area and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Turner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.54 p.m.): I move—

> "That the Bill be now read a second time."

This Bill forms part of a legislative framework that will give effect to the Torres Strait Treaty. The Torres Strait Treaty is an arrangement made between the Commonwealth Government and the independent state of Papua New Guinea.

As the treaty itself states, it concerns the sovereignty and maritime boundaries in the area between the two countries, including the area known as the Torres Strait.

The treaty sets apart an area described as the Torres Strait Protected Zone, and I will discuss that a little further on. It defines the sea-bed jurisdiction line between Australia and Papua New Guinea and also the fisheries line between the two countries. The sea-bed jurisdiction line runs midway between the two countries, and the fisheries line, which is substantially the same, includes in Australian jurisdiction that area known as the Top Hat Area, which includes the islands of Boigu and Saibai.

The treaty also deals with a number of other aspects, such as navigation and overflight, wrecks of ships, the protection of flora and fauna, health, customs and quarantine.

However, critical to the treaty is the need to preserve the traditional way of life of the inhabitants of the area and the protection of the fisheries resources. The treaty acknowledges that there will be continued commercial exploitation of the fishery and makes special provisions for the operation of commercial fishing. Traditional fishing by the local inhabitants will continue as it always has in the past.

As I indicated earlier, the treaty establishes an area described as the Torres Strait Protected Zone. This protected zone, which covers the bulk of the area between the two countries, is established to allow for the co-operative management of the area as a whole by the two countries conjointly.

I think that it is easily understood that if the marine life of the area is to be protected and managed in such a way as to optimise the productivity of the area, then overall, biologically sound management practices have to be adopted. The treaty provides for this.

However, for the treaty to be effective, it is necessary that the Governments of the Commonwealth, Papua New Guinea and Queensland pass complementary legislation. The Commonwealth and Papua New Guinea have passed Bills, and I look forward to the support of this House so that Queensland will be able to participate in the operation of the treaty and the management of the fishery.

The Queensland legislation is essentially enabling legislation allowing this State to take advantage of Part V of the Commonwealth Torres Strait Fisheries Act. That particular part of the Commonwealth Act allows the Commonwealth to make arrangements with Queensland for the management of fisheries in the protected zone.

These arrangements provide for any particular fishery to be managed either by Queensland alone or jointly with the Commonwealth by way of a joint authority. The joint authority proposal will operate along lines similar to the presently existing joint authority arrangements that were made between the States and the Commonwealth for the management of offshore fishing.

The arrangements made with Queensland in relation to the Torres Strait area may also nominate the law that is to apply to a particular fishery. This will be either Commonwealth law or State law.

The Bill that I now introduce has been drafted to be read in conjunction with the Commonwealth Torres Strait Fisheries Act 1984 and the Torres Strait Treaty itself. As a matter of legislative convenience, a copy of the treaty has been included as a schedule to the Bill.

Basically, the Queensland Bill states and acknowledges that the Torres Strait Protected Zone will consist of the area described in the treaty, together with adjacent areas north and south of the zone. These adjacent areas will be defined by agreement between the Commonwealth and Papua New Guinea and will be additions to the protected zone only for the purposes for which they are declared.

The Bill also states that the general offshore constitutional settlement will not apply to the area and establishes its own joint authority system. It also provides that, unless arrangements to the contrary have been made, Queensland law will apply within protected zone coastal waters of Queensland.

Provision is made for the recognition of rights and obligations placed on Australia by the treaty.

The Bill provides further that the joint authority may delegate its powers to Queensland officers and that, in return, Queensland officers are able to accept the legislation.

It recognises the limitations that have to apply to both Queensland and the joint authority in relation to matters dealing with foreign vessels. Dealings with foreign vessels are the prerogative of the Commonwealth, and this is acknowledged.

In short, the Queensland Bill will allow Queensland, either conjointly with the Commonwealth or as an agent for the Commonweath, to participate in the management of the Torres Strait area.

The Queensland Government supports the Torres Strait Treaty and recognises the need for its early ratification. Queensland was, of course, heavily involved in the drawing of the treaty and has been constantly involved with its development since that time.

Since the signing of the treaty in 1978, negotiations have taken place, not only with the Commonwealth but also with authorities from Papua New Guinea, regarding the method of implementation of the treaty. In this regard, consultations have also taken

place with representatives of the island communities, commercial fishermen and local interests. I am pleased to be able to say that these consultations have been an outstanding success and point to a smooth implementation of the treaty and the arrangements made for that implementation.

As I have indicated previously, this Queensland Torres Strait Fisheries Bill is an enabling Bill that will allow Queensland to have a meaningful presence in the Torres Strait fisheries area and allow this State to participate in the operation of the treaty. I believe that this has to be the case when the area of Queensland and the number of citizens in the Torres Strait protected zone are taken into consideration, and, accordingly, I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6.1 p.m.