

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1984

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

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Department of Primary Industries for the year ended 30 June 1984

Department of Mapping and Surveying for the year ended 30 June 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978

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

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Petroleum Act 1923-1983

Regulations under—

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Gas Act 1965-1981

Miners' Homestead Leases Act 1913-1982

Mining Act 1968-1983

Mining Titles Freeholding Act 1980-1983

Petroleum Act 1923-1983

Statements of account of the Coal Mine Workers' Pension Fund for the year ended 30 June 1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Taxation and Economic Policies of Federal Government and Coalition Parties**

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: In the lead-up to this unnecessary and unjustified Federal election called for 1 December—

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Everyone must agree that it is an unjustified election.

As I was saying, in the lead-up to it, much has been said about the taxation and economic policies of both the Labor Government and the coalition parties, and the ramifications for all Australians.

Particular emphasis has been placed on the immediate future of the Australian economy and the likelihood of new and additional taxes, no matter which party wins office.

The Queensland Government's position is quite clear. We oppose any new or additional taxes on the Australian public and we urge that steps be taken towards the immediate reduction in the Commonwealth deficit, which has continued to grow under

successive Federal Governments. All that needs to be done is not raise taxes and lower the cost of government.

My purpose in rising today is to provide the Prime Minister with yet another opportunity to give the people of Australia an undertaking that, if Labor is returned to office on 1 December—which I doubt very much—it will not introduce a capital gains tax or additional taxes.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: All I want Mr Hawke to say is “Yes” or “No”; it is as simple as that. I challenge Mr Hawke and members of the Opposition in this Chamber to state whether or not they support the introduction of a capital gains tax or additional taxes.

To date, Mr Hawke has refused every opportunity to give such an undertaking. He has had plenty of opportunities to do so. He and his Treasurer (Mr Keating) have launched a bitter personal attack against the Government’s former senior economic adviser, Mr John Stone, who had the courage to tell the public that a capital gains tax was on the way.

Mr Hawke and Mr Keating have been just as vehement in their behind-the-door carpeting of Senator John Button, who really let the capital gains tax cat out of the bag.

Should anyone have any doubt that Labor is planning a new range of taxation measures, including a capital gains tax, that doubt can be expelled by a quick look back into history. The Prime Minister today wants an open cheque to consider, a capital gains tax. He is the same politician who as a humble back-bencher wore his heart on his sleeve not long ago. “The Sunday Mail” of 21 October 1984 reported these comments, quoting Mr Hawke—

“If we cannot sell the concept of a capital gains tax, then we shouldn’t be in the business of politics.”

I repeat that the Prime Minister said, “If we cannot sell the concept of a capital gains tax, then we shouldn’t be in the business of politics.”

There are a lot of statements in his past that Mr Hawke would like to forget, and one is the crusade for a capital gains tax undertaken when he was president of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. In 1973, during Mr Hawke’s presidency the ACTU called on the Federal Government to introduce an all-embracing capital gains tax and a wealth tax. The ACTU submission, endorsed by Mr Hawke in his capacity as president, declared, “An individual’s tax capacity is measured not only by his income, but also by his wealth.”

The Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Button) placed his political foot firmly in his mouth with his support for a capital gains tax, and that prompted Mr Hawke to jump into the ring with an assurance such a tax would exclude the family home—another virtual admission that a capital gains tax is on the way if Labor is returned to office. “The Australian Financial Review” of 19 October this year reported that the bureaucracy is under a Government dictum to keep the tax issue quiet until after the election. The Government is ensuring that its cover-up is really covered up.

We all know that Mr Bill Hayden is also a strong capital gains tax supporter. As the previous Labor Party leader, his views are worth remembering. “The Australian Financial Review” of 5 March 1979 quotes Mr Hayden as saying—

“Democratic socialists had to divert resources away from those who had them in over abundant measure and direct them to the fulfilment of urgent social needs . . . It is Labor policy to introduce a capital gains tax to correct this massive inequality . . .”

One cannot get anything more real or more deadly than that.

Labor's deputy leader (Mr Bowen) was no less forthright in 1979 on the same issue. "The Australian" of 29 March 1979 reported Mr Bowen as taking his stand at the launching of a book entitled "Australia Ripped-Off", the product of research by the pro-communist Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, a union which has given, and is giving, support and advice to the Labor Government. At that time, Mr Bowen was reported as being concerned that there was no tax on capital and complaining that the taxes on property were being dismantled.

It is important to recall that Labor's 1983 policy speech pledged the ALP to reform the tax system on the principle of the ability to pay (page 11) and to place taxes on speculative gains (page 13).

That is Labor Party policy. The speech added these words—

"All that is needed is a Government with the will and determination to apply the law."

As one goes along the line one finds that Labor is committed to introducing, and will introduce, these various taxes.

Mr Vaughan: That's not true.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am only quoting what Mr Hawke said. It is true. The honourable member ought to grow up.

Last week, news reports told of Mr Hawke asserting that he had no plans for a capital gains tax. In the next breath he claimed the public had nothing to fear even if the Government did introduce a capital gains tax. Mr John Stone has issued the warning. Countless news reports have given Australians an idea of what to expect. The Labor Government will impose a capital gains tax, which will further weaken prospects for recovery. If anybody would know, John Stone would. The negative impact that such attacks will have on investment and the prospects for job creation in the future is a good reason why the Prime Minister and his band of tax-gatherers should come clean now on the issue and be judged at the polls. That is all that I ask. They should come clean. I repeat my challenge to the ALP—

Mr Warburton interjected.

Sir JOH-BJELKE-PETERSEN: I issue a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition, too.

Mr Warburton: Will you tell that to the Japanese when you go on your "teddy bears' picnic" tomorrow?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will tell them how the Labor Party hates them.

I repeat my challenge to the ALP to come clean and give a categorical assurance to the Australian electorate that—

1. Labor will not introduce a capital gains tax.
2. Labor will not introduce wealth and death taxes.
3. Labor will not impose new direct or indirect taxes on the Australian community.

That is all I want them to say. I have given the Prime Minister and members of the Queensland Opposition the opportunity to declare where they stand.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.12 a.m.): Yesterday, in answer to a question, the Honourable the Premier and Treasurer indicated that I was a member of Cabinet when certain lands at Kangaroo Point were lawfully acquired by the Government. I can confirm that was so and that the land was acquired for public purposes, as the Premier confirmed in a recent public statement. However, the Bill introduced in the

House dealing with the redevelopment of Kangaroo Point was prepared in recent months and I was not a party to its preparation. Legislation involving the compulsory acquisition of private lands which would be made available to a private developer is unacceptable to the Liberal Party and, I would hope, be rejected by the House. I am pleased that, as a result of public protests by me and by others, this outrageous legislation, which apparently had been approved by the Government party, will not be further considered.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Harvesting of Kangaroos

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

(1) Is he aware of the huge build-up of kangaroos in many areas of the State?

(2) Is he also aware that many land-holders are suffering financial loss as a result of the build-up and that, if allowed to go unchecked, such plague numbers will assist in precipitating drought conditions?

(3) What measures are being undertaken to increase quotas to a more realistic level, without any danger to the long-term survival of the species being harvested?

(4) As harvesting of kangaroos has been carried out over a very long period and still kangaroos are present in huge numbers, does he consider that such harvesting has posed any long-term problem to the common species being harvested?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) My National Parks and Wildlife Service officers are currently preparing a case for submission to the Commonwealth for greatly increased 1985 quotas.

(4) The commercial harvesting of the four abundant species has not posed long-term problems to their survival. It is time that that fact was recognised by Canberra by increasing quotas granted to Queensland. I take a very close interest in the preparation of the Queensland submission, and I assure the people of Queensland that it will be a good submission and that it will be followed up vigorously by me.

It is time that the Federal Government placed greater trust in the National Parks and Wildlife Service officers. I endorse their recommendations and will submit them to Canberra. Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service are of the opinion that at least 1.5 million kangaroos can be harvested each year without any long-term effect on kangaroo population. That fact should be recognised by Canberra by the allocation of a decent quota for Queensland.

2. Fraud Squad Investigation into Bargara Land Sales

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

With reference to the Bargara land fraud investigation of Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd and Francis Patrick Luton, and to the visit by Assistant Commissioner Dwyer to the office of the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services—

(1) On what dates during 1983 did Fraud Squad detectives visit Bundaberg or Bargara?

(2) What was the purpose of each of these visits?

(3) In relation to each of these visits what are the names of the detectives who were in attendance?

(4) What are the names of the people interviewed on each occasion?

(5) What was the reason for Assistant Commissioner Dwyer visiting Mr Goleby's office?

(6) On how many occasions did Assistant Commissioner Dwyer visit Mr Goleby's office or meet with Mr Goleby?

(7) What was the date of each of these visits?

(8) At each of these visits who was in attendance?

(9) Who initiated the meetings?

(10) In relation to the reason for the meeting, did Assistant Commissioner Dwyer or any officer in attendance at the meetings interview any other people?

(11) If so, what are the names of these people and on what dates did these interviews take place?

Answer—

(1 to 11) I can assure the member for Lytton that a full police investigation is still being conducted into this matter. Detectives are conducting investigations and interviewing persons concerned. Where evidence is available, charges will be preferred. As the release of any further information concerning this matter may prejudice any proposed action, I do not intend to supply the information requested or comment on it.

3. **Queensland Cultural Centre**

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

With reference to the construction of the Queensland Cultural Centre—

(1) Were the people of Queensland originally told that this project would cost \$43m and be completed in time for the Commonwealth Games in 1982?

(2) What was the original cost quoted when the plan was first mooted?

(3) What were the planned completion dates of each stage?

(4) What is the reason for the substantial increase in costs and the long delays and why were not these problems allowed for in the original estimate and plans?

(5) When is it expected that the whole project will be completed?

Answer—

(1 to 5) The Queensland Cultural Centre is a major and exciting project for the State. With its four-stage development, it is unique in Australia for the wide range of cultural, heritage and entertainment activities for which it will cater. Already hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders and visitors to the State are enjoying the first stage development—the Queensland Art Gallery. Next year the official opening of the Performing Arts Complex and the completion of the Museum building will take place. New doors will be opening to the enjoyment and development of the arts and to the study and appreciation of our heritage and natural history.

The Cultural Centre project is the most ambitious construction project ever undertaken in the State. In fact it is the most ambitious project of its type in the nation and, despite the difficulties that face all such projects, the Cultural Centre will be built in less time and at less cost than any other major cultural centre project in Australia.

On 18 November 1974, Cabinet approved of the provision of a Queensland Cultural Centre at an initial budget of \$45.4m. Additional to this was \$3m for land acquisition and \$6m for fit-out. The base budget at December 1974 prices was, therefore, \$51.4m.

The budget figures were always to be subject to adjustment in accordance with a rise and fall formula throughout the period of construction. It was never intended that the Queensland Cultural Centre should be completed in time for the Commonwealth

Games. The initial program target dates, established in October 1975, for each stage were—

Stage 1	1979
Stage 2	1981
Stage 3	1982
Stage 4	1983

These were subject to a viable and more detailed program for planning, documentation and construction following appraisal of the contents and sequence of all individual construction operations being established.

The first stage, the Art Gallery construction, commenced in 1978. By next year, seven years later, the first three of the four stages of the centre will be completed. The final stage, the Library building, is scheduled for completion in 1988, that is, within a decade of the start of the four-stage building program.

There are a number of considerations central to the budget and cost increase issue. They are—

The original budget was established, without a brief, on the basis of very broad assumptions prior to any planning being carried out on the project.

All stages of the project are unusually complex—functionally and technically—with consequent contractual complications and problems.

Cost increases need to be viewed in the context of projects of a similar nature and size elsewhere.

I will make some comparisons—

At October 1983 prices the four stages of the Queensland Cultural Centre—the Art Gallery, the Performing Arts Complex, the Museum and the Library building—will cost \$167m and will be built in a 10-year period.

The Victorian Arts Centre comprises two buildings. The Theatre Complex and the Concert Hall cost \$225m and the Theatre Building cost \$167m, which is the cost of Queensland's total four-stage Cultural Centre. That complex took more than 10 years to complete.

The Sydney Opera House was 14 years in the building and, in present day costs, has a price of \$400m.

I emphasise that the Queensland Cultural Centre will be built in less time and at less cost than similar projects elsewhere in Australia. The project is one that will benefit Queenslanders for generations to come.

4. Paper-mill, Maryborough/Gympie Area

Mr ALISON asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) What progress has been made in negotiations with the company conducting the feasibility study for the construction of a paper-mill in the Maryborough-Gympie area?

(2) How many jobs will be created in the construction of this mill and how many jobs will be involved in the running of the mill?

(3) When is it expected that the final proposal for this project will be lodged with the State Government?

Answer—

(1) The company conducting the feasibility study on the paper-mill in the Gympie/Maryborough area, Ekono Oy, has been involved mainly in completing a large newsprint production and marketing trial based on pulpwood from the pine plantations in the Gympie/Maryborough area. Newsprint produced from the trial was run on the presses of several newspaper publishers throughout the State. The company considers the results of the trial to be most promising and is now proceeding with the final stages of the feasibility study.

(2) Up to 1 000 people would be employed during the construction of the mill and about 320 people in the running of the mill. An additional work-force of about 100 would be required in pulpwood harvesting and transport operations.

(3) The company is to complete a feasibility study and make a firm investment decision by 31 December 1984.

5. Complaints Received by Industrial Inspectorate

Mr McLEAN asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

With reference to the Industrial Inspectorate and the obvious shortage of staff that exists—

(1) How many complaints were received by the department for each of the last three financial years?

(2) How many were investigated and how many are still outstanding?

(3) How many convictions or fines were imposed for breaches?

(4) What are the break-downs of the complaints and convictions in regard to the various industries?

Answer—

(1) 4 376 complaints regarding moneys owing to employees were received by my department during the year ended 30 June 1984. Detailed figures regarding such complaints were not kept prior to 1983-84. Records are not available of the number of complaints concerning trading hours and physical working conditions for the periods sought by the honourable member.

(2) All complaints received by the department are investigated. As at 30 September 1984, exactly 500 complaints were either under investigation or awaiting investigation.

(3) Convictions or fines during the last three years numbered—

1981-82	739
1982-83	419
1983-84	357

(4) Since the passing of the Annual Reporting Act in 1982 the annual reports of my department include a table giving particulars of prosecutions undertaken by the Industrial Inspectorate and details of the results of such prosecutions, and I refer the honourable member to those documents.

6. Railway Passenger Services

Mr McPHIE asked the Minister for Transport—

With reference to the fact that the extension of electrified train services in the Brisbane area is a worthy project and obviously benefits thousands of rail commuters—

Is this program inhibiting the provision of better facilities in other parts of the State?

Answer—

Although a good deal of emphasis has been placed on the suburban electrification program in recent years, the main line electrification projects will far exceed the Brisbane area works. Stages 1 and 2 of the main line program will serve coal mines railing to export terminals at Gladstone, Hay Point and Dalrymple Bay, and are major undertakings in anyone's language, calling for expenditure of over \$600m. As well as generating employment (over 100 000 man-weeks for the construction of 146 electric locomotives, which is only one component of the project), there will be benefits to Queenslanders as a whole because of massive savings in the consumption of diesel fuel (90 million litres annually when Stages 1 and 2 are completed), and more efficient haulage of a major export-earner.

The main line project is the biggest railway electrification enterprise currently proceeding in the world, but I must make it clear that other projects have not been ignored. During the past year, new facilities for supply functions and wagon repair have been provided at Townsville, and work is proceeding on a new wagon repair depot and marshalling yard at Rockhampton. Over \$10m worth of houses and accommodation units was provided at centres throughout the State, new equipment was purchased for workshops and maintenance employees, crossing loops were extended, new revenue-earning rolling-stock was purchased, and a host of other capital works was undertaken at an overall cost exceeding \$58m.

I recognise that urgently required works have to be given priority, but I do not lose sight of the fact that railwaymen and rail customers in all parts of the State are entitled to consideration in the provision of better facilities and amenities.

7. Police Complaints Tribunal Findings on Stock Act Offences, Charters Towers

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

With reference to the inquiry by the Police Complaints Tribunal into the improper transfer of Constable Hurrell from Charters Towers to prevent him from investigating a range of Stock Act and associated offences, and in view of the fact that the tribunal completed its hearings and delivered those findings to him some weeks ago and he has now, according to newspaper reports, directed the Police Commissioner to charge certain serving police officers—

(1) When will the findings of the tribunal be tabled in Parliament so that this House and the public can make a judgment as to whether the Hurrell transfer was improper?

(2) What are the names of the police officers against whom he has directed that charges be brought and what are those charges?

(3) Has he directed the commissioner to abide by the tribunal's recommendations as to who is charged or will he decide for himself?

Answer—

(1 to 3) The relevant file has been referred to the Commissioner of Police (Mr T. M. Lewis) for consideration as to what action should be taken in the matter. Any prior release of information may prejudice any action which may be proposed. Further, in the circumstances, it is not intended to table in Parliament any report on the matter at this time.

8. Payments to Police Informers

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

With reference to statements recently made on the "Nationwide" program by the former head of the Special Branch, Inspector Hogan, that the branch paid money to informers for political information—

(1) Does he approve of this practice?

(2) How much public money was paid out in the last five financial years for such information?

(3) Without giving details or names, what was the nature of the information?

(4) Is he prepared to tell the Parliament how much it cost the people of Queensland to operate the Special Branch in the last financial year?

(5) Since the time of the Commonwealth Games has the Special Branch maintained an agent on campus at Griffith University and, if so, is such agent paid?

Answer—

(1 to 5) Because of the highly confidential nature of the duties performed by members of the Special Branch, I do not propose to make any comment on the issues raised.

Mr Goss: What's the point of asking questions?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury has asked his question and received a reply. I will not have any further questions asked across the Chamber.

9. Purchase of Helicopter

Mr LEE asked the Premier and Treasurer—

Why was a second helicopter purchased without the calling of public tenders?

Answer—

I thought that the honourable member was a good operator, but he has obviously had his leg pulled by agreeing to ask such a question. There was no necessity to call tenders. In my answer to a question on 11 October 1984, I informed the House that a twin-engined helicopter was to be purchased by the Government. All helicopter manufacturers were considered and, of these, two companies, Aerospatiale and Bell, were asked for detailed submissions. Only Aerospatiale met the requirements.

10. Secondary Boycotts in Building Industry

Mr LEE asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

With reference to the ongoing stand-over tactics of unions in the building industry including the use of secondary boycotts, the use of pickets, the use of powers under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act provisions relating to the right of entry, demands that subcontractors be engaged as employees and demands that the new superannuation scheme must apply—

(1) Will the Government facilitate injunctions under sections 45D and 45E of the Trade Practices Act to ensure that secondary boycotts on the supply of concrete or bricks can be removed forthwith?

(2) Will the Government immediately investigate the implementation of legislation parallel to the Federal trade practices legislation before the Federal ALP Government removes those sections from that Act, thus allowing unions to be unfettered in extracting money from subcontractors under false pretences?

(3) Will the Government be prepared to assist by provision of police protection those subcontractors who wish to work and exercise their rights not to join a union?

(4) Will the Government support the subcontractors and their contractors before the Arbitration Commission in the removal of the powers of those unionists who are abusing their powers under the Act?

Answer—

(1 to 4) I appreciate the import of the honourable member's question. Almost daily I receive reports of conduct occurring in the building industry as described in the honourable member's question.

I preface my answer by informing the honourable member that the majority of employees in the building industry are covered by federal awards and legislation of the Federal Government.

The actions of the Hawke Labor Government in moving to repeal sections 45D and 45E of the Trade Practices Act are regrettable. The replacement of provisions in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act will not remedy the situation.

The Queensland Government will not sit by idly and watch these things happen. Where it can effectively take action it will move to do so. I can assure the honourable member that the Government has this matter actively in hand. I hope that he will support the action which ultimately may be taken.

11. Reduction of Federal Deficit

Mr HENDERSON asked the Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Did he read the article in "The Courier-Mail" of 11 October which states that the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating, will reduce the Federal deficit further next year out of economic growth?

(2) How can Mr Keating do this or is it just a confidence trick?

Answer—

(1 & 2) This is an important question. It is true that a substantial rate of economic growth in the Australian economy should provide the Federal Government with an excellent opportunity to reduce its Budget deficit. Further requirements, however, are good Budget management and tight control on Government spending. Of course, that has not happened. This is not, however, the way in which this Federal Government operates. It printed \$13 billion worth of bonds. It has spent money, through various departments, on all sorts of schemes. Even the Defence Department has paid for many of the schemes.

The Federal Government had the best opportunity that it would ever get in this year's Budget to reduce the crippling deficit and the consequential debt cost, and to get its finances into order. For two basic reasons, both outside the Federal Government's control or influence, this year's Budget was set in a scene of rapid growth in the Australian economy and thus a rapid growth of Federal Government revenues. These two basic factors were—

- (a) A recovery from recession for the world economies with which we trade; and
- (b) The fact that it had rained, and the drought was broken.

Coming from a period of recession and drought, when all economic measures were down, to this new period of world trade recovery and good rural seasons (rural production alone was up by nearly 40 per cent) Federal revenues were increasing by \$8.6 billion, or 17.7 per cent. Of course, that had nothing to do with the Federal Government's initiatives. Those things happened in spite of the Federal Government.

What a great opportunity this presented the Labor Government to reduce the crippling deficit which had blown out because of the adverse economic factors of depressed international economies and drought. But what did the Federal Government do? Its expenditures were let run out with a massive increase of 14.8 per cent, from \$37.9 billion to \$43.5 billion. Reimbursement to the States was not included in this expenditure splurge. The overall increase in payment to the States was only 9 per cent. As a matter of fact, general purpose grants, such as tax-sharing grants, increased by less than 6 per cent. Commonwealth departmental expenditures increased by 17 per cent.

Despite this once in a lifetime and fortuitous lift of \$8.6 billion in Federal revenues, the deficit was reduced by only \$1.2 billion and still stands at \$6.7 billion. The expansion in the national economy will not be at that level again. The Federal Government has blown its chances.

However, something certainly will have to be done about the deficit level. The debt-servicing costs alone last year increased by 29 per cent, but an improvement in the economy will not do it for the Federal Government. It, by nature, will not decrease expenditures, and a substantial decrease would be necessary. What will happen of course is the only other alternative—a massive lift in taxation. That is what it is all about.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: All that the Federal Government needs to do is introduce smaller government and lower taxes, but it will not do that. If the Hawke Government is returned—and I do not believe that it will be—there will be huge increases in tax levels to unheard of heights and an expansion of the incidence of taxation into

such areas as capital gains, death duties, gift duties, further sales taxes and taxes on superannuation.

I am not alone in these thoughts and worries. Many respected authorities and experts such as the former Commonwealth Treasury Secretary, Mr John Stone, have also predicted that a Federal Labor Government will be unable to contain the Budget deficit next year without massive tax increases.

12. Commonwealth Assistance to Industry

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

What is the extent of Commonwealth funds made available to industry in the form of tariffs, subsidies, bonuses, etc., for each of the Australian States?

Answer—

Information of the type sought by the honourable member is not readily available, and there are no prizes for guessing why that is so. In fact, the last comprehensive study relates to the 1977-78 financial year and was done by the Industries Assistance Commission.

In that regard, the Industries Assistance Commission indicated that, in 1977-78, the net subsidy equivalent of assistance, which is defined as the amount that would have to be paid by way of annual subsidy to provide the same amount of assistance as is provided by tariffs, subsidies, quantitative import restrictions and export incentives, was as follows—

	Total (\$m)	Dollars per capita (\$)
Victoria	1,635	430
New South Wales	1,465	294
South Australia	375	292
Tasmania	87	211
Western Australia	176	145
Queensland	265	123
Australia	4,001	289
Australia (excluding Queensland)	3,736	320

Those figures show that in 1977-78 Victoria received an extra \$307 per capita, or about \$1,370m per annum, and New South Wales an extra \$171 per capita, or \$1,200m per annum, to support inefficient, uncompetitive manufacturing industries to the detriment of internationally competitive export-oriented industries located in Queensland. In the past the Leader of the Opposition has condemned Grants Commission payments to Queensland, but the amounts that the other States receive by way of tariff protection must also be considered.

Even those figures greatly understate the extent of protection of the industrial structures in New South Wales and Victoria. If it was not for that protection, much of the protected Victorian and New South Wales manufacturing industry would simply not exist. In terms of direct employment and investment in the protected industries and the flow-on benefits in terms of production, employment and investment in related industries, that is, supplying and consuming industries, the benefit of Commonwealth assistance to these industries is enormous.

Later figures are not available from the Industries Assistance Commission. It is believed that the dollar values would have increased substantially but that the relative positions of States would be virtually unchanged.

13. Overseas Travel by Offices of Quangos and Statutory Authorities

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

With reference to quangos and statutory authorities under his ministerial control—

(1) Which officers have travelled overseas during 1983-84?

(2) To which locations did they travel?

(3) For what purpose did they travel and what were the dates of departure and return for each trip?

Answer—

(1 to 3) With a Chief Office and 12 statutory authorities under my control, it would be a long and somewhat pointless exercise to detail the overseas travel of every officer. For instance, officers of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation frequently go on familiarisation trips that often involve expenditure as low as \$14.

I refer the honourable member to the answer given by the Premier and Treasurer to the Leader of the Opposition that all overseas travel by members of statutory authorities and Government departments must be approved in advance by Cabinet.

14. Sections 29 and 52 of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Act

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

With reference to his powers under the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Act—

(1) Under section 29 of the Act, (a) on how many occasions (i) has he and (ii) have his predecessors, revoked a corporation member's disqualification from taking part in the corporation's proceedings, (b) who were the members, (c) what were the dates of each revocation of disqualification, (d) what were the details of declared interest in a contract made or proposed, (e) what was the nature and purpose of each contract made or proposed and (f) what was the reason for each revocation?

(2) Under section 29 of the Act, (a) on how many occasions has a member declared his interest in a contract made or proposed, (b) who were the members, (c) what were the dates of each disclosure, (d) what were the details of the declared interest and (e) what was the nature and purpose of each contract made or proposed?

(3) Under section 52 of the Act, (a) (i) has he or (ii) have his predecessors allowed assistance to be given to a corporation member or someone connected with a corporation member, (b) what were the dates of each, (c) who were the people and/or businesses involved, (d) what assistance was given and (e) what was the reason for granting assistance?

Answer—

(1 to 3) I do not propose to take up the time of my officers at the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in answering these long and rambling questions unless the honourable member supplies details of some specific instances that he wishes to raise.

I abhor the criticism levelled by the honourable member in this place last night against Sir Francis Moore, who is the chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. To smear someone who has done so much for tourism—

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is rambling. He could have said this last night, when he refused to enlighten the Opposition. Why is he saying this now? Is he so incompetent that he needs 24 hours to prepare an answer?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member under Standing Order No. 123A. I do not expect him to interject again.

Answer (continued)—

I also abhor criticism levelled by the honourable member in this Chamber last night against the chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, Sir Francis Moore. To smear somebody who has done so much for tourism and job creation in Queensland is typical of the spineless, gutter politics played by members of the Opposition, who are bereft of policies and can obtain publicity only by playing this style of politics.

15. Subsidy Paid to Gold Coast Public Transport Services

Mr BORBIDGE asked the Minister for Transport—

What amount of Government subsidy has been made available for Gold Coast public transport services over the past 12 months?

Answer—

At present, under the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975-1978, the Department of Transport makes available subsidies to the operators of five private bus services in the Gold Coast region. During the 12 months from 1 October 1983 to 30 September 1984, subsidies totalling \$962,791.51 were paid to those Gold Coast bus services.

16. Human Relationships Courses

Mr SMITH asked the Minister for Education—

With reference to the human relationships courses—

(1) In view of the Government's decision to continue out-of-hours human relationships courses and to make those courses available throughout Queensland, how many people will ultimately be employed on a full-time basis to fully implement and maintain the program?

(2) What are the base qualifications that will be required of people involved in the program?

(3) How long a period of training will they receive?

(4) Will preference of appointment or employment be given to members of the Queensland Teachers Union or the Professional Officers Association?

(5) What is the estimated full cost for the salaries of the staff to be employed in the program at present-day values?

(6) What is the estimated total cost of support services for the staff including transport and accommodation charges?

(7) What period will be required to implement the program fully?

(8) In view of the low participation rate during the trial period, at what cut-off point, expressed as a percentage of the participation rate of pupils and/or parents, will the program be discontinued?

(9) Will that percentage cut-off apply to individual schools or to the State-wide school system?

(10) Will he now also implement a trial of the in-school recommendations of the Male report as set out in section 4 entitled: "Guidelines for Implementation of a Human Relationships Program in Queensland State Schools, in the Community and in the Family", in a similar manner to the trial period of the out-of-hours instruction?

Answer—

(1 to 10) The Government's decision to continue the personal development courses and to extend their provision ultimately to all parts of the State has been made because the evaluation of the trials conducted in the Brisbane north and Wide Bay regions this year has shown that the courses are successful and are meeting a public need. The rate of implementation of the program and its cost will depend upon the availability of suitable teachers.

17. Tutorial Service Conducted by Mrs Joyner

Mr SMITH asked the Minister for Education—

With reference to his answer on 7 March to part 4 of question 3, asked by me, dealing with non-approved schools, in which he indicated that Mrs Joyner was conducting a tutorial service, the implication being that it was not a school and, therefore, not required to meet the requirement to employ registered teachers, and to his answer on 8 March to a question from the member for Sherwood, in which he outlined his definition of what constituted a school—

(1) Is he aware of the High Court decision in *Cromer Golf Club v. Downs*, (1972-3) Australian Law Reports [A.L.R.] at 1295 and 1299, cited in *Birch, I. et. al., Intergovernmental Relations and Australian Education Centre, for Research on Federal Financial Relations*, ANU (Canberra), 1979, at page 2, in which Barwick, C.J., held that a school is "a place where people whether young, adolescent or adult assemble for the purpose of being instructed in some area of knowledge or activity"?

(2) In view of the broadness of that definition of a school, does he still maintain that establishments similar to that of Mrs Joyner can avoid the responsibility of employing registered teachers?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) The responsibility for the employment of suitable people to work within schools rests with the employers of those people.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Tariff Protection

Mr WARBURTON: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. This morning, in answer to a question asked by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt, the Minister was somewhat critical of the moneys that are made available to manufacturing industries in Victoria and New South Wales. In response to an interjection from me, he said that he did not support industry tariffs. I ask him to elaborate on that comment.

Mr GUNN: If the Leader of the Opposition would like to read my answer to the question, I will have a copy made available to him. The answer is a very important one, and the Leader of the Opposition should take note of it because he was the first person who condemned Grants Commission approvals to this State. He has done that time and time again.

What I asked in my answer was: Why should Queensland prop up inefficient southern industries? I will say that again and again, as many times as the Leader of the Opposition wants me to say it. I gave the figures. The Federal Government paid a total of \$1,370m by way of tariff protection to inefficient industries in Victoria. In contrast, the sum paid to Queensland is minute. The tariff protection paid to Victoria is six times that paid to Queensland.

Mr Warburton: Do you want tariff protection?

Mr GUNN: I am illustrating how the system works, and it seems to be working very well indeed in Victoria.

The Leader of the Opposition should absorb my answer to the question. When he does that, he can tell me whether or not he supports my comments.

Criticism of Sir Edward Lyons by Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing

Mr Warburton: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer him to the fact that today a senior Minister in his Cabinet, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), publicly pulled the rug from beneath the feet of Sir Edward Lyons and accused him of making a negligible contribution in relation to Government matters. Obviously the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing aims to take over the position of Premier.

Mr Hinze: Why don't you ask me the question?

Mr Warburton: I am asking the Premier and Treasurer because this matter is a very serious one.

Mr Speaker: Order! The fact that the question is directed to the Premier and Treasurer has been recorded.

Mr Warburton: That is right.

The Minister also stated that Sir Edward Lyons is an embarrassment to the National Party Government and, in particular, to the Premier and Treasurer.

I now ask: As this is the very Sir Edward Lyons who claims that he is the Premier and Treasurer's financial adviser, who led the secondary mortgage market committee and, of course, who dabbles in other matters concerning the expenditure of public moneys, and in view of the damaging effect—this is the serious part—that this ongoing public brawl will have on the conduct of Government in this State, will the Premier and Treasurer continue to use the services of Sir Edward Lyons? Alternatively, will he discontinue the service of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: I would hate to tell the House what the honourable gentleman says about him and his position as Leader of the Opposition.

Aboriginal Land Rights Policies of Federal Government

Mr Jennings: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs: Is he aware of a statement made last year by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Holding) that the Hawke Government's Aboriginal land rights policies would be implemented during the first 12 months of the Hawke Government? Is he also aware that that has not been done, and that a few weeks ago Mr Holding refused to answer questions as to why he had not done what he said he would do and whether or not he would impose land rights policies on non-complying States? Is he also aware that after the Western Australian Labor Premier (Mr Burke) said that Western Australia would not have a bar of the Hawke Government's land rights policy, Mr Holding accused the Western Australian Premier of Canberra-bashing?

Is he also aware that the Prime Minister recently stated that he did not believe that he could clarify the land rights issue before the election as he would not have time; that a Federal parliamentary committee uncovered serious maladministration in the Aboriginal Development Commission, possibly justifying criminal charges; and that the Prime Minister has done another double-header by stating that he will now not override States' rights with his land rights legislation?

If the Minister is aware of all those Federal shenanigans, will he assure the House that the Queensland Government will proceed with its present outstanding Aboriginal

policies, which are acknowledged as the best in Australia, and not succumb to the fidgety-feet approach that is adopted in Canberra?

Mr Burns: Without notice!

Mr KATTER: As the member was speaking, I made some notes.

Recently, I had the unfortunate experience of going to the Northern Territory——

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There will be fewer conversations. I call the Minister.

Mr KATTER: Recently, I had the unfortunate experience of going to the Northern Territory. When the present claims are processed, 48 per cent of the entire surface area of the Northern Territory will be off limits to the rest of Australia. That is the work of the present Federal Government. The rest of Australia cannot obtain access to 48 per cent of the surface area of the Northern Territory. Any developmental work that takes place there——

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr KATTER: It is important to refer to these matters in answering the question.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Cook. His constant interjections are upsetting the House.

Mr KATTER: The situation is that any business dealings relating to 48 per cent of the Northern Territory must be done with the traditional owners. To quote a senior person associated with the Aboriginal side of things in the Northern Territory, the legislation is unworkable because the traditional owner cannot be defined. Not a single mining development or exploration operation has taken place in that area in the last two years, since the new Federal Government has come into power and fully implemented the recommendations of the Woodward commission. So much for lawyers running the country, as they would under the Bill of Rights, of course!

To answer the question specifically—Mr Holding has promised the Australian people that he will introduce a land rights Bill in the first year of the Government.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr KATTER: Queensland has already processed its land rights Bill, or whatever the honourable member likes to call it. It is already in existence and working. People are extremely happy with it. They have spoken to me about what they think about the honourable member and his attitudes.

The situation that exists in the Northern Territory——

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Cook under Standing Order No. 123A. Further interjections by him will not be tolerated.

Mr KATTER: The promise that has been made——

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member under Standing Order No. 123A. I now ask him to leave the Chamber.

Mr KATTER: I understand the reasons for so many interjections. What I am saying is hurting very much, particularly in the electorates held by northern Federal members

who, after the election, will no longer be northern Federal members. Decisions made in respect of the Northern Territory will be extended to apply to the rest of Australia. The Federal Government has made a firm promise and commitment. Mr Holding has said, "We will give inalienable freehold title"—and that is interesting, because it is a contradiction in terms—"we will give mining royalties, we will give control over mining, we will introduce a Relics Protection Act and we will give compensation for the invasion——"

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ipswich also.

Mr KATTER: Mr Holding has said, "We will give compensation for dispossession and invasion by the Europeans." That ridiculous program has been promised to the Australian people——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Cook to withdraw from the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Cook withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr KATTER: It is satisfying to see how worried members of the Opposition are on this matter. I understand their concern at such ridiculous principles being foisted onto the Australian people. The Federal Government has promised that its actions in the Northern Territory will be extended to cover the rest of Australia. Let us not have Opposition members claim after the Federal election that the Federal Government did not promise the imposition of those Aboriginal land rights upon the Australian people. It has effectively stolen, from the Queensland Government, 7.5 million acres of Queensland that will be administered by the Federal Government. We can all see what a magnificent job the Federal Government is doing in the Northern Territory! Its actions are a disgrace not only to this generation of Australians but also to future generations.

I add that the Federal Government's promises include the use of mining royalties for the purchase of the properties. The 48 per cent of the Northern Territory that has been given over will never shrink—it is enshrined in Federal legislation—but it will certainly expand.

The Prime Minister's son is working as a land rights activist in Western Australia. I can understand that his daddy wants to do the right thing by him and ensure that his views are pushed forward and applied in the rest of Australia. I note, too, that Ernie Bridge, the local Western Australian member of Parliament, describes him as a typical white do-gooder. Obviously he has nothing but contempt for him.

I say to the people of Australia on the eve of the Federal election that the Federal Government has promised land-grab legislation. Anybody who thinks that the Federal Government will not deliver the goods ought to bear in mind that it has already delivered the heritage legislation.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. This is an abuse of the privileges of the Parliament. In answer to the longest question asked in the House this year, we now have to sit through the longest answer—a rambling, insensitive discourse that it is impossible to understand. It is a waste of the time of the House.

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

Mr KATTER: The reason why the member for Cook has left the Chamber—the reason why he is so upset about the matter—is that not a single person on any of Queensland's reserve areas backs the Federal Government's policy of land councils, which would result in the dispossession of their land, and I make the point as forcefully as I can. The land constituted by the Edward River reserve is owned by the Edward River council. If Federal legislation is passed, the land will no longer be owned by the Edward River council and the local people. Rather, it will be owned by a land council.

It is for that reason—and Opposition members cannot understand it—that the National Party has such strong support in reserve areas. I strongly recommend that Opposition members communicate that to the Federal Government.

Mr Hawke is now claiming that he cannot make any statement on land rights as he does not have sufficient time before the election—an election that he called early. The Federal Government has already passed heritage legislation that is the most shocking legislation ever seen in Australia. The Federal Government has taken Ayers Rock from the Australian people and given it to a small section of the community. I have no doubt that that is the only promise that the Federal Government will honour.

Prime Minister's Election Promises

Mr JENNINGS: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the fact that during the last Federal election campaign the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) stated in Griffith, New South Wales, that his Government would not bring in a wine tax. Australia now has a wine tax. He stated that the tax on lump sum superannuation benefits would not be increased. They have been. He promised that large sums of money would be given to assist the sugar industry. They have not been. In view of those purposely misleading statements of the Prime Minister during the last election campaign, as the Prime Minister purposely called an early election for 1 December when the Government does not have to go to the people for over 12 months, and as Mr Hawke will not give any guarantees in regard to the non-introduction of a capital gains tax, I now ask the Premier and Treasurer: How could the people of Australia possibly trust the assurances of the Prime Minister?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As the honourable member has stated, so much evidence exists on which quite clearly the people of Australia can decide that they should not trust what the Prime Minister now says and has said in the past. On many, many occasions the Prime Minister has shifted his ground.

The only redeeming factor for the Prime Minister is that this morning the Federal Government very, very generously said that it would contribute \$5m towards the sugar industry. That brings to \$15m the contribution of the Federal Government since it took office, compared to the State contribution of \$30m. The Federal Government cannot even match the State contribution.

It is disgusting and disgraceful that time and time again the Prime Minister has made promises that he has not kept. From the tip of Cape York to Queensland's southern border, he promised five patrol boats, three Fokker Friendships, the underwriting of the sugar industry, and so on. Under no circumstances can people trust the Prime Minister. That is why this morning I have given him another opportunity to confirm or deny the introduction of all those new taxes that obviously he intends to introduce.

Wally the Baboon

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Is it true that, under an order from the Federal Health Department, Wally the baboon is to be destroyed? Can the Minister do anything to save the animal for the Williams family, the former owners of the Alma Park Zoo, who have apparently been given the right by the State Government and the Pine Rivers Shire Council to keep the baboon?

Mr McKECHNIE: Mr Speaker——

Mr Smith: It just so happens that he has a prepared answer.

Mr McKECHNIE: Because it is an important issue in the lives of many of the people of Queensland, I am prepared.

I will give the developments to date. Upon selling the Alma Park Zoo, Bill Williams took a number of birds and animals, including Wally, to his private residence. The

National Parks and Wildlife Service, acting upon complaint—I stress that—seized those birds and animals, including Wally. Bill Williams was charged with keeping those animals without the appropriate permit. Williams subsequently appeared in court and pleaded guilty to the charge of keeping the birds and animals without a permit.

Under section 657A of the Criminal Code, a magistrate has the power to discharge a first offender without conviction if he can produce evidence of good character and high standing in the community. The magistrate made no order to return Wally because it is a primate, which comes under Commonwealth jurisdiction. My department always agreed to the return of Wally if that was OK with the local authority and the Commonwealth Health Department.

The Commonwealth chief quarantine officer in Queensland directed the National Parks and Wildlife Service to hold Wally at the quarantine station at Moggill until his future was decided. Unfortunately, last week, the chief quarantine officer issued an order for the destruction of Wally. That was to have taken place on Tuesday, 23 October. I stress that the Government has had some success in having the execution delayed. I do not want to see the animal destroyed. Mr Williams, through his solicitor, has applied for an injunction to try to prevent the destruction of the animal. I understand that the application will be heard on Friday.

I appeal to the media, and everybody else who has an interest in Wally, to see whether they can interest a zoo in taking him. Nobody likes to see an animal destroyed, particularly one that has captured the hearts and imagination of so many people. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has tried to interest zoos in taking Wally, as has the Federal Health Department. To date, there has been no success, although from something that has arisen today, I understand that there is some hope.

It is the Commonwealth department not the Queensland department, that is saying that Wally cannot be retained by Mr Williams. If he remains an entire, he must go to an A-class zoo; if he is castrated, he must go to a B-class zoo.

Once again, I appeal to the media and anybody interested in the animal to try to find a zoo that will take Wally and so save his life.

State Service and Police Superannuation Funds

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer: Is he aware of a report in "The Courier Mail" of 19 October headed "Taxpayers' \$5.4m to bail out super funds"? Is the report correct?

Mr GUNN: I have here the article written by Peter Morley, which demands correction. The \$2.4m mentioned has nothing to do with the liquidity of the scheme. That amount was simply an additional endowment by the employer by virtue of the fact that on that occasion employees' contributions were up by about \$1m. The Government maintains full funding for the scheme.

In regard to the police scheme, the \$3m referred to was an amount paid to enable additional payments to superannuitants to be made without having to liquidate invested funds. Funds held in the police scheme at present total \$45m, but it does not make sense to allow a short-term liquidity problem to occur. The \$3m will be treated as a 1984-85 advance from consolidated revenue.

ALP Election Promises to North Queensland

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs: Can he advise the House what promises were made by the ALP, then the Federal Opposition, to the people of north Queensland before the last election? Have those promises been honoured, and, if not, what effect has the breaking of those promises had, and is it continuing to have, upon the economy of north Queensland?

Mr KATTER: I must cite a document that I always carry with me—The Australian Labor Party north Queensland policy speech. The first promise was that the ALP would

upgrade the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Has that promise been kept? The ABC studios in north Queensland and Rockhampton have been closed completely. There are now only two cameramen left in the area.

The second promise related to the Australian National Line shipping service. The ALP said that it would do away with the unfair cost of transport and services into north Queensland. The ANL service has been closed completely. Australian National Railways in Adelaide, the sister organisation of ANL, has been permitted to continue although it had an annual loss of \$18.9m compared with the lousy \$6m annual loss by ANL. The closure of the ANL services caused the loss of 56 jobs in north Queensland.

The next promise was to remove sales tax on freight to north Queensland. That promise was not fulfilled in any way, shape or form.

The next promise was to investigate the possibility of introducing no-frills service on airlines to significantly reduce airfares to and from north Queensland. The Federal Government will remove the subsidies on all inland air services in north Queensland in the new year, so I imagine that there will in fact be no services in inland north Queensland in the forthcoming year.

The next promise was to provide three tracker aircraft and maintain a commitment to the building of five more patrol boats for northern surveillance. That promise has been flagrantly broken and today North Queensland Engineers & Agents announced the putting off of another 100 men in north Queensland. That is 192 jobs lost at NQEA alone that can be sheeted home entirely to the Federal Government.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Performance of National Party Government

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (12 noon): This week's first anniversary of the election of the National Party State Government is a most inauspicious occasion. It reminds us of the greedy, ruthless, insensitive and small-minded type of Government under which we suffer. The Government has no breadth of vision for this State. It has no depth of concern for Queensland people. It has no commitment to economic and social justice.

The Premier and Treasurer presides over a disgraced, discredited and dishonest Government. The National Party State Government is the most untruthworthy, uncharitable and uncaring in the land. It has no decency. It operates at the lowest standards, and even then on double standards.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is referring to the Premier and to other Ministers of this State, and I suggest that the words that he is using in referring to them are unparliamentary. I ask that he refrain from using that type of language.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I take the Minister's point of order that the suggestion by the honourable member for Lytton that the Government has no decency is a reflection on the members of the Government. I suggest that the honourable member refrain from making further comments of that nature.

Mr BURNS: Mateship is a quality that this Government could not comprehend if it tried. A mate is a person on whom one can rely and whom one can trust. He is a person who is decent and honest and above board. Those qualities apply just as much at Government level as they do at the individual level. But they do not apply to the Queensland Government. The great majority of the people of Queensland have been left in the lurch by this Government. Not content with that, the Government then spends colossal amounts of their money to tell them how well off they are. That is just not so. I repeat: Bjelke-Petersen is interested only in Bjelke-Petersen; the National Party is interested only in the National Party.

Mr Hinze interjected.

Mr BURNS: By the evidence of the Minister's own deeds, the people can be damned. That is the policy of the National Party in this State.

For example, the Government proclaimed 1984 as the Year of the Family, but it has done virtually nothing except spend public money on a saturation advertising campaign proclaiming the fact. I gather that the Government did outlay a few dollars for a picnic at the week-end that was rained out. Out came the member for Toowong with a tirade of abuse against the Weather Bureau because the picnic was rained out.

I ask Government members to go out and ask a family what the Year of the Family has meant for it. They should go and ask a low-income family how much it has been helped in the Year of the Family. There have been no tangible benefits, no genuine assistance and no additional effort. It has all been one big public relations exercise. No doubt the same thing will happen next year, which we are told is to be Youth Year.

Peel away the rhetorical veneer and there is no substance underneath. I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing to listen to this. This Government is riddled with dry rot, in much the same way as the old Parliament House used to be. It was gassed. A big tent was put over the top of the old Parliament House, to hide its shortcomings. That has been done by the Government's public relations office for the Government.

The truth is that this Government could not care less about families and the problems that they face. Those problems include making ends meet and feeding, clothing and educating their kids when they do not see in a year the kind of money that the Minister spends each week on his ministerial expenses. The Government could not care less about our society's youth, the aged in our community, the unemployed, the sick, the needy—and so the list goes on.

Is it any wonder that the National Party Government did not have any birthday celebrations at the end of the first year of its term of office? It had nothing to celebrate. Firstly, the National Party was not elected to Government in the State; it did not receive a majority of the votes in the State. Two men crossed the floor, and in the Letters to the Editor column in today's "Courier-Mail" a man gave them a nice serve. If ever I have seen two people given a serve by one of their own, it was done this morning by that man. A man named Turnbull got hold of both of them by the scruff of the neck and rubbed their noses in the dirt.

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member mentioned an article in this morning's newspaper. He failed to mention that that man stood against me for endorsement and I beat him. It is just a matter of sour grapes.

Mr Burns: The Minister is only taking up my time. That is not a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that that could be construed to be unparliamentary comment, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr BURNS: I will withdraw it, but I do not know what to call it.

This is an illegitimate Government. The National Party polled only 512 890 votes out of a total of 1 336 985; so 824 095 voters rejected the National Party. Approximately 62 per cent of the people in this State voted against the National Party. The National Party did not win the election in its own right. It became the Government because two men left the Liberal Party and went over to the Nationals.

I turn now to some of the Government's law and order policies. An aged widow died in a fire in her house because she had locked herself in to keep the crooks and robbers out. That is a mark of the Government of this State. So poor is the protection of decent people in the community provided under the law that crime is out of hand. Underage drinking has gone through the ceiling. Brisbane has the worst record for

burglaries and white collar crime in the State. There has been an amazing rise in juvenile crime.

The crime rate has increased because of the depressed conditions suffered by people out of work. Families are being broken up because they cannot pay for their house, their car or for their children's education. As a result, fights occur and families break up. Kids are left on the street. The incidence of vandalism, robbery and murder has increased, and the Government is doing nothing about it. All it does is blame somebody else. In particular, it likes to blame the Federal Government.

Thousands of cars are stolen each year. Only 28 per cent of them are ever recovered. Victims of crime in Queensland have to pay the cost of bringing criminals to court. It is unbelievable that a person has to pay the Government to bring a criminal to court. Insurance companies restrict policies because of high losses from burglaries on the Gold Coast. So much pot is grown in north Queensland that that area does not have fogs but it has smoke hazes.

Let me speak now about taxes. Over 5 000 State Government charges have increased, making a mockery of the Budget. In fact, the Government virtually introduced a mini-Budget before the Budget was debated. For the average Queenslander, this is not a low-tax State; it is a high-charge State. The Premier and Treasurer wants Federal taxes reduced, and he made that comment again this morning. However, all of the Ministers pop up and down demanding that the Feds spend more money. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing wants \$150m for main roads. The Minister for Health wants another \$40m or \$50m for hospitals. The Minister for Primary Industries wants \$10m for the sugar industry. He also wants money for brucellosis eradication and drought relief. How can the Federal Government provide the money if it reduces taxes? Where will the money come from? The State Government cannot keep demanding that taxes go down and at the same time demand increased Commonwealth spending. Government members would be off their brains if they started to talk like that.

The junior Ministers speak about wanting more money for marriage guidance and a swimming centre. The Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni) speaks about fire costs. He also wants gravel on that funny-looking road that has been built at Bloomfield. The Government asks for more and more money but it wants the Feds to cut back on taxation. That is crazy.

But what about State charges? Queensland's car registration fees are the highest in Australia because of the costs and charges of the State Government. Electricity charges have increased 98 per cent since 1978. The Consumer Price Index rose 70 per cent over the same period. The stamp duty payable on household insurance and superannuation has also increased. Queenslanders pay high prices for bread, milk and other necessities. That is a good example of the cost of living in this State. The Consumer Price Index in Queensland for 1983-84 was 5.3 per cent but it was only 3.9 per cent for the rest of Australia.

The State Government's reports on the economy and about all the things that will happen in Queensland are a load of bulldust. The Department of Commercial and Industrial Development report was suppressed by the Government. Industry groups have slated the Government's list of projects. They say that fewer than one quarter of the projects on the list are likely to go ahead. However, the Government keeps putting out a list.

The Government has no long-term plans for the sugar and beef industries, and its short-term solutions are unacceptable. The Metal Trades Industry Association and the Australian Confederation of Industry say that Queensland is lagging in its recovery. MIM has attacked the Government on its lack of concessions. Rail freight rates threaten the mining industry, and many mines are just not viable.

Many businesses are going bankrupt. With Suttons Foundry, \$5.5m went down the drain. The General Motors-Holden's plant at Acacia Ridge is to close. Comalco has

deferred indefinitely the Boyne Island smelter. The Townsville casino project has been slow to develop. The Queensland Graingrowers Association failed. The Red Ru pipeline project resulted in a \$100m loss. What about the Peanut Marketing Board and other quangos? The only thing that the Government has done in relation to its policy on quangos is count them. The Government does not know how much they spend and it cannot account for them. It has no idea.

The Government also reneges on its promises. Flo spoke to the coal-miners at Ipswich before the election last year and guaranteed them that they would have permanent jobs after the election. Of course, they do not have their jobs. I can go on and on about the broken promises of the Government and the things that are wrong with it after its first 12 months of office. It is no wonder that the Government did not have a birthday party to celebrate those first 12 months. It is no wonder that it did not invite its business friends along.

The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) has got stuck into Sir Edward Lyons. Let me tell the story about why he has done that.

Time expired.

Nursing Home Care for Aged Persons

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (12.10 p.m.): I rise to speak about the absolutely disgraceful way in which the Australian Labor Party is using the aged people of Queensland who are in need of nursing home care. It is using them in its bid to gain complete control of the House of Representatives. The aged people of Queensland are being sacrificed. They do not receive the same financial support to enable them to enter a nursing home as that given to their counterparts in southern States.

I refer honourable members to an article in today's "Courier-Mail" in which the Federal Health Minister makes the political statement that the Federal Government will provide a \$38m boost to nursing homes. Towards the end of the article the disguised figures show that an aged person in Victoria will receive \$285.60 more per fortnight than an aged person in Queensland.

That is nothing more than a political stunt, aimed at wooing the greater population of Victoria rather than the smaller population of Queensland. That clearly shows the Federal ALP's policy of ensuring that it retains power in the House of Representatives by dominating the southern States and neglecting Queensland.

Complete control of the 148 House of Representative seats at the next Federal election can be gained by the domination of seats in New South Wales and Victoria. Of those 148 seats, 90 are in Victoria and New South Wales.

The aged people of this country constitute a significant proportion of voting power and, to dominate the House of Representatives, the Australian Labor Party needs the support of the aged in New South Wales and Victoria. It is obvious that the Queensland branch of the ALP is embarrassed by that.

Following recent media statements by the matron of the nursing home in Nambour, I am advised that she was immediately contacted by the former Leader of the Opposition, who offered his assistance. What has that assistance achieved?

Instead of a difference of \$258 per fortnight, as it was then, after 1 November it will be \$285.60. What great representation from the former Leader of the Opposition, who has decided to go to Canberra! Is that how the former Leader of the Opposition will represent Queenslanders if he does go to Canberra?

What is the Australian Labor Party doing? It is offering aged persons in nursing homes in other States financial assistance and neglecting Queenslanders. The Federal Health Minister (Dr Blewett) is offering a subsidy of \$48.50 per day to aged people in nursing homes in Victoria and only \$28.10 per day to aged people in Queensland. That

is a difference of \$285.60 per fortnight between the payment to an aged person in Victoria and that to an aged person in Queensland.

So what is the reason for all of this? It is obvious. The ALP wants to ensure that the aged people in Victoria and New South Wales will not reject it. That will be the end result of the great one-man, one-vote system that the ALP instigated in the recent Federal redistribution for the House of Representatives. Quite obviously, by controlling the States of New South Wales, Victoria and part of South Australia, the Australian Labor Party can dominate Australia. Not only can it use the southern vote to dominate the House of Representatives; it can also use it to gain higher percentage support for its referendum to allow State rights to be taken over by the national Government.

Our forefathers saw the danger in that system. One-man, one-vote works in a country in which the population is spread relatively evenly, but the Australian population is concentrated in the south-east corner. That factor will be used by the ALP to gain control of the House of Representatives, abolish the Senate and have passed the referendums transferring power from the States to the new republic. To achieve its aim of dominating the House of Representatives, of having the referendum carried and of finally abolishing the Senate, the ALP is using the aged people of Queensland.

I quote from a private advertisement that was placed in "The Courier-Mail" recently. It sets out the present subsidy figures that are paid to nursing homes on a daily basis in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. Those figures again show the \$18.50 per day difference, as it is now, between the payments made to Victorian aged people and those made to Queensland aged people.

The advertisement states—

"Great hardship is being imposed on many thousands of Queensland's sick aged and their relatives and friends. It is unjust in a nation that prides itself on a fair go where pensions are equal, personal income tax identical, plus universal health insurance cover for Australians, which our government is proudly acclaiming on the grounds of equality.

But we see higher personal contributions necessary from Queensland pensioners to meet fees in new nursing homes."

I wrote to the Federal Minister for Health (Dr Blewett) and quoted the differences in the payment to aged people in nursing homes in New South Wales and Victoria, and the payment made in Queensland. I asked him for an explanation as to why the aged people in Queensland had to pay more for their nursing home care than those in Victoria. Before reading Dr Blewett's reply, I point out that it should be remembered that nursing home fees cannot be increased by any nursing home unless the increase in costs incurred in the operation of the home is demonstrated and approved by Dr Blewett's department. Therefore, no nursing home can charge whatever it likes.

In his answer, Dr Blewett said that Victoria required a significantly higher nursing home benefit than Queensland because of the higher staffing requirements in Victoria. However, he did not say that the Federal Government approved of those arrangements. He then said that the staffing regulations were the responsibility of the State Government. But, of course, that answer is a big snow job. Obviously, the extra money is transferred to the benefit of the Victorian aged people who do not have to pay as much as the Queensland aged people.

Let me give some basic figures. Imagine a 100-patient nursing home in Victoria and a 100-patient nursing home in Queensland operated by the same company. In Victoria, the Federal subsidy will now be \$20.40 extra per day. That amount multiplied by 365 for each patient equals \$7,446, and that amount multiplied by 100 for the number of patients equals \$744,600. That is an extra amount for the Victorian nursing home. Dr Blewett says that that money is needed for extra staffing. At a generous average of \$20,000 per annum per staff member, 37 extra staff are needed to run a Victorian nursing home for 100 people than to run a Queensland nursing home.

I have checked staffing figures and it is clear that that is a fabrication. Nowhere near that number of extra staff are being employed in Victoria and, clearly, the money is being transferred to the patients in Victoria who are paying less than Queenslanders. Clearly, the Federal Government is buying the votes of the aged people of Victoria and New South Wales.

Recently in Federal Parliament, when Dr Blewett was asked a Dorothy Dix question by his Labor counterpart Mr Keogh, he gave an answer that indicated that he was aware of a rather dishonest advertisement placed in the Queensland press. I challenge Dr Blewett to show why the statement is dishonest.

He then tried to place the blame on decisions made in 1977. Many decisions have been made in the last 18 months that have enforced the 1977 decisions. Of course, Dr Blewett cannot continue to blame the decisions made in 1977. A Labor Federal Budget has clearly shown the ALP decision to favour the many extra south-east Australian voters. Today's announcement confirmed my worries.

Even worse, honourable members would have read the recent reports in the "Daily Sun" of Dr Blewett's criticisms of Mr Moran, who conducts aged persons homes throughout Australia. Mr Moran had asked the people of Queensland to—

"support Queensland's sick aged by contacting your Federal member of Parliament urgently insisting on modern facilities built to current State health and fire department regulations but most importantly to give a benefit, sufficient to give the pensioner patient pocket money for daily needs after meeting their fees in a modern nursing home."

He continued—

"In fairness to all Australians, all patient benefits paid by the Federal Government should be equal in all States. All State requirements and regulations should be uniform for the care of all sick and aged Australians in need of nursing home care."

Instead of giving a decent answer, Dr Blewett, who obviously found himself with no decent answer, made a personal attack. He is reported in the press as stating—

"Mr Moran had used advertisements to cause unnecessary concern to patients and relatives by claiming Queensland nursing homes were gaining smaller Federal subsidies than those in other States.

Yet the company was run by a man worth \$30 million who had been listed as one of Australia's wealthiest 200 people.

'One must question the motives of a man who provides this information,' Dr Blewett said."

What difference does it make? What a disgraceful answer to a group that has probably done more for the sick and aged than any other group. I know personally that, at a nursing home in my electorate, pensioners, who have absolutely no way of paying the \$209 per fortnight that has been approved by the Federal Government, are being charged only \$198 at present by the Moran group.

Time expired.

Union Claims on Cottage Housing Industry

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (12.20 p.m.): I draw attention to the present tactics of stand-over and industrial sabotage that are currently inflicted on the cottage housing industry in Queensland by members of the Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia—a union that parallels that other destroyer of our economy, the Australian Builders Labourers Federation.

Mr Davis: That is not a matter of public importance.

Mr WHITE: For the benefit of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, I mention these newspaper headlines: "Coast will shut down"; and, in the Brisbane

"Telegraph", "Union drops Bricks on Boss" In Western Australia, the tactics employed are reflected in newspaper headlines such as these—

"Union is accused of terror tactics";

"Union heavies front irate brickie"; and

"Builders in call for protection".

A fundamental denial of individual rights is being perpetrated by an extortion operation of the BLF type. Subcontractors are being coerced into joining the BWIU and the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme, which is commonly referred to as BUS. That is a matter of great public concern, because the housing industry in Queensland is the most efficient in the industrial world.

One of the principal factors leading to the extraordinary level of productivity has been the almost total dependence on the independent, self-employed subcontractor. To exemplify the significant difference between the two spheres of the building industry, I refer to CSIRO research which shows that unproductive on-site time in the housing industry is as low as 4 per cent, whereas the equivalent figure for the unionised, non-residential sector, where Normie Gallagher reigns supreme, is an average of 23 per cent.

To highlight the danger that the cottage housing industry would face if subbies were unionised, I refer to the latest flight of fantasy by the BLF. In its latest claim it asks for new boots, overalls, more holidays and free telephone calls. Its 39-point claim starts with \$600 for a 30-hour week. The claim proposes \$200 a week for every 10 metres of height in the structure being built. It includes a further \$300 a week project payment, a construction disability allowance of \$200 a week, an extra, special payment of \$100 a week and a travel mobility payment of \$150 a week. In addition to all of that, the log of claims also proposes that the members receive 10 weeks' holiday every six months.

I say in all seriousness that the claim is nothing less than an effort to destroy a productive industry. Unions involved in the construction industry proudly boast about Comrades Day, under which sites are closed down for one day in every four weeks. The cottage housing industry simply cannot afford that sort of fantasy.

Mr Davis: Do you know what an ambit claim is?

Mr WHITE: I know what an ambit claim is, and I know about previous ambit claims by the BLF. If members of the Opposition want to support the BLF and associate themselves with the tactics of that union, the public of Queensland ought to know.

Enterprising subcontractors who object very strongly to Comrades Day move from site to site to avoid thrice daily inspections by union officials to ensure that Comrades Day is being observed. Such a practice is ridiculous and ludicrous.

It is quite clear that the building industry unions are making vigorous attempts to extend their influence and membership in the housing sector, where, previously, they had been rejected. The unions were rejected for the simple reason that subcontractors jealously guard their independence as small businessmen and do not see themselves as employees. The BWIU is attempting to bolster union membership by compulsion.

Compulsory unionism is inconsistent with the right of an individual to make a free choice. Subcontractors, as employers, are outside the provisions of union charters and it is therefore illegal for unions to attempt to exert influence on them. The concentration of power in any area of commerce or industry is undesirable—it is bad—and the lack of effective control over, and ability to impose sanctions upon, union management is a manifestation of such concentration of power.

The nation's economy is dependent for the most part on a healthy and vital private sector which is driven by entrepreneurs—people who are prepared to take a risk, to work hard and to exercise initiative and great self-discipline. Independent, self-employed subcontractors are a good example of entrepreneurs. They jealously guard their independence. If they are subjected to such treatment they will lose their most important

motivation, which is incentive. That incentive has made this nation and the cottage housing industry the most efficient of any in the industrialised world. I seek leave to incorporate in "Hansard" part of the productivity listing for the countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Productivity in Dwelling Construction

Nation	Productivity (Man-hours/m ²)	Date and Source
Netherlands	12.3—18.3	1973 E.E.C. Survey
Sweden	11.3—12.7	
USSR	15.3—28.8	
Poland	15.0—27.8	
Czechoslovakia	9.4—22.0	
Yugoslavia	21.5—46.0	
U.K.	20.2 conventional 13.8 system-built	(1972 UK Building Research Establishment Survey)
Netherlands	23.7 conventional 5.9 system-built	1973 C.S.I.R.O.
U.S.A.	9.2 conventional 6.5 system-built	
Australia	5.5—6.0 best estimate for conventional volume-built 9.5 average for conventional	

Mr WHITE: The housing industry has also provided the overwhelming majority of Australians with a house that they can afford. All honourable members ought to be concerned about doing everything possible to ensure that young people can get a house that they can afford. This country has an enviable 73 per cent record in home-ownership, which is a direct consequence of the subcontract system. It gets down to the fact that the system works and that most people can afford to get into their own home.

Four major inquiries or court decisions have supported the system. All have expressed concern that attempts to disrupt the system could place the affordability of housing at considerable risk. Those unionists who wish to remove the independent nature of the subcontractor should be aware that they must inevitably damage the housing aspirations of ordinary Queenslanders. The housing sector, unlike the construction industry, has enjoyed industrial harmony. Before construction proceeds, prices are negotiated between builders and subcontractors.

Despite the importance of the industry, which last financial year built approximately 135 000 houses in Australia, of which more than 30 000 were built in Queensland, the building unions have attacked the housing subcontract system through the use of secondary boycotts, pickets and coercion, powers under conciliation and arbitration legislation covering the right of entry, demands that subcontractors be classified as employees and demands that the unions new BUS scheme should apply.

To my mind it is an indictment of the nation's industrial relations system that flagrant breaches of the country's laws can continue unchecked because of the almost total absence of effective deterrents. I call upon the State Government as a matter of urgency to—

- (1) Make it an offence for an organisation to coerce subcontractors to join that organisation or any other.
- (2) Make it an offence for any organisation to coerce employers to take discriminatory action against a subcontractor because he is not a member of a particular union or organisation.
- (3) Make it an offence to take or threaten any action against a subcontractor whether such person has employees or not.

- (4) Facilitate injunctions under subsections 45 D and E of the Trade Practices Act to ensure that secondary boycotts on the supply of materials such as concrete and bricks can be removed forthwith.
- (5) The Minister for Industrial Affairs should immediately implement legislation parallel to the Federal Trade Practices Act as the Federal Labor Government is moving to remove those sections because of union pressure for an unfettered right to extract money from subcontractors under false pretences.
- (6) The Government should be prepared to assist those subcontractors who wish to work and exercise their right not to form a union, if necessary by provision of police protection.
- (7) The Government should support the subcontractors and their contractors before the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Unless immediate action is taken by the State Government, the right of an individual to work and have the freedom of choice on whether to join a union will be removed from the housing industry for ever. The privileged position the trade union movement now holds in this country brings to mind this quote from George Orwell's "Animal Farm"—

"All animals are equal but some are more equal than others."

Performance of Parliamentary Liberal Party

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (12.30 p.m.): This debate, coming, as it does, hard on the heels of the anniversary of the first year of stable Government following the formation of the first National Party Government in the history of this State, is an appropriate time to look at the performance of that Government.

I believe that Queensland has been well served by its first National Party Government, which has brought stability to the Treasury benches and a practical, down-to-earth approach to decision-making that has been recognised by the public. That is proved by the latest Gallup poll figures showing the National Party holding up well at about 38 per cent, while the Premier's approval rating is about 55 per cent.

I believe that it will also be of interest to the people of Queensland if I examine the role that has been played by the third force in this Chamber, the Liberal Party members of this Parliament. I have been concerned that there has been a contrived attempt by some sections of the media to portray that group as being vital to the role of good government. But let me look at the true record of that group over the past year. When it suits them, they move round the city saying that they support the Premier and this Government; but when there is some excuse to have a go at the Premier or the Government, they waltz about saying, "Of course, this would not have happened had the Liberal Party been in coalition with the National Party."

What role has that group played over the past 12 months? Its contribution has been mediocre. Firstly, the attendance record of Liberal Party members has been poor. Their voting record has been erratic and unreliable, and there has been no consistency in direction. That schizophrenic stance has so concerned me that I have taken the trouble to research the details of their record in the past 12 months, that is, from the date of the last election to 10 October 1984. I have here the alarming statistical results of that research. During the past year, on 50 sitting days there have been 103 divisions.

Mr De Lacy: This won't get you back into Cabinet.

Mr ELLIOTT: Fortunately, it will not be up to the honourable member. Of those 103 divisions, on only 49 occasions have the Liberals supported the Government. Of course, that does not even reach a level of 50 per cent support. On 22 occasions the Liberals voted with the Labor socialists——

Mr Davis: The Labor Party.

Mr ELLIOTT: Very well, the Labor Party socialists. I am quite happy to say that.

But worse still, in some ways, is the fact that on 29 of those occasions Liberal Party members played no role on behalf of the people of this State. They absented themselves from the Chamber. To be fair about that voting pattern, one must ask: Has the Liberal Party voted with the ALP on matters of extreme national importance? It is of considerable regret to me, having worked with many Liberal Party members for 10 years, and in fact having spent three years in Cabinet with both the present leader and a number of former leaders, that such is not the case. Out of the 29 times that the Liberals voted with Labor, only twice has it been at the instigation of the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) by way of proposed amendment to significant legislation—once on the retail shop leases legislation, and on the second occasion on legislation dealing with building units. On another two occasions, at the instigation of Sir William Knox, they voted to disallow regulations under the Mining Act and the Main Roads Act. The other occasions, regrettably, have all related to matters of a procedural nature instigated by the socialist opposition, the ALP. Of course, the Liberal Party has spent the last 20-odd years, bar one, fighting alongside the National Party in coalition.

Let me examine now the individual voting records of the Liberals in this Chamber. It must surely be of grave concern to all those supporters of the Government's private enterprise philosophy that the leader of the Liberal Party, the once——

Mr Davis The once-great Sir William Knox.

Mr ELLIOTT: The once-great Sir William Knox, if that is the way in which the honourable member likes to put it, has voted with the Government on only 41 occasions out of a total of 103 occasions. In fact, during the period that I have reviewed, he absented himself from voting on 43 occasions. All of that means that the record of the leader of the Liberal Party, about which he is so ready to tell the captains of industry, is in fact a dismal 39.8 per cent support for the Government. Even his record of abstention from voting was higher, at 41.7 per cent.

Let me now turn to the deputy leader——

Mr Davis: Which one is that?

Mr ELLIOTT: The member for Mount Cootha (Hon. Bill Lickiss). His record is only marginally better than that of his leader, with 40.7 per cent support for the Government, while his abstention rate is slightly less at 36.8 per cent. He shares that distinctive voting record with the former leader of the Liberal Party, the honourable member for Redcliffe (Mr White). During that period, Mr White also achieved a record of 40.7 per cent support for the Government and an abstention rate of 36.8 per cent.

Mr Davis: We used to get a better vote out of him when he was a Minister.

Mr ELLIOTT: I think that the honourable member got a better vote when he used to count the ballots at Trades Hall.

I do not wish to labour the point, but let me look at the newest member of the Liberal Party, who found it convenient to campaign in Stafford as a coalitionist. During the short period in which he has been back in this Chamber, of the 10 divisions taken between August and October, he supported the Government on only four occasions. He voted with the Opposition on two occasions and he absented himself from the Chamber on four occasions.

During the debate on the Mental Health Act, Criminal Code and Health Act Amendment Bill, we all witnessed the spectacle of the member for Stafford speaking against a clause in the Bill and then scurrying out to hide in the Parliamentary Library when the division bells rang. During the debate, he repeated that childish behaviour again and again. It is worth noting that, during that performance, no other Liberals were in the Chamber to vote, either.

On that occasion an honourable member in the Chamber observed that the Liberals appeared to have only part-time or social membership of this Assembly. Government members believe in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. I ask: Does the electorate of Queensland believe that it is getting its money's worth from those people? If they were school kids, they would be up before the Childrens Court. I guess that one could only refer to them as Liberal truants.

So that there can be no doubt about the authenticity of those statistics, I table the documents from the Parliamentary Library that set out in detail the record for the period between the last election and 10 October 1984.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

It was with regret that I had to take that action today to point out to the people of Queensland the voting record of the Liberals, but it had to be done.

Problems in Queensland Prison System

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (12.39 p.m.): In recent weeks, quite a deal of publicity has been given to the problems that still exist in the Queensland prisons system and, in particular, at the Brisbane Prison Complex. Today, I intend to show that the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs has been less than diligent in the handling of the Welfare Services portion of his portfolio. I am sure that all honourable members agree that prisons is a very difficult area. Nevertheless, it is an essential service, and a service that will cost the Queensland tax-payers about \$35m in this financial year.

It is now clear that trouble at the Brisbane Prisons Complex was brewing for some months prior to the riots of last November, and certainly there was every opportunity on 21 November 1983 to attempt to stop those riots. As reported in "The Courier-Mail" on 12 October 1984, a Mr Fuller, a prison officer, was present at 6 a.m. on that day when four emergency squad members reported to Chief Prison Officer Woods that the prisoners planned to riot that day, and they repeated the warning at 10 a.m. They requested permission to move the ringleaders, and the chief prison officer said that he would look into it. Apparently he did not.

On the same day, Superintendent Lye approached two prisoners from 6 yard, C division in the early afternoon asking that the prisoners elect two delegates and present their demands to the chief superintendent and other superintendents in a meeting with them and delegates from other yards that afternoon. Clearly, Superintendent Lye knew that there were problems but he did not call back to collect the list of grievances until the next day, when the riots were already under way. The proposed meeting to discuss the prisoners' grievances did not take place.

I would like to table a document entitled "The Report on Debriefing Relating to the Disturbance which occurred at Brisbane Prison Complex in November 1983".

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind the honourable member for Townsville that unsighted documents that members request to have incorporated in "Hansard" can be an embarrassment to the Chair.

Mr McELLIGOTT: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. May I table it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member has something to state, he should do so.

Mr McELLIGOTT: I will quote from the report, but may I table it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Did the honourable member seek leave to incorporate the report in "Hansard"?

Mr McELLIGOTT: No. I seek to table it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member may table the document.

Mr McELLIGOTT: The report states—

“During the two weeks prior to 19th November, 1983 it was becoming increasingly obvious that something more than a hunger strike was being planned. The emergency squad identified the ten main leaders.”

On Saturday, 19 November 1983, the hunger strike began. The debriefing report goes on to describe the events that occurred between then and the commencement of the riots on Friday, 18 November. Knowing that there would be some sort of hunger strike on the next day, a meeting of senior staff made the decision to operate on a low-key basis, whatever happened. The staff also decided that the emergency squad would be on stand-by, but out of sight.

The prisoners refused to take food the next day, as expected, and a stand-off existed until 4.30 p.m. on the Monday when the divisional superintendent and chief prisons officer gave the order for prisoners to fall in, which they did. They were marched to their cells and locked in.

The report states that—

“Soon after they were locked in, at approximately 5.00 p.m. a news broadcast which included comments from the Minister to let the prisoners starve was heard by the prisoners. It was at this time that the disturbance began.”

The report goes on—

“All yards started making noise, began barricading themselves in and later lit fires.”

I quote now from a letter dated 24 May 1984 that was written to me by a prisoner. The letter reads—

“The prison riot on 21st November 1983 was caused by a member of the present Government. What started out as a peaceful hunger strike by inmates here to bring public attention to the needed reforms on 21st November, turned into a riot because of a statement given to the media by the honourable Mr Muntz. The statement was, ‘If the inmates at Boggo Road prison continue their hunger strike they can starve to death for all I care.’ After being on the hunger strike for four days and getting no conference with the prison authorities to talk about our problems and then hearing that statement by Mr Muntz that no conference would be given to us to resolve our problems and that he didn’t care set the spark that resulted in the prison riot.”

Unfortunately, I do not have the time to read extensively from the debriefing report, but it clearly shows that the authorities were totally unprepared and that no worthwhile efforts have been made to improve the situation since the riots.

The report indicates that there was a break-down in communications at all levels and that there were conflicting ideas as to how the riot should be handled. This developed to such a stage that, at the height of the disturbance, officers were threatening to strike. Few officers were properly trained to handle the situation. Although a number of staff urged the use of gas, there was a lack of understanding as to how to use it. Equipment was also a problem. At 5.30 p.m., during the riots, two-way radios failed to work because there were no spare batteries. Riot shields were unsuitable. The prison had only 30 riot helmets. It also had motor-cycle helmets, which were considered unsuitable. A shotgun was accidentally discharged during the disturbance.

I turn now to what happened after the riot subsided. The Minister did not visit the prison or talk to prisoners until a week later. He then imposed a ban on the Opposition and the media. That was almost certainly in breach of the Criminal Code which specifically forbids interference with the free exercise of a member in the carrying out of his duties.

Honourable members might recall my allegations that prisoners had been bashed in orgies of punishment, and the Minister’s assurance that no reprisals occurred. On 3 August this year, in passing sentence on a prisoner, one Frank Gorman, who pleaded

guilty to having damaged a cell during the riots, Mr R. Quinlan, S.M. said, "I find it more probable than not that the defendant was unlawfully assaulted on the way to the detention unit."

Remember also my concern that the visiting justice was hearing charges and my argument that he was not divorced from the system. On 17 October 1984, in the Brisbane District Court, Judge Skoien ordered a new hearing of a case against a prisoner because of special and unusual circumstances, one being that the prisoner had not had counsel and did not call evidence to corroborate his claim that he was not involved in the riots. Judge Skoien also said that some remarks by the magistrate seemed harsh and were not qualified.

The latest round of allegations against the system clearly indicates the need for an open inquiry into the system. Although I initially responded to the reports by saying that they were the result of efforts by a group of officers who were opposed to reform, I nevertheless believe that the responses by the Minister are less than satisfactory.

He has been forced to concede that the reports in most cases were basically true and, in the case of assertions that three prisoners had been moved to minimum security, his response was later proven to be false. The Minister first of all claimed that "The Courier-Mail" report was wrong in all three cases, yet a list of transfers circulated in Brisbane gaol shows that they were to be transferred to Palen Creek minimum security prison farm, which has no locks on the doors. I understand that those transfers have since been cancelled.

Only yesterday I spoke to a prisoner recently released from Brisbane gaol. He is well known to at least one National Party member of this House. He is an Apexian and a Rotarian, so his word carries some weight. He served four weeks for a traffic offence. He contacted me because he is disgusted with what he saw.

He tells me that a prisoner had a wound to the arm stitched by an unqualified prison officer. The arm became infected but the prisoner was refused medication. The recently released prisoner talks of a prisoner with a kidney complaint who has been refused medication and indeed was locked in his cell for four days.

This former prisoner also claims to have seen an officer named Robertson load a prison motor mower into a gold-coloured Sigma motor vehicle and instruct another prisoner to cannibalise other mowers to make up the deficiencies. He has told me an extraordinary story about the night he spent in No. 2 Division where he claims officers embarked on a drunken party. He says that when a prisoner named Mathers was brought into the division, the officer was too drunk to open the cell door and had to hand the keys to Mathers to let himself into the cell. No. 2 Division houses the worst prisoners. He says that the officers broke furniture and made a real mess. They explained the destruction by claiming that an escape attempt had taken place and that a hole was discovered in an internal wall.

My Rotarian friend tells me that no such hole existed and that no escape attempt occurred, yet on 21 September the Minister issued a press release announcing the escape attempt and praising the diligence of the officers and asserting that a prisoner would be charged over the incident. I would be most interested to know which prisoner, if any, was charged.

The former prisoner also referred to substandard meals which were being served during modifications to the prison kitchen. The prisoners were promised that the modifications would be completed in three weeks. They have presently been under way for six weeks, with no sign of completion.

The Minister has shown himself to be more interested in the glamorous aspects of his portfolio, although I note today that he will not now have the opportunity of being repeatedly photographed with Greg Chappell. Incidentally, I hope that next time he makes a better choice for chairman of the International Youth Year Co-ordinating

Committee. He should get his hands dirty in the mire that is the Queensland prison system. It is crying out for leadership.

The Minister misled the House by his statement on 11 October, in which he suggested that information given to prison authorities prior to the riots was unsubstantiated rumour only. The debriefing report shows that it was fact and should have been acted on.

In recent days, the Minister has referred to the emergency squad. Initially he claimed that he had complete confidence in that squad. It has since been disclosed that squad members have been locked out of their offices and that an investigation is presently under way into their operation. Once again, the Minister seems to be badly informed about the true situation at Brisbane gaol.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Kangaroo Point Land Development Bill

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (12.48 p.m.): I rise to speak about the Kangaroo Point land grab in which the Government attempted to take land from private individuals and hand it over to private developers. The legislation that has been introduced to enable it to do that is unprecedented in Australian parliamentary history. It is a gross abuse of legislative power. As I said on earlier occasions, it is State capitalism at its worst. It appears that the National Party Government is much more interested in creating prime, juicy real estate than in protecting the rights of individuals.

By this land grab, it has trampled over the rights of individual owners to their private property and their right to profit from it. The decision-making process in Cabinet must be questioned very seriously to see how that happened. Yesterday, members of the National Party said that the original attempt to do this on 17 March 1983 also had the concurrence of the Liberals. I obviously want to know why the Liberals were counted on that occasion.

The Premier, in making that statement, said, quite untruthfully, that the owners of four or five properties that were going to be resumed wanted to sell their properties. To date, I have had contact with three of those owners who noted press reports in "The Courier-Mail". They are most upset about that untruthful statement. The fact is that they did not want to sell their properties. If they wanted to sell their properties, why would the Government have to resume them? It is unbelievable that the Government would suggest that the five property-owners who were the subject of the legislation wanted their properties to be resumed or wanted to sell their properties. That is a downright untruth. The Premier should know better than to make such statements in this Parliament. He misled the Parliament. Upon his return from Tokyo, I ask him to apologise for misleading the Parliament.

The five properties were resumed prior to the introduction of the Bill. People were forced out of their houses. I admit that one of the owners sold his property on the open market. Only one of those five persons sold his property voluntarily. The other four property-owners were threatened with resumption. At the time that the Order in Council was issued on 17 March 1983, I had been reliably informed that members of the Land Administration Commission had told the Minister that it was wrong and that it was illegal. An opinion was sought from the Crown Solicitor. His advice was that the resumption order was illegal.

An iniquitous Bill was introduced in the Parliament for the following reasons: firstly, to validate the illegal actions that forced those four persons out of their houses; and secondly, to enable the Government to resume those properties that it could not badger the owners into selling, with the ultimate objective of giving them to other private individuals so that they could profit from them. The Government needed to validate ipso facto what it did.

All of the former owners of the properties are aged persons. Their houses have been removed. They have gone through a great deal of trauma and they have made other arrangements.

One property-owner has since suffered a stroke.

I have recently spoken to some of those property-owners. I would like to reiterate some of the statements that they made to me.

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I inform the honourable member that what he is saying is not correct. No action has been taken against those persons. The Bill has been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for South Brisbane to accept the Minister's explanation of the matter that is under discussion.

Mr FOURAS: I accept it. I am talking about the five owners whose properties were resumed under an Order in Council dated 17 March 1983.

As I said, after the resumption, one property-owner suffered a stroke. Those persons underwent a great deal of trauma. As I have said, they were old people. They sold their properties under pressure as a result of the resumption order.

There are three ways in which it is possible to obtain private land. Firstly, it can be purchased on the open market. Secondly, a resumption order can be issued. However, a person can still negotiate the sale of his property without its being resumed. Thirdly, a property can be resumed. Once it has been resumed, as happened with "Collins Place", the property is taken over.

One person said to me, "I did not want to sell. I was told that you couldn't beat the Government and that they would be taking it by Christmas." Another lady said that she thought that the Government wanted the land for the Queensland Housing Commission. Moreover, she said to me, "I was told that by Christmas all houses would be pulled down, anyway."

That is the voluntary acquisition that the Government talks about! It is absolute nonsense.

The daughter of another lady wrote to me in the following terms—

"My mother was one of the five property owners forced to sell to the Government last year.

My mother had lived at Kangaroo Point 75 years of her 76 and resumption the second time in 19 years of her property was difficult to accept."

That lady's property was resumed so that the shipyard could be built. She moved up the road. The property that was resumed for the construction of a shipyard was again resumed. She was forced to sell. That is a fact that cannot be denied.

Mr GLASSON: I rise to a point of order. The properties were not resumed. Negotiations were conducted voluntarily between officers of the Lands Department and the property-owners.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask the member for South Brisbane to accept the explanation of the Minister.

Mr FOURAS: I accept it, but I am saying that the Government had a resumption order and an Order in Council. The Government did not negotiate. Under threat of the resumption order, residents were told that they had to be out by Christmas. They were told also that they could not beat the Government. Although, technically, the properties were not resumed, the owners were put under tremendous pressure to sell. I stand by that. What the Government did is absolutely unbelievable. Residents affected by the Government's actions included, for example, a lady who was 76 years of age. They were told, "We will use a resumption order to get rid of you."

What did they receive for their properties? There is no doubt that acquisition of property under such circumstances absolutely robbed those people—a fact that would be borne out by real estate agents. The Government's acquisition in such circumstances amounts to legal robbery. Most of the people were paid——

Mr GLASSON: I rise to a point of order. I object to the statement that people were robbed. I can produce the valuations. Property-owners agreed to prices in excess of those paid by a private developer who acquired property on the other side of the street.

Mr FOURAS: Mr Deputy Speaker, the Minister is wasting my time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Once again, I ask the member for South Brisbane to accept the Minister's explanation. He may continue his speech.

Mr FOURAS: What has the Minister to say about the offer of \$370,000 made to the Ace Driving School for nearly 100 perches? For Southpoint and similar areas the offers are \$10,000 a perch. The offer for the Ace Driving School was \$3,700 a perch, and that site has three or four houses on it. Because of his gross incompetence, the Minister should resign. Although the Minister is a very nice person, he is unable to handle the administration of his portfolio. The people affected could have obtained \$1m on the open market. That is the measure of their loss. If the resumption order had been served and if the Bill had been passed by Parliament, the Government would have paid the property-owners according to the resumption price. Substantial amounts of money have been lost by the property-owners.

The Government's philosophy on land acquisition has been amply illustrated on a prior occasion. When it acquired the site for Expo 88, the Government refused options to property-owners to repurchase their properties. The principle applied in the acquisition of land for Expo is exactly the same as that proposed in the Kangaroo Point Land Development Bill. The difference is one of degree. In the case of the South Brisbane land, the Exposition will take place between the resumption of the properties and their resale to private developers, whereas at Kangaroo Point the intention was to resume from private land-holders and immediately resell to private developers. In both instances, it is highway robbery.

The Government ought to be ashamed of itself. This so-called private enterprise Government has behaved as no totalitarian Government would behave. One land-owner came from Poland. He said that he escaped from the Nazis and he escaped from the communists—Poland was caught between the two sides—and he thought that he had come to a free country in which people believed in private enterprise. However, he found himself faced with a threat of a resumption order. When the Government was unable to badger him in that way, it attempted to resume his property by an Act of Parliament. An 85-year-old man who has lived in his house for 45 years does not want to shift. At no price would he go voluntarily. Again, an Act of Parliament was the means by which the Government intended removing him from his property.

It is abysmal that the Government could contemplate such draconian measures. Honourable members have witnessed a charade of incompetence. The Minister should resign. It is a shame that, after receiving the Solicitor-General's opinion that the Order in Council was illegal, he attempted to impose a legislative enactment on those land-holders. Such a measure is unprecedented under our system and a gross abuse of the legislature.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

SUPERANNUATION TRUST FUNDS (PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE ENTITLEMENTS) BILL

Suspension of Standing Orders

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the immediate presentation to the House of a Bill to provide for the protection of employees’ entitlements to superannuation benefits and for related purposes; the passing of such Bill through all its stages this day; and if debate be not concluded by 4.30 p.m. the Chairman and the Speaker as applicable shall put all the remaining questions necessary to dispose of the remaining stages without further amendment or debate.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 19	
Ahern	Lane	D’Arcy	
Alison	Lester	De Lacy	
Austin	Lickiss	Eaton	
Bailey	Lingard	Fouras	
Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud	Gibbs R. J.	
Booth	McKechnie	Goss	
Borbidge	McPhie	Kruger	
Cahill	Menzel	Mackenroth	
Chapman	Miller	McElligott	
Cooper	Muntz	McLean	
Elliott	Newton	Palaszcuk	
FitzGerald	Powell	Shaw	
Gibbs, I. J.	Randell	Smith	
Glasson	Row	Underwood	
Goleby	Simpson	Warner, A. M.	
Gunn	Stephan	Wilson	
Gygar	Stoneman	Yewdale	
Harper	Tenni		
Harvey	Wharton		
Henderson	White		
Innes			
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Katter	Kaus	Davis	
Knox	Neal	Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

First Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General): I present the Bill and move—

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

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 20	
Ahern	Lane	D'Arcy	
Alison	Lester	De Lacy	
Austin	Lickiss	Eaton	
Bailey	Lingard	Fouras	
Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud	Gibbs R. J.	
Booth	McKechnie	Goss	
Borbidge	McPhie	Kruger	
Cahill	Menzel	Mackenroth	
Chapman	Miller	McElligott	
Cooper	Muntz	McLean	
Elliott	Newton	Palaszczuk	
FitzGerald	Powell	Shaw	
Gibbs, I. J.	Randell	Smith	
Glasson	Row	Underwood	
Goleby	Simpson	Veivers	
Gunn	Stephan	Warner, A. M.	
Gygar	Stoneman	Wilson	
Harper	Tenni	Yewdale	
Harvey	Wharton		
Henderson	White		
Innes			
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Katter	Kaus	Davis	
Knox	Neal	Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Printing

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General): I move—

“That the Bill be printed.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 20	
Ahern	Lane	D'Arcy	
Alison	Lester	De Lacy	
Austin	Lickiss	Eaton	
Bailey	Lingard	Fouras	
Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud	Gibbs R. J.	
Booth	McKechnie	Goss	
Borbidge	McPhie	Kruger	
Cahill	Menzel	Mackenroth	
Chapman	Miller	McElligott	
Cooper	Muntz	McLean	
Elliott	Newton	Palaszczuk	
FitzGerald	Powell	Shaw	
Gibbs, I. J.	Randell	Smith	
Glasson	Row	Underwood	
Goleby	Simpson	Veivers	
Gunn	Stephan	Warner, A. M.	
Gygar	Stoneman	Wilson	
Harper	Tenni	Yewdale	
Harvey	Wharton		
Henderson	White		
Innes			
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Katter	Kaus	Davis	
Knox	Neal	Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (2.33 p.m.): I move—

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

The attitude of the Opposition in regard to this Bill is surprising. It would seem that the word has come up from Mr Gallagher in Victoria and that Opposition members are dancing to his tune. What this Bill is all about is the protection of the worker in Queensland.

One of the most significant changes that has occurred in the relationship between employees and employers over the last 15 years has been the growth in the availability of superannuation as an entitlement available to employees at all levels.

Whereas superannuation was once confined mainly to the public sector or to senior management in private enterprise, superannuation schemes are now becoming increasingly available to persons at all levels of employment; in other words, to the work-force generally.

Superannuation, once synonymous with large-scale organisations, has now become available in many small-scale business enterprises. As I said, it is available to the average Queensland worker. Indeed, over the years, successive Commonwealth Governments have legislated to encourage the development of superannuation schemes, particularly those for small-scale individual entrepreneurs and the self-employed. Until recently, this growth in superannuation has been encouraged largely by successive Commonwealth Governments granting benefits through the use of the Income Tax Assessment Act. Of course, the current Commonwealth Government seems to be bent on destroying the attractiveness of superannuation by imposing greater taxes on lump-sum entitlements under superannuation schemes.

Mr Simpson: Shame!

Mr HARPER: Shame, indeed! But what else could we expect from a centralist Federal Government, a totalitarian Government that is bent on bringing about economic chaos?

Nevertheless, trade unions, as representatives of employees, are continuing pressure for the extension of superannuation entitlements.

In general, superannuation schemes are a useful adjunct to employee/employer relationships, for they encourage a greater stability in the work-force and thus more harmonious industrial relations. They also provide a mechanism whereby capital can be accumulated and invested, thus aiding the general economic well-being of the community.

The schemes were intended to encourage those who were prepared to help themselves in providing for security in retirement. Of course, that is why Opposition members do not like anything that helps people who help themselves. Opposition members have a philosophy of giving all. This Government believes in helping those who are prepared to help themselves, and that is the intention of the superannuation scheme. It is designed to encourage persons who are prepared to help themselves in providing for security in their retirement.

Apart from the specific taxation legislation of the Commonwealth, superannuation schemes have been generally free of Government regulation other than the general law of each State regulating the use of trusts, which governs the trust deed usually entered into by employers in order to commence a superannuation scheme.

Over recent years, this lack of regulation has led to a growing number of complaints of abuse by the workers, who are the potential beneficiaries under superannuation schemes. This has occurred particularly in relation to small-scale superannuation schemes where the trustees under the superannuation schemes have not necessarily been as completely free from influence by the employer as should be the case. Surely members of the Opposition cannot find fault with something that is aimed at correcting that type of situation?

In view of these complaints, it has been determined that it is time for the State Government to legislate to provide the maximum degree of protection for the entitlements of employees under superannuation schemes.

It is not the intention of this Government, being a Government dedicated to free enterprise, to establish a great new bureaucratic structure. Rather, it is intended to introduce a legislative mechanism which will enable the Government to supervise, and intervene only in those circumstances in which it is considered appropriate.

The Bill provides by clause 5 for the creation of the office of Registrar of Superannuation Trust Deeds. It is intended that this function will be fulfilled by the current Registrar of Commercial Acts—no new great bureaucracy—and his staff will carry out any necessary functions under the Act. Necessary powers to carry out such functions are provided for in the Bill.

By clause 15 of the Bill it is proposed that, by Order in Council, the occupations or business undertakings to which the Bill will apply will be declared from time to time. Moreover, by clause 4 (2) it is specifically provided that the superannuation schemes to which the Bill applies are limited to those where the contract of employment is made in Queensland, where the proper law is the law of Queensland or where employees are required pursuant to their contract of employment to perform work in Queensland. This will ensure great flexibility in applying the Bill only to problem areas.

Once a particular occupation or business undertaking is declared under the Bill, all trust deeds or variations thereto relating to superannuation schemes for that occupation or business or business undertaking will, by clause 7, require the approval of the registrar. The registrar, by clause 8, is forbidden to grant approval for a trust deed unless the provisions of the Bill are complied with.

Among requirements with which the superannuation trust deed must comply is a requirement in clause 16 that the deed be in accordance with the law of trusts of Queensland, that there be no provision granting the trustees any indemnity or freedom from liability—the spokesman for the Opposition is being distracted and I suggest that he should have regard to his particular provision. I will repeat it for his benefit. Among requirements with which the superannuation trust deed must comply is a requirement in clause 16 that the deed be in accordance with the law of trusts of Queensland, that there be no provision granting the trustees any indemnity or freedom from liability in respect of anything done or omitted to be done by them in connection with the management of the superannuation scheme or fund and also a requirement that an employee under an approved superannuation scheme will only be able to transfer his entitlements to another approved superannuation scheme.

Clause 17 of the Bill provides that the trustees are to be ordinarily resident in Queensland or that the director of any corporate trustee also be ordinarily resident in Queensland. Moreover, unless the Governor in Council otherwise provides, the trustees are to include a representative of the employers, a representative of the employees and one independent person. Thus the problem of employer domination of trustees will be avoided.

In addition, clause 18 requires that the benefits under an approved superannuation trust deed include an annuity or pension convertible to a lump sum, or vice versa, or both an annuity or pension benefit and a lump-sum benefit, thus enabling an employee to maximise his entitlements under the superannuation scheme.

In addition to approving the provisions contained in the superannuation trust deed, clause 12 of the Bill entitles the registrar to take action to obtain for an employee his rights under an approved superannuation scheme. I stress that it entitles the registrar to take action to obtain for an employee his rights under an approved superannuation scheme. This is a major advance to protect the rights of employees and to ensure that their rights under superannuation schemes can be enforced, notwithstanding that they themselves may not be able to fund any litigation necessary to obtain their rights.

The registrar, in the case of approved superannuation trust deeds, also has the power to supervise approved schemes. He is authorised, by clause 11, to order a spot audit at the expense of the superannuation fund.

Clause 22 imposes an obligation on the trustees to submit annual returns of the affairs of the approved superannuation scheme.

In addition, the Bill makes it an offence for employers to contribute to a non-approved trust scheme or for a trustee to hold funds in relation to a non-approved trust scheme, and any moneys that may be held by a trustee in relation to a non-approved scheme is, by clause 21, made recoverable. However, no prosecution under the Bill can occur unless, by clause 28 of the Bill, a specific authorisation is given by the Minister.

Mr Speaker, this Bill represents an important initiative by the Government of Queensland to ensure that adequate protection is given to Queensland employees and employers in the field of superannuation. The Bill contains the minimum degree of Government legislation necessary to ensure that identified abuses are able to be avoided without imposing upon employers and employees another layer of bureaucratic interference in their entitlements. It seems to me that this initiative will be a forerunner to similar legislation likely to be introduced throughout the rest of Australia.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is—

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

All those in favour say, “Aye”; to the contrary, “No”.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: No!

Mr SPEAKER: I think the “Ayes” have it.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Divide!

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

In division—

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Are you calling on me to speak?

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Wolston called for a division.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: No. I want the right to speak to the second reading of the Bill.

Government Members: You called, “Divide!”

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Wolston called, “Divide!” A division was called.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER: The member called a division. He can seek the right to——

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I seek the right to speak, obviously.

Mr SPEAKER: The member called a division and, on that basis, the division will proceed.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I seek permission to have the division called off.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

Government Members: No!

Opposition Members: Aye!

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The “Ayes” have it.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Wolston has sought leave to have the division called off.

Government Members interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Tell them why.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

Opposition Members: Aye!

Government Members: No!

Mr SPEAKER: The "Ayes" have it.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (2.48 p.m.): Mr Speaker, the Bill before the Parliament—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry. I have made a mistake. In this instance, the "Noes" have it.

Mr WARBURTON: I rise to a point of order. I clearly heard you say, Mr Speaker, "The 'Ayes' have it."

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr WARBURTON: The shadow Minister for Justice then began his speech. Surely, Mr Speaker, you will allow the debate to proceed.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I apologise for the statement I made. A division was called. I asked the House whether the division was to proceed. I have to say that, in this instance, the "Noes" have it.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a further point of order. I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the fact that on occasions in the past a mistake has been made in the Parliament and that you have allowed debate to continue. That precedent has already been set. Because of the importance of the Bill, it is absolutely vital that the Opposition be given an opportunity to debate the legislation in the Parliament. You put the question, Mr Speaker. You should not have put the question. I ask that you be fair in your ruling and uphold my appeal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A division was called and a division will take place. The tellers for the "Noes" will be the honourable member for Brisbane Central and the honourable member for Port Curtis. The tellers for the "Ayes" will be the member for Balonne and the member for Mansfield.

Mr POWELL: I would like a point clarified. Mr Speaker, what is the question on which the House is dividing? Is the division on whether the second-reading debate should be closed, or on whether the honourable member for Wolston should be allowed to continue to speak?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is—

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

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The tellers have been nominated.

Mr GIBBS: I rise to a further point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I can see that. I am on mine, too.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a further point of order. Mr Speaker, I point out to you that I sought to stop you putting the motion for the second reading of the Bill. That

was my sole intention. It was not my intention to prevent the Opposition from having the right to debate the Bill in Parliament. Mr Speaker, you have made that ruling. The Bill is bad enough, but if the House is to operate on the ruling that you, Mr Speaker, seem so intent on pursuing this afternoon, this will be one of the darkest days in the democratic processes of this Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is—

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

The honourable member for Wolston called for a division on that question.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: After you put the motion, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: After I put the motion.

Opposition Members: You shouldn't have put the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Opposition members are in contempt. I have nominated the tellers.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a further point of order. Mr Speaker, I again draw to your attention that I sought to stop you putting the motion for the second reading of the Bill, not to gag the right of the Opposition to debate the legislation before the Parliament. That is what I have done, and you, Mr Speaker, have made an incorrect ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Will the tellers carry out their duties?

Later in division—

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I move—

“That the division be cancelled.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That motion has already been moved, but leave was not granted by the House.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I just moved that motion. The Opposition has got itself into an awful mess again. I do believe that they genuinely want to debate the Bill, in spite of their bad leadership. If the division were cancelled, we could get on with the business of the House. I move—

“That the division be cancelled.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

AYES, 45

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

NOES, 25

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

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—resolved in the affirmative.

Motion to Allow Debate on Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (2.57 p.m.): In view of the fact that the Opposition spokesman made an obvious mistake, I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will allow a debate to proceed as if it were a second reading debate.”

Mr Goss: That's to cover up your Speaker's mistake.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Salisbury will withdraw the remark.

Mr GOSS: Certainly, but I made it on the basis that I understood you had apologised.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member under Standing Order No. 123A.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (2.59 p.m.): I want to make the point very clearly at the outset that when the Minister moved the motion for the second reading, Mr Speaker, you put the question without allowing me an opportunity to speak to the Bill.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr Goss: Why don't you two swap places?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the member for Salisbury. If anything more is said against my ruling, I will ask the honourable member to withdraw from the Chamber under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am quite happy to pursue that point later; at the moment there are more important matters at hand.

Obviously the most important point is that this Bill is another example of the way in which this Government believes that democracy should operate in this State. In many ways it is a replica of other legislation that has been introduced into this Chamber recently, such as the Expo 88 legislation and the debacle from which this Government was forced to retreat in relation to the resumption of properties at Kangaroo Point.

It is obvious that the sole reason this legislation was introduced into this Parliament this afternoon is that a Federal election is pending. This is a provocative and deliberate attempt by the Government to create industrial unrest in Queensland, and quite rightly so. When I say “and quite rightly so”, I qualify it by saying that the Opposition will stand by and support the rights that the building workers in this State and in Australia have and will have in the future under the superannuation scheme that they have established.

The Government has a deplorable record not only in industrial relations but also in its dealings with the Building Workers Industrial Union and the building industry. On numerous occasions legislation providing for the portability of long service leave was introduced into this Parliament by Mr Campbell, a former member of this Parliament, and even by the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox), but on each occasion the legislation had to be withdrawn because of the pressure applied by the National Party. Queensland is the only State in which portability of long service leave does not apply to members of the Building Workers Industrial Union and to other workers in the building industry.

The Opposition is concerned, and the people of Queensland should be alarmed, about the way in which this legislation was introduced this afternoon. In moving for the suspension of Standing Orders, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General said—

“... and if debate be not completed by 4.30 p.m. the Chairman and the Speaker as applicable shall put all the remaining questions necessary to dispose of the remaining stages without further amendment or debate.”

In my seven years in this Parliament, I cannot recall an occasion on which such a motion has been moved in the Chamber. This afternoon, it was incredible to hear the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General talk about this so-called Government of free enterprise.

I shall quote some relevant sections from his second-reading speech. They prove conclusively that the Government believes in free enterprise only when it suits the Government. This is one of the best examples of jackboot legislation that we have seen introduced into this Parliament.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General said—

“Of course, the current Commonwealth Government seems to be bent on destroying the attractiveness of superannuation by imposing greater taxes on lump sum entitlements under superannuation schemes. Nevertheless, trade unions, as representatives of employees, are continuing pressure for the extension of superannuation entitlements.”

The trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party make no apologies for seeking an extension of superannuation entitlements to any employee. I certainly make no apology for the attitude that the Federal Government adopts towards imposing taxation on lump-sum superannuation payments. I entirely support that attitude. The whole intention of superannuation is to take some of the weight off the shoulders of Governments that have to contribute ever-increasing amounts for what is becoming an aged community in Australia. It was never intended that superannuation schemes should provide lump-sum payments. It was always intended that they should provide superannuation to assist people to enjoy a reasonable standard of living in their retirement. The Minister went on to say—

“Superannuation schemes are in general a useful adjunct to employee-employer relationships for they encourage a greater stability in the work-force and thus more harmonious industrial relations. They also provide a mechanism whereby capital can be accumulated and invested thus aiding the general economic well-being of the community.”

That one paragraph contains the reason for the introduction of this legislation. This greedy Government, which is prepared ride roughshod over the wishes of trade-unionists not only in Queensland but throughout Australia, wants to grab all the cake for itself.

The Minister went on to make this alarming statement—

“By clause 15 of the Bill it is proposed that, by Order in Council, the occupations or business undertakings to which the Bill will apply will be declared from time to time.

Moreover, by clause 4 (2) of the Bill it is specifically provided that the superannuation schemes to which the Bill applies are limited—”

this is the crux—

“to those where the contract of employment is made in Queensland or of which the proper law is the law of Queensland or where employees are required pursuant to their contract of employment to perform work in Queensland. This will ensure great flexibility in applying the Bill only to problem areas.”

As I have stated, this Government is jackbooting over the democratic rights of the people and over the bastions of the free enterprise system, including some of the biggest insurance companies in this State. The Government supposedly supports those groups. Those people will also be affected on a Commonwealth basis and I hope that they are well aware of that fact.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister also said that clause 17 of the Bill provides that the trustees are to be ordinarily resident in Queensland or that the director of any corporate trustee shall also be ordinarily resident in Queensland. Unless the Governor in Council otherwise provides, the trustees must include a representative of the employers,

a representative of the employees and an independent representative, so the problem of employer domination of trustees will be avoided.

What a load of political garbage and jingoism. It is a deliberate attempt to work in with some of the stooges from the Confederation of Industry who were sitting in the gallery earlier this afternoon. I notice that they have left. They are in cahoots with the Government and have influenced it to bring this legislation before the House.

Who will be affected by this legislation? Why was the Bill introduced? The unions that are involved in the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme Pty Ltd are the Australian Building and Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation, the Operative Painters and Decorators Union of Australia, the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union of Australia, the Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Australia, the Operative Plasterers and Plaster Workers Federation of Australia, the Slaters, Tilers and Roofing Industry Union of Victoria, the Operative Stonemasons Society of Australia, the Victorian Operative Bricklayers Society, the Victorian Plaster Industry Workers Union and the Victorian Plasterers Society. All of those trade unions are involved in this scheme on a national basis.

What obviously galls the Government is the fact that the figures suggest that approximately \$1m comes into this superannuation scheme on a weekly basis. The Government's jackboot approach to the unions shows that it is so greedy that it wants the million dollars for itself. The Government will give that money to its greedy cohorts so that it can be invested in the way that the Government sees fit, without the knowledge of the investors in the fund, that is, the trade-unionists.

Mr FitzGerald: The employers are investing, too.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The Government is prepared to ride roughshod over the employers who have made a democratic decision to contribute to the fund and support the fund.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: No, it is not.

I have a letter that I will read so that the people of Queensland will be aware that what I am saying is correct. The letter is from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs and is dated 10 October 1984. It reads as follows—

“Lately I have received many representations from firms operating in the Building Industry and those representing their interests. These representations have expressed deep concern about the potential operation in Queensland of the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme (BUS Pty Ltd).”

That is not true, because the people to whom the Minister referred do not object to the scheme. The Confederation of Industry is objecting to it. The letter continues—

“As you would be aware there are a number of characteristics of the scheme which are adverse to the interests of Queensland as a whole and particularly its employers and employees.

What particularly concerns me is that the scheme is southern based and union dominated.”

That is an absolute fallacy. The Minister continues—

“There is little likelihood that monies from Queensland will be invested back into this State.”

I will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that what the Minister stated in that letter is nothing more than a downright lie. He goes on to say—

“No doubt you are aware that the Board of Trustees of the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme comprises six union representatives and two employer representatives.

There is also the element of coercion and the likelihood that many firms would be conscripted to join a scheme in which they have no faith and which has been developed because of deals in Victoria with minimal concern for Queensland.

I have been gratified to see the initiative of the Queensland Confederation of Industry and the Housing Industry Association in establishing Queensland based schemes that do not have the inimical characteristics of BUS.

A decision has been taken by the Government that it supports the principle of Queensland based schemes and is looking at a situation in future Government projects where a preference may be given to companies contributing to Queensland based schemes where superannuation is a requirement.

Given your major role in the Queensland building industry you will no doubt be involved in contracts where superannuation now becomes an issue and will be forced to make decisions concerning it.

I would hope and indeed I would encourage you in those circumstances to also support Queensland based schemes since it is obvious that in the long term this would be to the benefit to all those with a stake in the future in Queensland."

Not only are the contents of that letter deliberately designed to be provocative; they are also a downright lie. That is the only way to describe them.

I point out that the company that is handling the investment fund—this superannuation scheme—is none other than Colonial Mutual, which is one of the most respected business names in Australia. It has earned that respect from the way it has handled its business affairs not only with this Government but also with all Governments in Australia, and the way it has invested moneys in this State.

I have a photograph that was taken when Colonial Mutual celebrated its anniversary. It shows the Premier and it bears the caption, "A symbol of strength". The Premier has praised Colonial Mutual, yet in the House today the Government is making a deliberate attempt to interfere in what the Government plugs all the time—private enterprise. It is riding roughshod over people and will continue to do that until the people of this State decide that it should no longer be in office.

When we get down to the nitty-gritty, it is interesting to see that following that letter from the Minister for industrial relations—I am loath to describe him as that, because he thinks that an industrial relation is an illicit affair—a letter was written by the Queensland Master Builders Association. I do not say this in any derogatory fashion, but that is a group of people who would not be noted for supporting the Labor movement or the combined strength of the trade union movement in this State. The Master Builders Association wrote letters in which it said it supported the scheme in toto.

This one states—

"Your circular letter dated 10 October, 1984, which apparently has been forwarded to contractors and subcontractors operating within the building industry throughout the State, is of immense concern to this Association because of the inaccuracies of the statements contained in it."

So the Queensland Master Builders Association has come out openly and said that the Minister has made inaccurate and virtually untruthful statements in his letter. It goes on to say—

"Your letter was discussed at a State Council meeting of the Association held on 16 October, 1984, and in view of the division your letter could cause in this industry, we request an urgent meeting with you to acquaint you with the background of the Building Union Superannuation Scheme (BUS Pty. Ltd.), and the Memorandum of Understanding entered into with the building trades group of Unions, which establishes a peace agreement throughout Australia."

That is vitally important, because it is an Australia-wide scheme.

Mr FitzGerald: I would not lend him a wheelbarrow.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The honourable member should be in a wheelbarrow; that is where he belongs.

The Minister was incorrect when he said that similar legislation would be introduced in other States. That is incorrect, and he knows that it is incorrect. A harmonious industrial relationship exists in Australia today, but there is one Government that is intent on stirring up industrial problems, and that is this National Party Government of Queensland.

The letter further states—

“It is rather ironical that the Queensland Confederation of Industry, being the founders of the QUEST scheme for superannuation, made very strong representations to the Federal Government opposing the introduction of superannuation to the building and construction industry, where it represents a minority of participants . . .”

The people who are leaning on the Government are pulling the strings behind the scenes. The Confederation of Industry represents a minority of people within that industry who will be affected.

The letter further states—

“The fact it has set on a campaign to disrupt the orderly introduction of superannuation into the building industry as agreed between the Federal Government, the A.C.T.U., and the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors and the Master Builders’ Federation of Australia could normally be applied to activity of Unions, and is not becoming of an Employer organisation, which apparently has an ear of the Queensland Government.”

How absolutely correct! If it did not have the ear of the Queensland Government, this legislation would not have been introduced this afternoon.

The letter further states—

“We also note in your letter you have been gratified to see the initiative of the Queensland Confederation of Industry and the Housing Industry Association in establishing a Queensland based scheme. We would hasten to point out that your letter has given the building Unions the opportunity to mount a campaign to break into the housing sector within this State. You should be totally aware that the negotiations undertaken for the introduction of the BUS scheme excluded the housing sector and apprentices after negotiations spanning a period of two years.”

It is important to realise that the correspondence ties in with the point that I made earlier about the people who are handling this scheme on a national basis, namely, Colonial Mutual.

The Queensland Master Builders Association further stated—

“Colonial Mutual’s Direct Investments in Queensland total \$132,422m.”

That is the amount directly invested in this State by that company. The argument advanced by the Minister in his second-reading speech that he wanted the money on the basis that it would be totally invested in Queensland is a fallacy. It is an example of the public being misled about that money. The Government wants its hands on that money for purposes that are not known fully to the Opposition or the trade union movement. Obviously, the Minister’s colleagues and fellow conspirators in this whole affair, associated with the Confederation of Industry, have ulterior motives in mind. The contents of that letter are very interesting. Perhaps I will allude to other parts of it later.

Today a letter was sent to all members of Parliament. It was intended that the letter be circulated to all Government Ministers. Regrettably, because of the rules that apply in this Assembly, the parliamentary attendants were unable to distribute that literature so that Ministers could be made aware of its contents. Therefore, I propose to read a letter dated 24 October from the Queensland Master Builders Association. It states—

“We have been informed that it is the Government’s intention to introduce legislation giving preference to contractors who contribute to the Queensland Employers Superannuation Trust (QUEST) Scheme on State Government projects.

The attached letter details our Association's concern at the Government giving preference without understanding the implications it will cause to the building and construction industry in Queensland.

To date our industry has been free from major disputes and has operated in a peaceful manner with the Unions and Employers accepting the decisions of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. If legislation is passed, this position will change drastically. In addition, every major contractor in this State, and many subcontractors, have signed Deeds of Adherence to contribute for their employees to the Building Unions Superannuation scheme (BUS). They have a legal requirement to contribute for all those on-site employees and must give twelve months notice of withdrawal from the fund."

The salient point follows—

"Therefore, every Government building project in Queensland will cost the taxpayer additional money, as contractors would have to continue making payments to the BUS scheme, as well as the QUEST scheme.

We would stress that many Queensland contractors and subcontractors will be seriously prejudiced by this legislation."

Honourable members are faced with an absolute contradiction. The Government says that it is not only a private enterprise Government but that it is also a low-tax Government—and we know that that is boloney—whereas the legislation it has placed before the Parliament this afternoon will directly contribute to Queensland tax-payers having to dip into their pockets to fund the scheme proposed by the Bill. In addition to that, the future livelihood of subcontractors and contractors is prejudiced. The Government is determined, by its action in the Parliament this afternoon, to drive these people to the wall—a Government that is supposed to be the bastion of free enterprise.

I propose to read the letter, because it is very important and should be noted. It states—

"Your circular letter dated 10 October, 1984, which has apparently been forwarded to contractors and subcontractors operating within the building industry throughout the State, is of immense concern to this Association because of the inaccuracies of the statements contained in it."

I read that part before, but I missed out the following section—

"We note your concern in relation to coercion and conscription of firms being asked to join a scheme. "

That is one of the major grounds on which those people base their objections. The Government has accused unions of standing over employers and forcing them to contribute to the scheme. I repeat that section of the letter—

"We note your concern in relation to coercion and conscription of firms being asked to join a scheme in which they may have no faith and which you state has been developed because of deals in Victoria which would not normally concern Queensland. This is totally incorrect."

This is an assertion by the Queensland Master Builders Association—

"Within Queensland we have developed over many years a working relationship with the building trades group of Unions which has achieved, without a great deal of disruption, a very viable building involvement within the State and has in fact attracted many projects from south of the border. Our Association has been the recipient of some criticism from yourself over its support of the BUS scheme."

This is a letter to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), and it says—

"As we entered into industrial negotiation to achieve a peaceful settlement throughout Australia in the building and construction industry, we believe the objective will be to the benefit of our industry in this State.

Our association has never at any stage entered into any separate sweet-heart deals with any building trades group of Unions to achieve this situation, and as you will be aware, has always opposed matters within the relevant State and Federal Commissions, particularly site allowances. You should be aware through the copies of the documents attached in relation to sweetheart agreements the Queensland Confederation of Industry—the organisation you are supporting for the QUEST scheme—”

the alternative one to this—

“has arranged on behalf of State Government bodies pre-negotiated site allowances to which your Government states it is also totally opposed. These two levels of standards are difficult for us as an Employer organisation to remain silent about. We are being criticised on the one hand, and totally rejected on the other for any reimbursement of site allowances awarded by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. You should be aware the decision of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission varies the paid rates Awards which our members are legally bound to pay.

We trust in view of the difference of opinion we have with you in relation to building unions' superannuation, that you are in a position to meet with a small delegation from our Association as a matter of extreme urgency.”

That letter went not only to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) but also to the Premier and Treasurer, to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) and to the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton). In spite of the representations to those people, the Government has introduced the legislation today. Why? What is behind it? What is the reason?

Mr FitzGerald: We will tell you.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will be very interested to hear. This kerfuffle by the Government that it wants the money solely for the purpose of investment in Queensland just does not wash. It does not hold up for the Government to claim that it is a superannuation fund to be controlled by the trade union movement for a group of trade unions. That is not correct.

The reason that the Government's claim does not hold true is contained in this document. I am prepared to table it. Its title is “Declaration of Trust” It was prepared on behalf of the Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Ltd. It puts down in legal terms the requirements of this superannuation fund. The Government's argument that its actions have been taken purely on the basis of Queensland investment does not hold water. In the words of an employer organisation—not my words—at the present time that company is investing a great deal of money in Queensland.

Why does the Government want that amount of money? One can only guess. That people be aware of exactly what the building unions have done in this regard is important. People should be aware of the contents of the superannuation scheme, which has been established to provide benefits for employees in the building industry. It has been approved by the Commissioner of Taxation properly to provide benefits that are fully transferable between participating employers, something that has to be healthy for an industry in which job continuity is always doubtful, particularly in times of economic slumps. The scheme is a protection for employees.

Under the fund, the trustee has appointed a major life assurance company, the Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Ltd, which will handle the day-to-day administration through its fully owned subsidiary, Jacques Martin Pty Ltd. The Colonial Mutual group has assets in excess of \$2,900m.

In addition to the benefits that I have already pointed out, I believe it is pertinent that I point out to the House exactly what employees will get by being members of this fund.

The people of Queensland should be aware that the Government is steam-rolling this legislation through the Parliament. I point out that the time is almost 3.30 p.m. and, under the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders moved by the Minister, the debate will be gagged at half past 4. The Bill is being pushed through as quickly as the Government can possibly do it.

I will examine the Government's accusation that this superannuation scheme is a union controlled and run fund. On page 6 of the declaration of trust, under the heading "Administration of Scheme", the following appears—

"2.3 The Trustee has the complete management and control of all proceedings matters and things in connection with the Scheme and may delegate any power . . . exercisable by the Trustee to any person upon such terms and conditions as they think fit. The Trustee may revoke any such delegation and may exercise any such power itself concurrently with or to the permanent or temporary exclusion of a delegate.

The Fund comprises all moneys, policies and other assets and investments held by the Trustee in accordance with this Deed.

INVESTMENT

So much of the moneys of the Fund as is not directly required for any other purpose shall as soon as practicable be invested

in any investment authorized by the laws of the Commonwealth of Australia or of any of its States or Territories for the investment of trust moneys; or

on deposit with any trading or savings bank in Australia or with any dealer authorized or approved by the Reserve Bank of Australia to operate in the official short term money market, or (except where to do so would be a loan back to an Employer within the terms of guidelines issued from time to time by the Commissioner of Taxation) with any company; or

in debentures of or preference or ordinary shares or stock in or registered notes (secured or unsecured) issued by any company quoted on the official list of any of the Australian Associated Stock Exchanges; or

in the units sub-units or other fractional interests howsoever called and whether divided or undivided in or any of unit trust or other scheme in the nature of a unit trust; or

in or upon policies of assurance or insurance on the life of any person "

That is explained in black and white.

Mr Simpson: Yes, but it is very broad.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The terms are not very broad at all. The document goes on—

" . . . in making drawing accepting endorsing discounting and issuing promissory notes bills of exchange and other negotiable or transferable instruments without any qualification as to bank acceptance or otherwise; or
in the acquisition or upon the security of real estate; or
in the acquisition of options to purchase or other limited interests in any real or personal property—

with power from time to time to sell or get in any such investments or property and to vary or transpose them for other investments or property of any of the classes specified in this Rule PROVIDED THAT the Trustee shall not make loans to Members."

It cannot be any clearer than that. That is what surely must amount to a gilt-edged guarantee of investment. Moneys placed in that superannuation fund are protected under

the laws of the land. They are protected and guaranteed by one of the biggest financial institutions in Australia—Colonial Mutual. As I said, it has assets in excess of \$2,900m. But in spite of that, this afternoon the Attorney-General, under pressure from the Premier and the Confederation of Industry Limited, has introduced this piece of jackboot legislation, which takes away the rights of people to decide democratically where their investment shall be made.

I will tell members what will follow on from this legislation. For years Government members have joked and laughed about what happened when the Labor Party moved on the banks. But this is one of the worst pieces of legislation that I have ever seen. The Government is interfering in the private enterprise world and removing the right of people to trade and invest moneys where they wish.

Mr Harper: We're upsetting your mate Gallagher.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The Government is not upsetting Mr Gallagher. I have no truck with Mr Gallagher. But the Government is paranoid about the strength of the trade union movement in this country and the money that will go to Colonial Mutual. Somebody in that company must have upset the Government. It is dirty on the company, and that is why it has introduced this shocking legislation.

Let me look further at what the declaration of trust says. Under the heading of "Accounts and Audit" it states—

"The trustee shall cause proper——"

A Government Member: Look at the Bill.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Because of the short time which the Government has allowed us to look at the Bill, we cannot possibly debate it properly, but I will mention that further at the Committee stage.

Let me take a close look at some of the shocking provisions of this Bill. The clause headed "Prohibition of employers contributing to unapproved scheme" states—

"An employer shall not—

- (a) offer to his employees the right or option to participate in benefits under a superannuation scheme; or
- (b) contribute to the fund of a superannuation scheme for the purpose of securing benefits under the scheme for his employees or any of them,

unless the superannuation scheme is provided for by an approved trust deed and, in the case referred to in paragraph (b), the contribution is paid in accordance with the approved trust deed."

In other words, the Bill states, as the Minister said in his introductory remarks, that the superannuation fund must be entirely based in Queensland. But here is the crunch—if any person acts outside that guide-line, he is subject to a fine of \$10,000. There are crooks and shysters whom I have named in this Chamber recently and about whom the Government has done nothing. Those people scarper over the border and come back two weeks later and set up more bogus companies. They then milk funds from those companies. But they are never taken to court, and are certainly never fined \$10,000. The clause continues—

"An employee shall not contribute to the fund of a superannuation scheme to which he is required or permitted to contribute by reason of his occupation unless the superannuation scheme is provided for by an approved trust deed and the contribution is paid in accordance with the approved trust deed."

Obviously the approved trust deed has to be set up in Queensland and, if a person does not comply with that provision, he will be found guilty and fined \$500. As I said, I will go further into those aspects of the legislation when the clauses are debated, that is, if that stage of the debate is ever reached.

I return to the document to which I have referred—the declaration of trust to the fund—because I believe it is very important and people should be aware of it. Again, it states in very clear terms—

“The Trustee shall cause proper books of record and account to be kept showing all the assets and liabilities of the Fund and all receipts and disbursements in connection therewith and once in every calendar year shall cause a balance sheet and statement of receipts and disbursements to be prepared and (unless the Trustee otherwise determines) audited by a suitably qualified person.”

Again, that is a gilt-edged guarantee that this will be a properly run and honestly administered trust fund. The Minister alluded to that this afternoon when he spoke about an approved trust fund, etc. What is the problem with this fund?

Mr Harper: Let them register in Queensland.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Surely the Government, in acting responsibly, should approach those people and talk to them about that. I understand that the Government has not been near them. It will not talk to them. The Government will not meet with those people and discuss what it sees as a problem. It has never been prepared to do that because of the confrontationist attitude adopted by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), who has just entered the Chamber. The attitude of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs in the industrial affairs of this State is absolutely parlous.

The document to which I referred is extremely comprehensive and covers a number of areas. If a national superannuation scheme is introduced at any time, the document provides that the fund will be fully protected. It states—

“If the Trustee considers that by reason of any government or legislative action or proposed action the benefits provided by the Scheme are or will be no longer necessary whether wholly or in part for the welfare of the Members, the Trustee may arrange for—

- (a) a cessation of contributions of all Employers; or
- (b) a reduction of contributions, whether of Members or of Employers, to such extent as the Trustee considers appropriate,

and shall take any other action which the Trustee considers appropriate.”

Other provisions in this document absolutely guarantee the rights of members. Under the heading “Member Contributions”, it states—

“Subject to this Deed a Member shall make contributions (if any) to the Fund of such amounts and at such times as the Member selects when applying for membership or increased benefits from the options set out in form of application prescribed by the Trustee. The Member may in special circumstances with the consent of the Trustee increase or reduce the amount of his contributions and vary the dates of payment.”

I could go on and refer to the other major headings in this trust deed. One of those headings is, “Leaving Industry—Normal, Early or Late Retirement Benefit”. I have referred already to the section headed “Accounts and Audit”. Other sections deal with investment and the administration of the scheme. One would think that it is a perfectly acceptable document in the free enterprise society to which Government members like to refer. They talk about the right of people to trade with each other without Government restriction.

I return to the question that I asked previously: Why is the Government so intent on steam-rolling this legislation through the House this afternoon in this way? Why were not the Opposition, the trade unions that are affected by this Bill—

Mr FitzGerald: And employers.

Mr R. J. GIBBS:—employers and other people who have expertise in this area given an opportunity to study the Bill? It is not just the Opposition that is saying that. I shall not point the finger, but prior to the luncheon recess a back-bench member of the National Party told me that the Bill was hardly brought into the party-room for discussion. When it was, it was steam-rolled through there in the same way as it is being steam-rolled through this Chamber. Since the luncheon recess, the same comment has been made to two of my colleagues.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The ginger-nut over there cannot talk. The honourable member for Lockyer does not know what is in the Bill because he has not seen it. He has not read it, because it was steam-rolled through the back-bench members and they have not had the opportunity to peruse it. Of course, the honourable member will deny it, and I suppose that he will take a point of order. I know that I am correct. He is deliberately trying to mislead the House.

Mr FITZGERALD: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Wolston accused me of trying to mislead the House by standing on my feet. I point out to him that I am on the Minister's committee.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That was a very clumsy and frustrated attempt by a little boy member of the National Party to cover up the incompetence of the Government and its jackboot approach to the democratic rights of the people of the State.

I will repeat what I said at the outset of my speech. It is another sorry saga in the whole line of incidents of which the Government has been guilty, not only in years past but also in recent times. Other examples include the Expo legislation and the recently introduced Kangaroo Point legislation. The Government wants to evict poor, old people out of their houses and acquire their properties to sell to major developers.

This afternoon, the Government is attempting to do the same thing. Opposition members will not be a party to this legislation. We will oppose it all the way through.

Mr Davis: Why the haste? Do you think it is because there is a Senate meeting today?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That could be so.

Mr Davis: There has to be a reason for the haste.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That is quite a possibility, because anything is possible with this Government.

The Opposition opposes the Bill and will do so at every possible turn until the debate is gagged at half past four. It is a downright disgrace that the Government is interfering in the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme. The Minister knows that it is disgraceful to bring the legislation into the Parliament, steam-roller it through and gag the debate at half past four this afternoon.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (3.42 p.m.): Honourable members have seen the crocodile tears of the member for Wolston. Some people might think that he is really concerned about people; but after his performance in this debate, all honourable members know that it is his ignorance that has caused his fumble-footedness. That is why he could not hear the Minister explain the legislation.

Following submissions from employers and employees who were concerned that the scheme to which they were contributing had no control or audit of the funds——

Mr R. J. Gibbs: There is an audit. It is there in black and white.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member knows that there is no audit.

Mr Fouras: You are an absolute ignoramus.

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members have the audacity to say that there should be a public accounts committee of this House, and talk about accountability; but there is no accountability under the legislation that set up the BUS Scheme, and that is where it needs to be.

There is an old saying—and it is one that the Labor Party cannot get away from—that if one wants to know who the friends of Labor Party members are, one just finds out who they associate with. The line-up of people who control and manage this superannuation scheme is very interesting. Mr Gallagher, who is a crim, is one of those. Fancy a man of that calibre controlling millions of dollars that have been contributed by employers for their employees! That is why the Queensland Government is concerned. It is looking after the rights of Queenslanders. The Government does not intend to sit still and watch those rights being abused. The Government will put in place controls over superannuation schemes so that people who have been prudent will be able to cope with contingencies in retirement.

Mr Borbidge: Why is the Labor Party opposing the protection of employees' funds?

Mr SIMPSON: Its actions raise many queries in the minds of people.

This legislation is designed to protect the rights of people in this State. The Opposition spokesman told the House that all the participants in the scheme decided democratically to be in it. However, Government members know that, in many instances, decisions to participate in superannuation schemes in the building industry are arrived at as the result of intimidation and blackmail.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That is not what the Master Builders Association says.

Mr SIMPSON: It has been blackmailed into saying something.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That was in the letter that I read out.

Mr SIMPSON: Obviously, the honourable member has not received submissions, as I have, from employers who were stood over.

Mr Vaughan: Name them.

Mr SIMPSON: I could name any number of employers.

Mr Vaughan: Name them.

Mr SIMPSON: Which ones would the honourable member like me to name?

Mr Vaughan: Any one of them.

Mr SIMPSON: I could give the honourable member the names.

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

Mr SIMPSON: Why is the honourable member so paranoid about getting a name?

Mr Fouras: You are a fraud.

Mr SIMPSON: I was about to give the names to Opposition members.

Mr Fouras: Well, give them to us.

Mr SIMPSON: No, I will not, because I know that Opposition members, with their associations, and persons of their ilk would try to blackmail those people. Every Government member has received submissions from employers and employees on building sites in his electorate.

Mr Davis: Put up or shut up.

Mr SIMPSON: I will put it this way: On the Sunshine Coast, three schools are under construction, and each site has been treated in the same manner by blackmail. I will not go beyond that. Many contractors are engaged on those sites.

This legislation is designed to protect the workers and the employers in the State. It is interesting that Opposition members either are shedding crocodile tears or are trying to make out that they do not understand why the Government is bringing this legislation forward. As I say, it is designed to protect the rights of employees and employers and to allow lump-sum alternatives to pensions in superannuation, so that people can invest their benefits in a way that will suit their continuing life-style. That is called private enterprise. Opposition members, however, do not know anything about that. Their philosophy is to nationalise every industry in the State and nation and to put everybody on some sort of benefit. People are supposed to work according to their ability and to take only according to their needs.

If people are to be looked after properly and if proper control is to be exercised, the funds of a superannuation scheme must be audited. Certainly, the Government must ensure that people who have the responsibility of administering superannuation schemes are not of such doubtful character that they are brought before the courts and incarcerated. It is incredible that Opposition members associate with such people.

I believe that this legislation will lead to the introduction of similar legislation in other States as they realise that employees and employers are not protected under the present Commonwealth legislation.

Mr Borbidge: Even Mr Wran is worried.

Mr SIMPSON: From communications that Government members have received from other States, we know that other States are concerned about the legislation. Of course, the Governments of those States are told by centralist Hawke and people of his ilk that they must fall into line. With reciprocal arrangements, the scheme outlined in this legislation will provide for portability by——

Mr Harper: Negotiation.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, negotiation, and arrangements with other schemes. That will be the way in which the scheme will proceed.

I support the legislation. It is essential legislation that will protect the people of Queensland. The legislation is in the interests of the workers of this State. It will enable Queensland to have a strong and flourishing building industry. It is the result of many submissions that have been put forward by employers and employees. Undoubtedly, it will relate to other areas of business. This legislation will accommodate those areas. I have much pleasure in supporting this very forward move and the protective way in which this State is looking after the interests of the little guy.

Mr McLEAN (Bulimba) (3.51 p.m.): This Bill certainly highlights the attitude of the Queensland Government towards parliamentary democracy. For a Bill with 31 clauses to be thrown into this Chamber, and for two and one-quarter hours to be allotted in which to debate it, highlights the Queensland Government's attitude towards democracy and parliamentary procedure.

The member for Wolston outlined a number of problems associated with the Bill. Because of the limited time available, there is no way that Opposition members will be able to debate them today. It is obvious that trouble will be created by the introduction of the Bill. The most obvious union problems that will flow from the implementation of this Bill will most certainly add to the lack of credit of the National Party on industrial relations.

It is an absolute disgrace that a Bill of this size and importance can be introduced and, as the previous Opposition speaker said, pushed through in jackboot fashion in two and one-quarter hours. Further time was wasted because members had to listen to the rubbish that came out of the mouth of the honourable member who preceeded me. He had absolutely no idea what he was talking about. He said that the declaration of the trust of the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme had no account, no control and no audit. That is a complete lie, and the honourable member knows it. He misled the House, because there is audit and control. A document has been formulated Australia-wide. It was not prepared in the same fashion as the document which was prepared by the Queensland Government and will be forced upon the people. It is not a document that was rushed through in two and one-quarter hours; it is a document that took months, probably years, to reach its present state.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that there had been growth in superannuation schemes. Of course, that is so, but no thanks should go to the National Party or to the Queensland Government. If the National Party had its way, there would be no such thing as a superannuation scheme. To put such a statement in a National Party Minister's speech makes a complete joke of the matter.

It is obvious that the legislation is being brought in to try to destroy the industrial climate that has been created in the other States. Australia as a whole is adopting the Federal Government's accord and its attitude to industrial relations. It is obvious that the Queensland Government does not like that scene. It loves confrontation and the results of confrontation. The rushing through of legislation is typical of the approach adopted by the Queensland Government.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The next Bill that will be introduced is another example. At 12.30 p.m. I was informed that an important industrial relations Bill would be rushed through this afternoon in the same fashion. In one day the Government is pushing through two Bills, giving the Opposition two and one-quarter hours to debate the first and probably less to debate the second, if it has its way. If Government members believe that that is parliamentary democracy, they would be the only people in the free world to do so.

The Bill has 31 clauses. As was pointed out by the member for Wolston, some clauses provide for fines of up to \$10,000. That is not a small amount and ought to warrant close study of the Bill. Certainly more than two hours would be required to do so, as anyone with any sense would admit. Employers do not know what is in the Bill. Employees most certainly do not. Honourable members do not. As was pointed out earlier, Government members do not know what is in the Bill.

Mr Davis: The member for Cooroora didn't have a clue, and he was their gun speaker.

Mr McLEAN: He had no idea.

There is no way that any person with an interest in the Bill or a person who will be affected by it will have an opportunity to object. The Government's action is an absolute disgrace.

This type of rushed legislation requires a compelling reason for its introduction. In this instance, the reason is political. It is obvious that the National Party's aim with this Bill is to further its cause as a political party. When a Government places its own political ends before the consequences of legislation, we have reached a sorry stage.

I turn now to the growth of superannuation schemes over the years. More than 2 million employees, or 40 per cent of the work-force, currently benefit from superannuation in Australia. The proportion of employees benefiting from superannuation rose from 32 per cent to 40 per cent between 1974 and 1983. The proportion of men and women is unequal, with 50 per cent of male employees benefiting compared with 24 per cent of

females. The availability of superannuation has a concentration towards high income earners, with 72 per cent of persons earning \$420 a week or more in August 1983 being in a superannuation fund compared with 50 per cent of those earning between \$220 and \$240 a week. The distribution of superannuation throughout industry is quite unequal. The proportion of employees benefiting from superannuation varies between 12 per cent in the recreation industry and 82 per cent in communication.

I have referred to those statistics for a good reason. The Queensland Government has a terrible record in its treatment of building workers. Queensland is the only State that does not provide for the portability of long service leave. On two occasions Ministers for Industrial Relations as they then were—and I refer to Mr Campbell and Mr Knox—proposed legislation, only to have it withdrawn at the last minute. I repeat that the Government has a disgraceful record in its dealings with workers.

The distribution of superannuation between occupations is unequal, as can be seen from the 39 per cent of trade persons, process workers and labourers benefiting from superannuation compared with 65 per cent of administrative, executive and managerial employees. The distribution of superannuation by age is unequal, with a greater proportion of older employees benefiting from schemes.

Building workers, as unionists, are entitled to choose their own scheme. As Queenslanders and Australians, they are entitled to choose where their investments should be made. Australia-wide a great deal of work has gone on behind the scenes on the formation of the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme. For the Queensland Government to come in at the last minute to try to destroy the scheme, with the eventual industrial problems that will flow from that, is very thoughtless indeed, if in fact that is the Government's plan.

Over a long period, the Australian Council of Trade Unions has examined superannuation and, through affiliated organisations, has operated its own scheme since 1980. That scheme was established in the absence of any move towards a national superannuation scheme at that time. The ACTU believes that the eventual formation of a national superannuation scheme seems to be quite a way off. The ACTU believes that the short-term answer is the formation of schemes based on industries and areas, the improvement of existing occupational superannuation schemes, including a review of the taxation on lump-sum superannuation benefits, and a national superannuation scheme, which is either a supplement to existing occupational superannuation and pension schemes or a minimum to which all employees not in superannuation schemes or in schemes with benefits less than the minimum would be entitled.

At that time the ACTU proposal was further elaborated by Bill Kelty in a verbal submission to a Senate standing committee on 2 July 1984. Recognising that occupational schemes are here to stay, Mr Kelty agreed that the Government should establish a clear set of guide-lines for an orderly development of a national package. Accordingly, Mr Kelty suggested that the guide-lines should be based on the following considerations—

“That occupational superannuation be available to all;
the existing discriminatory provisions be removed;
that vesting provisions be improved;
that portability arrangements be maximised; and
that preservation of benefits be further developed.”

At its August 1984 meeting, the executive of the ACTU agreed to seek the views of affiliates regarding the distribution of national productivity in 1985. The national wage principles provide that from 1985 an increase in wages or conditions may be claimed on the grounds of productivity growth.

I mentioned those matters to outline that the Government's actions in introducing a Bill such as this in this manner is disruptive and will cause enormous disruption in the building industry.

Mr FitzGerald: Why?

Mr McLEAN: Because the workers do not want this. They have already done the organising.

Mr Simpson: They have asked for it.

Mr McLEAN: They have not asked for it.

Mr Goss: Isn't it deliberately designed to provoke them?

Mr McLEAN: Of course it is. As the honourable member for Wolston said, the Bill is deliberately designed to provoke industrial disharmony, particularly at a time when a Federal election is round the corner. That is an old trick of this Government, but this time it will not work because the people of Queensland are waking up to it.

The Bill is only an extension of the mistakes that the Government has been making over the last couple of weeks. Almost every person in Queensland was opposed to the moves that the Government wished to make at Kangaroo Point, so the Government has changed its mind. Expo 88 is presenting many problems, particularly with the resumption of Collins Place in South Brisbane. The people of Queensland are slowly waking up to the dictatorial attitude of this Government. This Bill, and the Bill that we are told will follow it, and the way in which they have been brought before the House, are examples of that attitude.

The scheme that the Government wants to set up has been proposed by the Confederation of Industry Limited. It is obvious that the confederation has a motive for wanting to run the scheme in consultation with the Government. It is quite obvious that the confederation's long-term plan is to try to gain control over the unions through the use of blackmail. A very important point that has already been made is that the Minister made no approach to the unions; at no stage was an approach made to the people that the Government claims to be helping.

One would think that, during the drafting of an important piece of legislation comprising 31 clauses, the Minister would have been sufficiently interested to speak to the people concerned, the ones who will be affected. I realise that the Minister spoke to the Confederation of Industry. That is understandable, because it is one of the organisations that the Government represents. But not once did the Minister talk to the unions or the workers who will eventually be affected.

Mr Harper: The workers or the union—there is a difference.

Mr McLEAN: Which workers organisation did the Minister talk to when this Bill was being drafted? Did he talk to any worker? Not one! He spoke to the Confederation of Industry on the basis that eventually the confederation would have the power to indulge in blackmail, to exert some influence over the decision-making of the trade union movement in Queensland.

The legislation had already been discussed in the party room on the basis that there would be a political advantage to the Government through the creation of more industrial strife in Queensland.

The Minister needs to answer many questions—that is, if time permits. Only 20 minutes is left for debate, the gates will shut and the House will proceed to debate another Bill. We as an Opposition, the back-bench members of the National Party, the people of Queensland, the unions and the workers in the building industry deserve to know why a limit of two and a quarter hours was placed on the debate on a Bill containing 31 clauses. Why at no stage of the discussions were the employees informed? Why were members not given a little time this morning to study the Bill?

Perhaps I should explain that this morning Opposition members were told that two Bills would be pushed through all stages this afternoon. I asked who would be in charge

of those Bills, and was told that it would be Mr Lester. Later on Mr Harper was mentioned. I asked what it was all about, but there was no answer. Opposition members could not even find out what the Bills were about. I asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs what his Bill was about, and I must admit that later in the day he got back to me and told me a little bit about the Bill that is to follow this one. But that was very late in the day. The point is that there must be some good reason why the Minister did not tell members what he was doing.

Why should this legislation have been kept secret until lunch-time today? Why was it brought in immediately after lunch, and why was the Opposition expected to read and digest 31 clauses and debate them in only two and a quarter hours? Is that democracy? Does the Minister really believe that that is how this Parliament should operate? Honourable members are entitled to be told why a two-hour limit was placed on the debate, why it was necessary to push the legislation through today, why it was kept a secret for so long and what were the motives behind that action.

The Government will rue the day that these two Bills were passed. The media must report this debate truthfully, and I believe that they will. The pushing through of these two Bills makes a complete shambles and joke of this House. It is a continuation of the Government's attitude that has slowly got worse since the National Party took over as the sole governing party in this State. The arrogance is coming through more and more. This is the climax. The arrogance has become so obvious that the Government will feel the backlash.

I support the remarks of the member for Wolston. The Labor Party completely opposes the Bill, the way in which it has been introduced and the reasons behind its introduction. The National Party will feel the consequences of the industrial strife that will follow in Queensland. The Queensland people will not accept the continual destruction of the democratic processes in this State.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (4.12 p.m.): I am amazed that the Opposition is opposing the Bill in toto. It has not even read the long title of the Bill. It is, "A Bill to provide for the protection of employees' entitlements to superannuation benefits and for related purposes" That is what the Bill is about. It does not set up a superannuation scheme. It provides where the contributions that employers make on behalf of employees will go in Queensland and how the trust funds are to be regulated and controlled.

Recently, a number of complaints have been made about the Building Unions Superannuation Scheme (the BUS Scheme). The questions that have been asked about it are: Who will administer it? How will the books be audited? Who are the responsible people who are likely to administer the trust fund? We have been led to believe that some of the people connected with the BUS Scheme include Mr Norm Gallagher. I would not trust him with a wheelbarrow, let alone a building industry trust fund in which perhaps \$50m will be invested each year.

A headline in the "The Bulletin" of 19 July 1983 reads, "BLF defies the courts and the Government". The article went on to refer to Mr Norm Gallagher.

An article in "The Bulletin" of 3 May 1983 states—

"That Prime Minister Hawke—looking as wholesome as breakfast cereal, just endorsed by every interest group in the country—could have his plans for recovery overturned by the Federal secretary of the 29,000 member Builders' Labourers' Federation, fresh from serving 52 days in Pentridge for contempt and about to face charges under the Victorian crimes act for allegedly receiving secret commissions.

It might sound far fetched but consider the following.

First, the government desperately needs this year to limit pay rises to only three to four per cent, basically to flow from a national wage case in August.

Second, this scenario demands, in the words of the summit communique, 'a suppression of sectional claims.'

Third, some unions, despite recession, retain their bargaining clout. In oil and transport they are only just being held in check. If one breaks through the others will follow. The BLF is straining hardest."

Hawke has decided to go to the people while there is a bit of industrial calm. He has been able to con the Australian people into believing that there is peace and harmony on the industrial front. We know that a Federal election is pending. When the member for Bulimba was speaking, I interjected and asked him why the election was being held. He could not answer that question; he does not know. I could give the reason why the election is being held, but I will not do so in the few minutes allowed to me in this debate.

Mr McLean: You never asked me that.

Mr FITZGERALD: I asked you why and you told me to read the pulls tomorrow.

What is the scheme set up to do? Firstly, it is set up to ensure that trust funds are accountable. That is basically its whole thrust. Any schemes that employers or employees are contributing to in Queensland will now be accountable.

Mr Fouras: That is not what you are doing.

Mr FITZGERALD: It is. It is setting up the legislative mechanism that will enable the Government to supervise, and it will intervene only in circumstances that are considered appropriate. The Registrar of Superannuation Trust Deeds will be the registrar, and it is intended that that position be filled by the Registrar of Commercial Acts. In other words, that is what the legislation is being set up for. The legislation is basically to stop all the crooks.

If Opposition members were fair dinkum about a superannuation scheme in Queensland and if they wished the building workers to benefit from that superannuation scheme, they would be supporting this legislation, which will protect the funds of employers who are contributing for their employees. If the building unions were fair dinkum about making sure that the benefits are passed on to their members, they would back this scheme.

The trustees must be above reproach, and many dubious characters have been put forward as trustees of the BUS Scheme. Plenty of examples have been given of the unions banning the scheme or blackballing and blackmailing employees, and the Government will not tolerate that. Provided that other schemes meet the requirements of the trustees and satisfy the registrar that they come within the laws of Queensland, they can be registered here. That point must be shouted loudly and clearly so that Opposition members can get it into their skulls. If the BUS Scheme met these requirements, it could be registered in Queensland.

Do Opposition members think that the BUS Scheme would ever be acceptable in Queensland? Honourable members know of the long campaign that has been going on to get such a superannuation scheme implemented. We all know what Norm Gallagher and his colleagues have been doing. Would Opposition members trust Norm Gallagher? As I said before, he stood up to the Government, and he will stand up to anyone.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: Would Opposition members have their superannuation scheme administered by the people who run the BUS Scheme?

An article that appeared in the "Daily Sun" of 27 February 1984 stated—

"The ACTU will today try to persuade the Builders Labourers' Federation to stop threatening the national wage case and the prices-and-incomes accord with its rebel wage campaign. The ACTU's secretary, Mr Bill Kelty—"

all honourable members have heard of him—

“will try to arrange a meeting with the general secretary of the BLF, Mr Norm Gallagher, before Federal Cabinet decides what action should be taken against the union.”

It is a good example of the tripartite Government in Australia, which comprises the Government, the ACTU and the BLF. The Queensland Government will not have a bar of it up here. It is not told what to do by Mr Gallagher. Mr Gallagher tells Mr Kelty what to do, Mr Kelty tells Mr Hawke what to do, and Mr Hawke is the Prime Minister. As I said before, Mr Gallagher has served 52 days in gaol. Would Opposition members trust people such as him to run the country?

Mr Littleproud: They let him out for the national summit meeting.

Mr FITZGERALD: That is right; they took him along to the national summit meeting.

The Government admits that Mr Gallagher is a very powerful man in Australian politics.

Mr Borbidge: He went from Pentridge to Parliament House.

Mr FITZGERALD: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise tells me that he went from Pentridge to Parliament House. Now he is one of the chief advisers to the Federal Government.

There is evidence that Mr Gallagher does not take notice of Mr Hawke. A headline in the “Daily Sun” of 3 October 1984 reads, “BLF Takes on Hawke with Bans” That was earlier this month. The article beneath that headline says this—

“Queensland builders labourers yesterday imposed crippling work bans on major sites as Prime Minister Mr Hawke reaffirmed his tough stand against the union.

Mr Hawke warned the militant Builders Labourers Federation to sign a national building industry peace agreement today or face the consequences.”

How could anybody enter into a peace agreement with Mr Gallagher? The basic point of this legislation is that Queensland will set up a trust fund and it will be administered in Queensland.

Mr HARPER: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr WILSON: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Under the provisions of the allocation of time order in relation to this Bill, I call the Minister.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I point out that the order agreed to by the House stated that the debate shall conclude at 4.30 p.m. The honourable member for Townsville South rose to speak to the Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! My interpretation of the order is that, if the debate is to conclude at 4.30 p.m., the Minister must be given time in which to reply. I call the Minister.

Mr FOURAS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not take a further point of order on this issue.

Mr FOURAS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I disagree with your ruling and I move—

“That the member for Townsville South be heard.”

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have called the Minister. It is within my discretion to call the Minister, and I have given him the call.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.23 p.m.), in reply: The contribution made by honourable members is appreciated.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for South Brisbane moved—

“That the member for Townsville South be heard.”

I believe that it is competent for the honourable member for South Brisbane to move such a motion and that you should put it to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accept the motion.

Question—That the member for Townsville South be heard (Mr Fouras’s motion)—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 25		NOES, 45	
Burns		Ahern	Lee
Comben		Alison	Lester
D’Arcy		Austin	Lickiss
De Lacy		Booth	Lingard
Eaton		Borbridge	Littleproud
Fouras		Cahill	McKechnie
Gibbs R. J.		Chapman	McPhie
Goss		Cooper	Menzel
Hamill		Elliott	Miller
Kruger		FitzGerald	Muntz
Mackenroth		Gibbs, I. J.	Newton
McElligott		Glasson	Powell
McLean		Goleby	Randell
Milliner		Gunn	Simpson
Palaszczuk		Gygar	Stephan
Shaw		Harper	Stoneman
Smith		Harvey	Tenni
Underwood		Henderson	Wharton
Vaughan		Hinze	White
Veivers		Innes	
Warner, A. M.		Jennings	
Wilson	<i>Tellers:</i>	Katter	<i>Tellers:</i>
Yewdale	Davis	Knox	Kaus
	Prest	Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

At 4.30 p.m.,

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Under the provisions of the allocation of time order agreed to in relation to the Bill, I shall now proceed to put the remaining questions necessary to dispose of the Bill.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Shame! Shame!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Shame!

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

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! Under the provisions of the allocation of time order agreed to in relation to the Bill, I shall now proceed to put the remaining questions necessary to dispose of the Bill. The question is—

“That clauses 1 to 31, as read, stand part of the Bill.”

As many as are of that opinion say "Aye"—

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will state his point of order.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: It is my right as a member of the Opposition to debate the clauses of the Bill.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The question has been agreed to.

Opposition Members: It has not.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I demand to be given my right as the Opposition spokesman to debate the clauses of the Bill.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Wolston will resume his seat. I will tell him the position. The resolution we carried—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You carried.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: It was carried by the House.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You carried it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Wolston will not dispute the point with me. It was resolved by the House—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the immediate presentation to the House of a Bill to provide for the protection of employees' entitlements to superannuation benefits and for related purposes; the passing of such Bill through all its stages this day; and if debate be not concluded by 4.30 p.m. the Chairman and the Speaker as applicable shall put all the remaining questions necessary to dispose of the remaining stages without further amendment or debate."

Question—That clauses 1 to 31, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 44

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

NOES, 5

D'Arcy
Gibbs, R. J.
Mackenroth

Tellers:
Vaughan
Fouras

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General): I move—

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

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 24	
Ahern	Lee	Burns	
Alison	Lester	D'Arcy	
Austin	Lickiss	De Lacy	
Booth	Lingard	Eaton	
Borbidge	Littleproud	Fouras	
Cahill	McKechnie	Gibbs, R. J.	
Chapman	McPhie	Goss	
Cooper	Menzel	Hamill	
Elliott	Miller	Kruger	
FitzGerald	Muntz	Mackenroth	
Gibbs, I. J.	Newton	McElligott	
Glasson	Powell	McLean	
Goleby	Randell	Milliner	
Gunn	Simpson	Palaszcuk	
Gygar	Stephan	Shaw	
Harper	Stoneman	Smith	
Harvey	Tenni	Underwood	
Henderson	Wharton	Vaughan	
Hinze	White	Veivers	
Innes		Warner, A. M.	
Jennings		Wilson	
Katter	<i>Tellers:</i>	Yewdale	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox	Kaus		Davis
Lane	Neal		Comben

Resolved in the affirmative.

QUEENSLAND TOURIST AND TRAVEL CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. P. R. McKechnie (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and citation—

Mr UNDERWOOD (4.50 p.m.): I ask you, Mr Booth, to bear with me for a moment because the Opposition thought that another Bill was coming on this afternoon, which is typical of the way in which the Government has been carrying out its business in this place. Members on this side of the Chamber thought that we had at least another half hour before this Bill would come on.

Mr FitzGerald: You want to keep your ears open.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Sometimes the honourable member for Lockyer should wash his mouth out with soap and water.

The Opposition will be moving amendments to clauses 5 and 8.

Because clause 1 deals with the short title and citation of the Bill, it enables honourable members to speak generally about it.

I wish to deal with the Minister's reply at the second-reading stage in the early hours of this morning. Opposition members raised some legitimate concerns about the operation of the Act and the effects of the amendments in this Bill. The Minister did

not address himself to one of those concerns. In the debate last night the Opposition referred to problems relating to financial supervision and raised concerns about pecuniary interests and possible pecuniary interests of corporation members, both present and future. The Minister had no comment to make about those concerns.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. I seek your guidance, Mr Booth, as to whether the honourable member is in order in speaking in general terms about the Bill at the Committee stage.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I rule that the honourable member is in order and may continue.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I agree with your ruling, Mr Booth, because a precedent has been set in this place, and I was involved, as were other members, in the setting of that precedent.

This morning during question-time, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and the Arts gave a rather trite and incorrect answer to a question that I asked of him about the overseas travel expenditure of members of the Tourist and Travel Corporation and other statutory authorities or quangos under his control for the year 1983-84. The Minister replied along these lines—

“With a chief office and 12 statutory authorities under my control it would be a long and somewhat pointless exercise to detail the overseas travel of every officer.”

That is a matter of opinion. It probably depends on whether a person supports the Government or the people of Queensland. The Minister continued—

“For instance, officers of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation frequently go on familiarisation trips often involving expenditure as low as \$14.”

That is fine. The Opposition has no objection to that but it wants to know whether the familiarisation trips are useful and benefit the tourist industry in Queensland as a whole. If there is nothing to hide, why has the Minister not given the details? The Minister continued—

“I refer the honourable member to the answer given by the Premier to the Leader of the Opposition that all overseas travel of statutory authorities and Government departments must be approved in advance by Cabinet.”

If overseas trips are approved by Cabinet, surely it would be an easy matter to go through Cabinet records to find out whether these people have been going on approved trips. That is all the Opposition asks. It is a simple matter.

It is made even more simple by the fact that earlier this month a similar question was asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner). The only difference is that my question this morning was addressed to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts rather than to the Minister for Primary Industries. For the edification of the Minister, who probably was asleep, I will read out the question asked by the honourable member for Lytton.

“(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?”

I only asked about the present financial year. The honourable member for Lytton also asked—

“(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?”

The Minister for Primary Industries answered—

“(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 was granted.

It is interesting to note that four pages of "Hansard" containing approximately 250 lines list the various destinations, the officers and the purposes of their visits. If the Minister for Primary Industries, whose department is much larger than that of the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, can do that, why cannot the Minister for Tourism? Is he hiding something? Is his refusal to answer the question this morning for the same reason as his refusal to answer the Opposition's queries last night and the charges levelled by the Opposition? Is he hiding something, or does he not know what is happening in the corporation under his control?

Has the Minister been waiving the necessity for pecuniary interest declarations under sections 29 and 52 of the Act, as I outlined last night and again this morning in my question? Is it that he does not want the people of Queensland to know what is going on? If the Minister has nothing to hide, let him enter this debate and answer those questions. He is sitting there with a smirk on his face. I tell the Minister and the Government that, because of the way they handle the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, their failure to declare pecuniary interests and their failure to keep a proper record to ensure that another Peanut Board-type scandal does not occur, this matter will blow up in their face. It might not blow up tomorrow, next week or next year, but the chickens will come home to roost as they have in relation to every other primary industry organisation in this State over the past two years. The warning is there. The Opposition has laid the charges and called on the Government to answer them. It has failed, both last night and this morning, to do so.

Mr Davis: They could not even answer a Dorothy Dix question that I asked.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right.

I asked the Minister three simple questions concerning pecuniary interests in relation to sections 29 and 52 of the Act. The information that I was seeking would be a matter of corporation record. It should be in the minutes of the corporation. If the Minister does not have that information, he has been abrogating his responsibilities.

The Minister's prepared answer took up four lines. It was as follows—

"I do not propose to take up the time of my officers at the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in answering these long and rambling questions unless the honourable member supplies details of some specific instances that he wishes to raise."

Bear in mind that he said earlier that he would not answer any question because the Premier and Treasurer would not answer the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I have already pointed out that the Minister for Primary Industries—and I take my hat off to him and congratulate him for his courage—has defied the order of the Premier. It shows that the Minister for Primary Industries has guts. Perhaps that is because he is a westerner and is able to stand on his own two feet. Maybe the Minister for Tourism should learn to stand on his own two feet. I suspect that, since the Premier gave the Minister for Tourism a rap over the knuckles earlier this year, he has been trying desperately to get onside with him because of the impending Cabinet reshuffle that we have all read about. That is important. Last night the Opposition called for the establishment of a public accounts committee. It said that this amending legislation demonstrates a need for such a committee.

On pages 7 and 8 of his report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts, the Auditor-General was strongly critical of the Government's failure to heed his previous advice. Under the heading "The Annual Estimates of Expenditure", the Auditor-General said—

"The review was prompted by my long held view that the form of the Estimates (and the financial statements which flow therefrom) do not provide sufficient

information to enable proper understanding by the Executive, Members of the Legislative Assembly, and the public of the purposes for which public moneys are proposed to be expended (and are eventually expended); nor do they provide a basis for sound financial management or financial reporting."

If honourable members refer to the Minister's answer this morning, they will see that it refers to the Premier's answer, which refers to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General says that insufficient information is provided to enable even the Executive to make proper decisions.

The Minister has already answered a question about some details that are a matter of record of Cabinet and the corporation. It is not a matter of assigning officers for days and weeks to search the records of the corporation; it is already tabulated in the minutes of the corporation and Cabinet.

The Auditor-General further stated—

"Treasury has prepared the Estimates in their present line-item form since the commencement of self government. Such form may have been suitable in the past. However, with the significant growth in governmental operations, the substantial delegation of financial administration to departments and the increasingly large-scale use of electronic data processing, there must necessarily be adjustment of concepts, procedures and techniques of financial administration.

There now exists a need for more comprehensive and relevant information to be supplied with, and to flow from, the Estimates to promote assessment and analysis based on proper understanding of departmental activities and the resources committed to those activities. I note that the Treasury had provided, with respect to the 1984-85 Budget, summaries of the important services and programs to be undertaken by Departments, mainly those from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. This is a move in the right direction and should be further developed."

The Minister should provide some basic information. If he does not do that, it demonstrates that damage would be caused to the Government if such information was provided. If the Minister has something to hide, it is high time that a public accounts committee was established and that the Treasury put into effect the recommendations of the present Auditor-General. If the Minister has nothing to hide, he should provide the details. He should instruct Mr Callaghan to extract that information, because it is at his fingertips in the records of the department.

Mr Davis: I would like to know how much money was spent on that Disneyland trip.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Some of those things would be very interesting. I do not suggest that members should not make overseas trips; they should use such trips to familiarise themselves with conditions in other countries. However, one ought to be able to ascertain whether the money has been well spent. There should be no big junkets.

The Minister said that many overseas trips are made. The information about them should be laid on the table. The Minister for Primary Industries has adopted that practice. He did it with courage, even though the Premier said that the information would not be provided. Will the Minister stand up, or is he skulking under cover, and using the failure of the press and the public supervision of this Parliament to get away with it once again?

Last night I said that the chairman of the corporation, Sir Frank Moore, who is one of the leading lights in the National Party, said that the corporation is not a quango and that it acts like a private company. I have news for Sir Frank Moore. He is under the control of the Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport. Every year, through the Minister, he must submit a report to the Parliament.

The Opposition would like to know what declarations of pecuniary interest have been made. The Opposition would like to know what waivers the present Minister and

his predecessors have made of those declarations so that members of the corporation can continue with contracts in which they have interests. The Opposition would like to know what assistance has been provided by the corporation to contractors when the pecuniary interests of members of the corporation are involved. As I outlined last night, that matter is particularly important. I am not dealing with tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars for promotion or sales; I am talking about projects worth hundreds of millions of dollars. The facts should be put before the people so that the Parliament can make a decision. There should be public scrutiny of those matters.

Mr De Lacy: He is not the Minister; he is Frank's boy.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right.

These are not my words; they are the words of the Auditor-General. He said that more information was required about the accounts of the Government so that the executive and the public could be informed; indeed, so that proper management in this modern age could be carried out.

The Opposition will later move amendments that will once again illustrate the hypocrisy of members of the Liberal Party who were party to the socialist legislation in the first place. Now they say that they had nothing to do with it; that when they formed part of the coalition they really did not mean that to happen. However, that is not so. The only difference, as the Opposition pointed out last night, is that the duties and functions of the corporation will be extended.

The corporation is currently in the business of tourism, promoting Queensland and selling packages. The Bill merely broadens the scope to encompass development of real estate and resorts. There is no difference in the role played by the corporation. If there is a role change, it is not in the way that the Liberal Party is suggesting. Liberal members should be fair dinkum. All they are trying to do is score a couple of points off their former colleagues and show members of the National Party to be the agrarian socialists that they really are.

Mr VEIVERS: I support the points raised by the honourable member for Ipswich West. As I mentioned during the debate on the second reading, I am concerned about what I see as serious aspects of the legislation. I was surprised—it would be no exaggeration to say that I was appalled—that the Minister took no time whatever to answer the constructive criticisms made by Opposition members.

The Bill is an important piece of legislation. Its implications are immense. Millions of dollars of this State's money will be involved as a result. In the debate on clause 1, I cannot deal with many aspects of that. However, I do refer to the conflict of interests that will arise. The problems flowing from that for the members of the corporation will be immense. I reiterate that five members of the corporation have direct tourist and business interests involved in the promotion of tourism in Queensland. Last night I pointed out that Sir Francis Moore is a director of the Bartlett group, which is heavily involved in tourism and other business activities in Queensland. He, therefore, has a direct conflict of interest. The deputy chairman, Mr Kennedy, is the proprietor of Daydream Island. The other three are Mr Driscoll of National Homes, Mr Duthie of Duthies Travel, and Mr Graham of Quality Inns. The only two members of the corporation without a direct conflict of interest in the State's tourist industry are the General Manager and Managing Director (Mr King) and the departmental head (Mr Callaghan). It is for that reason that the Opposition is particularly concerned about provisions in the Bill.

Section 29 of the Act, which deals with the disclosure of interest in contracts, states—

“A member of the Corporation who is directly or indirectly interested in a contract made or proposed to be made by the Corporation otherwise than as a member, and in common with the other members, of an incorporated company

consisting of not less than 25 persons, shall disclose the nature of his interest at the first meeting of the Corporation at which he is present after the relevant facts have come to his knowledge."

The public of this State are entitled to know that information. Today, the honourable member for Ipswich West tried to get that information from the Minister, but he decided to field the ball and throw it out of the ground. That is not good enough. If ever there was a reason for a parliamentary public accounts committee in this State, that is it. Even from the Government's point of view, the information ought to be disclosed. Section 29 (3) of the Act, in part, states—

"After a member of the Corporation has, in pursuance of this section, disclosed the nature of his interest in a contract. "

That is good legislation and I do not knock it. However, section 29 (5), which gives the Minister the power to override that, states—

"The Minister, subject to such conditions as he thinks fit to impose, may remove as respects any member of the Corporation any disability imposed by this section whenever the number of members so disabled at any time would in his opinion be such as to impede the conduct of business of the Corporation or if, in any other case, it appears to the Minister desirable that the disability should be removed."

I object to that. Every member of this Chamber should have serious and grave concern about the control that the Minister can exercise.

As the Committee is debating the title of the amending Bill, I wish to refer to section 52 of the Act, which is titled "Corporation to investigate application", and reads—

"Before recommending the provision of financial assistance under this Part, the Corporation shall inquire into the application for financial assistance under this Part and in particular with respect to—

- (a) the nature and objects of the project to which the application relates;
- (b) the sufficiency of the capital for carrying on such project successfully, making allowance for the financial assistance for which the applicant has applied;
- (c) the securities offered by the applicant for the financial assistance for which he has applied."

However, subsection (3) reads—

"Save where in a particular case the Minister specifically approves otherwise, financial assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Part shall not knowingly be given to a member of the Corporation."

Again the Minister is given the power to nullify the good intentions of earlier parts of the section. My point is that the amendments in the Bill put the members of the corporation in an almost impossible position. As I did last night, I challenge the Minister to publicly declare how members of the corporation will not be put into a difficult position or accused of corruption. How does the Minister see that that position will be overcome? He should seriously address himself to that.

Today, the member for Ipswich West again asked a question of the Minister, but he refused to answer it. The honourable member for Ipswich West wanted information concerning section 29 of the Act from the Minister about the number of occasions on which members of the corporation have been overseas and whether they have declared their interests to the Minister. The people of Queensland have a right to know that.

I propose speaking to another clause in the Bill, but I repeat for the benefit of the member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) and other members of the Committee that the Opposition does not oppose the general thrust of the Bill—

Mr Borbidge: You'd never guess that from the statements you have made.

Mr VEIVERS: I made the point last night that, unlike Government members, Opposition members are not knockers. Because the honourable member was not present in the Chamber last night, I will repeat what I said then. I have yet to hear any Government member give credit to any other Government in this country. Many members of the Opposition, me included, have given credit where it is due. We are not knocking the total concept of the Bill, which has some excellent points, but we are highly critical of the matters raised by my colleague from Ipswich West, and those I have mentioned.

Government members talk about free enterprise, as do members of the Liberal Party. But this is not free enterprise. The Government is buying into this area with a heavy commitment. Does it intend to use SGIO funds? I reiterate that we are quite sincere in our objective criticisms of certain sections of the legislation.

Mr McKECHNIE: Opposition members seem to think that something is sinister about my not being prepared to order the collation of overseas travel records held by the corporation.

Mr Underwood: That's not true. I didn't particularly point that out. We want some accountability.

Mr McKECHNIE: Opposition members want an accounting for what is going on. Of necessity, members of the Tourist and Travel Corporation have to travel more than members of any other Government department or organisation. The corporation is in the business of travel.

Mr Underwood: I said that.

Mr McKECHNIE: That is why I said that the corporation is different from the Department of Primary Industries or any other department. That is why I am not prepared to go to the trouble of having the information collated unless the honourable member can give me a specific reason for doing so.

The honourable member also referred to the pecuniary interests of members of the corporation. Opposition members are very good at making out that something is wrong, but the fact is that there is nothing wrong. If Opposition members make a specific allegation, I will look at it, but I will not look at the general sort of suspicion that Opposition members are trying to spread. This morning the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) held up the latest report of the corporation and said that it was a great report, and that if every other Government department and organisation published a similar report that he would be absolutely delighted.

The corporation is accountable. That is it.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That would have to be——

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. Mr Booth, I draw your attention to the time.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I believe that the honourable member still has five minutes remaining, and I so rule.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Now the Government is trying to gag me. The Minister will not answer basic questions, and now the Government is attempting to prevent me from taking part in the debate. That is an indication of the Government's attitude and, particularly, that of this Minister.

I refer the Minister to a question I asked him on 30 November last year about Cape Tribulation, which was then a red hot issue. The Minister's first words were, "The honourable member knows that I am a new Minister. I am unaware of the accusations." He was unable to answer the question, or even make up an answer, and he asked that it be placed on notice. Nothing has changed. The Minister still does not know. If he

was a Minister in the Federal Parliament, because he is incompetent, the press would tear him apart. Cape Tribulation was a big issue, but the Minister could not give any sort of an answer to my question. He had to admit his ignorance and ask that the question be placed on notice. That is indicative of his track record. He does not know what is going on in his own organisation. Sir Frank Moore and Mr Callaghan, the head of his department, are running the show. Public servants such as Mr Callaghan have shown how competent they are. They are the real strength of this National Party Government, in the same way as they were the strength of the National-Liberal coalition before it. This Minister—who has been publicly rapped over the knuckles by the Premier—and other Ministers have shown that they are so incompetent and out of touch with their portfolios that they cannot even answer basic questions.

It is no wonder that members such as the member for Surfers Paradise gave a much more detailed account than the Minister. The speech of the member for Surfers Paradise indicates that he has a much firmer grasp of tourism than the Minister. The Minister's speech is pathetic when it is compared with that of the member for Surfers Paradise. Even though I disagree with some of the propositions advanced by the member for Surfers Paradise, I take my hat off to him for some of his knowledge of tourism. Of course, he has gained that knowledge from his membership of a committee that is attached to the Tourist and Travel Corporation. However, the Minister is responsible for the Corporation and he should have more information on the matter. That is not the case, as he has clearly demonstrated.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I understand that the member for Surfers Paradise had a travel agency but he sold it. Is that right?

Mr Borbidge: No, I never had one.

Mr UNDERWOOD: My information was incorrect.

The points raised by the member for Ashgrove and me at the Committee stage and by other Opposition members at the second-reading stage are relevant. We warned the Minister and the Government about what will happen in the future. So let it be on their heads.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of s. 7; Members of Corporation—

Mr UNDERWOOD (5.22 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 2, after line 28, insert the following words—

‘(c) by inserting after section 7 (1) (b) of the Principal Act the following subparagraph—

“(c) At least one member to be resident in northern Queensland, one member to be resident in central Queensland, one member to be resident in western Queensland and one member to be resident in southern Queensland.” ’ ”

That amendment is particularly relevant considering the members of the corporation. As has already been pointed out, other than Mr Les Duthie who lives in Rockhampton, they are all resident in south-east Queensland. Sir Francis Moore lives in Clayfield. Mr Jim Kennedy lives in East Brisbane. Mr Driscoll lives in Bridgeman Downs. Mr P. Graham lives on the Gold Coast. The two public servants are Mr Callaghan and Mr King. There is one vacancy on the corporation. After this legislation is passed, there will be two vacancies on the corporation.

Mr Yewdale: Mr Duthie is absolutely committed to the National Party.

Mr UNDERWOOD: We know that he is a leading light in the National Party. Usually, that is a prerequisite to being appointed to Government bodies.

Why is it important that members of the corporation reside in the various areas of Queensland? Judging by the present members of the corporation and where they live, it is important that some of the members of the corporation live in other parts of Queensland so that they know what is happening in those areas.

Recently, the Minister has been talking in the press about western Queensland and how tourism is booming in that area. At present, none of the members of the corporation come from western Queensland. Of course, the Minister decided to go west instead of attending a meeting that was held in the south to discuss censorship. However, I will not go into that matter today. The Minister has said that western Queensland is important to tourism, and that is good.

A recent article in the press, headed, "It's the old raw prawn for hopeful US tourists", states—

"Tourists have been flocking to Queensland irresistibly drawn by Paul Hogan TV commercials and low fares to Cairns. But can the Outback live up to the glossy image of the adverts?"

In that article Elizabeth Johnston reported on the shrimpless barbie. She said that tourists are being taken to the outback by tourist operators but that they are not being catered for. Tourists are complaining that they are not getting the tours, the sights, the sounds and the experiences that were promised to them by the Queensland tourism corporation packaging and by the Australian tourism corporation packaging. The article goes on to say—

"They had heard about it from Paul Hogan, read about it through Colleen McCullough and have seen Bryan Brown doing it on TV.

But when 14 wealthy American tourists took the great Outback they realised nobody had told it quite like it is.

For a start there was flies—small, black, sticky and persistent about getting into the mouth and ears.

There was also the heat—it doesn't show on television—"

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I suggest that the honourable member for Cunningham let me finish and then he can have a go. I notice that he did not defend his Minister earlier. I do not blame him for that. He knows more about tourism than the Minister does and he knows how incapable the Minister is. It is no wonder that the member for Cunningham will not get up and defend the Minister.

The article explained that there was also a problem with the food. Apparently, not one shrimp landed on the barbie despite the fact that the Australian Tourism Commission's American television commercials said there would be shrimps. American tourists are disillusioned. They find that, although they enjoy the trip, it is not as it was represented to them. That is why people from the regional areas of Queensland must have an input into the corporation.

Mr Jennings: I will give you a shrimp on the barbie.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member for Southport does not come from western Queensland. He comes from that cold southern State of Victoria. He is an outcast from there. He should not try and tell me about this matter.

Elizabeth Johnston's article reported that not a shrimp or a prawn was to be had in places such as Karumba. That is the sort of problem that is facing the tourist industry in the west, and the article that I have referred to lists many problems.

Although an expensive brochure has been produced and a regional organisation has been set up in central Queensland, hardly any central Queensland tourism packages have been sold by the corporation. As I noted in my speech last night, Mr Duthie is the only central Queensland representative on the corporation. Perhaps the corporation needs another member from central Queensland so that something can be done to sell tourism packages to central Queensland.

Although the Opposition's amendment does not go this far, I believe that more small-business people should have an input into the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

In this regard I refer to an article that appeared on 11 August 1984 in the "Daily Sun". It is headed "Iwasaki's Oddity—Remote resort with its vista of dreary sand". The article talks about the image as opposed to the reality of the Iwasaki resort. The Government has promoted the image at great length. Many members will remember that the House sat for many hours so that legislation could be thumped through for the benefit of Mr Iwasaki and the Premier.

This article reveals that the image is grossly different from the reality, and "grossly" is the right word. The resort is not what was proposed and, in fact, it is the poor relation of the local tourist industry. The local industry is at odds with Mr Iwasaki.

Contrary to what the Government said at the time, the Tourist and Travel Corporation can make a deal with Mr Iwasaki to freehold his land. It is interesting to note that Sir Francis Moore, the chairman of the corporation, has taken journalists and important visitors to the Iwasaki resort and has told them that this is what some of Queensland's new resorts as proposed by the corporation will be like. The visitors are told that the corporation can do special deals for them as it did for Mr Iwasaki. I am sure that they are not told how far behind schedule the Iwasaki project is and that it will never be as it was promised in terms of the legislation. The legislation does not call on Mr Iwasaki to live up to the completion dates that were outlined to the Government and the Parliament.

If representatives on the corporation board are domiciled in the various regions of the State, some of these dangers can be checked. It is also important that people outside the main tourist destinations are represented on the corporation.

I will refer now to the incentive schemes of sales by the counter staff at various tourist bureau outlets. The Opposition has not mentioned this matter before. The value of sales that staff make looks good on paper. Naturally, there will be competition and they will be trying harder to sell more and more expensive trips. However, there is one problem that can be seen every day in the office of the Tourist Bureau in Brisbane. The staff are just flat out. I use the figures quoted last night by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. He told us that the number of staff at the counter has decreased, yet a vast increase has occurred in the volume of sales.

Mr Borbidge: That is called efficiency.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have another name for it; I call it slavery. The staff work absolutely flat out. They work overtime without pay, as a result of this efficiency attitude, "Let's keep costs down. Don't pay them overtime. Work them like hell. Get them in before starting time and keep them back after their normal finishing time." That is part of the corporation's so-called incentive scheme. The staff get a lousy return for their work. That is free enterprise? It is slavery.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Order No. 109, which provides that if an honourable member speaks for more than 10 minutes at one time to a particular clause, he shall not be permitted to speak again to that clause.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Mr Booth.

Mr Borbidge: A lot of their work is on computer. The bureau is computerised now.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The incentive scheme is all the more important because of the computer system that links the various offices. On that computer system is listed the sales for each front counter employee. That allows one employee to check on how another employee is going. The competition is a bit like that in McDonalds hamburger shops.

Mr INNES: I rise to a point of order. This clause is quite specific. It deals with the composition of the board. This part of the honourable member's speech is not about that subject at all. He is talking about industrial conditions in industry.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clause.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have been waiting for a member of the Liberal Party or some member who has not read my amendment to raise that point. The Opposition's amendment lists various regions of the State. We consider it important to have persons domiciled in those regions appointed to the board, because they are aware of local problems. The incentive scheme is causing a problem. I am highlighting certain points, and I shall conclude my comments very soon.

Members of the staff are looking over one another's shoulder and are looking at the computer. No longer do employees have time to sit down with a would-be tourist who wants to take a caravan up the coast of Queensland or visit inland Queensland. He would want to know where the caravan parks are, where he can buy petrol, what the price of petrol is, where the hotels are, what tourist attractions can be seen and where the national parks are. However, he will not buy one cent's worth of package tour from the employee on the other side of the counter.

Right beside that customer could be one who wants to buy a thousand dollars' worth of air fares or, if he is taking his family on a package tour, several thousand dollars' worth. The little tourist, who will spend a good deal of money on petrol and other services in local regions, thereby benefiting the local shop-keepers, service stations, motels and caravan parks, will be given the brush-off. That is happening now, because the staff are working flat out and this damned incentive scheme is in operation. The staff have to keep the number of sales up and they have to do a good deal of promotion work. They do that to hold their jobs. They do it particularly to keep their places at the front counter. An employee whose incentive figures are not high is taken off the front counter and put out in a back room. The staff of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation are being victimised. Suddenly the faces of Government members have a serious expression. What I am saying is true.

The traditional Queensland tourist is fobbed off because of the so-called free enterprise system under which the corporation works, with the approval of the Minister. A grave anomaly exists, and people from the various regions should be appointed to the board to overcome that anomaly. They could pull the corporation into line and, furthermore, they could pull the Minister, who knows nothing about his portfolio, into line. The incentive scheme is reacting to the detriment of Queensland tourists, particularly in the inland and western areas of the State.

The glamour resorts are doing better out of it because the customers are coming in with thousands of dollars in their pockets. The little caravan parks and the wayside shop-keepers are missing out, and that will continue to be so.

The member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) referred to the great apprenticeship training scheme conducted by the corporation. Because of the work pressure that has been placed on those persons, an inordinately large number of resignations have been submitted to the corporation at upper and lower levels. The people who work for the corporation are dissatisfied with their working conditions. They begin work with a warm inner glow. The course gives them that glow; they are all fired up with enthusiasm.

When they find themselves in the market-place and at the shopfront, they find out what the Frank Moore corporation is really all about—slavery! It is time that it stopped.

Government Members interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: It is not slavery? What do Government members call working for nothing, day after day, from early morning till late at night. If that is not slavery, what is it?

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member is certainly a fraud.

The corporation should be doing more for tourists in country areas. If people from northern Queensland, western Queensland and central Queensland were on the board, they would be bring to the attention of the board that the Sunlander cannot meet its commitment with the interstate railway system. Because the Sunlander cannot keep to its timetable, for some time the interstate railway system has not waited for the Sunlander. What has the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation done about that? Nothing! It is not interested in that sort of tourist; it is interested only in the big image that it promotes. The corporation is too busy promoting many wonderful projects instead of getting down to the nitty-gritty.

The Minister, the member for Surfers Paradise, Sir Frank Moore and others say that the backbone of the tourist industry in Queensland is the Australian tourist and the Queensland tourist. That is still so. They have said that Queensland needs international tourists. It certainly does, and international tourists are coming to Queensland. However, they are not the backbone of the tourist industry. The Australian tourist and the Queensland tourist is still the backbone of the tourist industry in this State. It is time that the Government, the Minister and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation woke up to that. Honourable members have seen the Minister's track record. I doubt whether the Opposition will ever get anything from him.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to support the eloquent and effective remarks made by the Opposition's tourism spokesman and to support the amendment that he intends to move.

I would like to address myself briefly to the relevance of tourism in the west and the north of this State. That has already been mentioned by the Opposition's spokesman. Recently, I was in the west at the same time as the Minister made his trip through the west. Our paths crossed at Winton. Although I do not agree with the Minister's press secretary on many matters, we agreed that there were many flies in the west. I saw the Minister's press secretary at about half past eight in the morning as I was leaving the town. He was then obtaining the daily papers to take back to the Minister's bedside. That was the way in which the Minister was seeing the west.

Not one member from the National Party who represents a western electorate has addressed the real needs of tourism in the west and the development of potential tourism in the west. There needs to be more than just tourist promotion in the west.

A Government Member: What do you know about the west?

Mr COMBEN: For seven years I worked in the west with my hands. I slaved out there. I do not know what Government members know about the west. However, they certainly do not do very much to promote tourism in their electorates. I do not see the members for Gympie or Cooroorra doing anything in their electorates.

The potential for tourism in the west should be developed. The Bill has the potential to develop tourism, not simply to promote it. Honourable members have already seen what can be created with a creative local community. In Longreach, the Stockman's Hall of Fame has captured the imagination of many Queenslanders. I have made a donation to that museum. Although most of the promoters are members of the National

Party, I am not ashamed to recognise that history should be fully promoted. The Stockman's Hall of Fame will attract massive numbers of tourists; but what else has been done about the potential of the west? Nothing!

In the time remaining to me today, I make a few suggestions. What is being done about an Aboriginal Hall of Fame to display the heritage of the Aboriginal people to Australians and international tourists? That could be done at Carnarvon.

Mr Gunn: Where would you put it?

Mr COMBEN: At Carnarvon—somewhere near Carnarvon Gorge, at an ancient Aboriginal site. That is an attractive area.

Mr McKechnie: It is now at Rockhampton.

Mr COMBEN: The last I was aware of any action by the Government on the matter was the suggestion that a proposal be put to the bicentennial committee. The Government will not do anything. It is asking someone else to fund it.

Mr McKechnie: You do not even know that we put in half.

Mr COMBEN: The only thing that has been put in so far has been the suggestion to the bicentennial committee. What has been done about a Queensland zoo? What has been done about a nocturnal house to display Australia's native fauna? The Government has done absolutely nothing.

Mr Davis: They have got the zoo on the Government side.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Brisbane Central is correct. The zoo is located opposite. They have a baboon, too.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member should be speaking to the amendment to clause 5, which was moved by the honourable member for Ipswich West.

Mr COMBEN: There is a need for a resident member of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in central Queensland to encourage tourism by promoting features such as national parks and developing a western botanical gardens, for example. Such developments would be genuine tourist attractions and would promote the whole area; yet we hear nothing but silence from honourable members on the Government side. It is not enough to promote the achievements of private enterprise.

The Bill will enable the Government to promote any form of tourist development in Queensland, not just the four or five major developments announced for coastal regions. The Government has done nothing for development in the west—an area which is declining and badly in need of support. That is a sad indictment of the Minister and the Government for their performance. It is to be hoped that the western electors will recognise the Government's lack of action and will do something about it at the next election.

Mr Borbidge: 73 per cent of the growth in the Australian tourism industry last year was in Queensland.

Mr COMBEN: Without hesitation, I acknowledge that there is development of tourism in this State and that Queensland is developing rapidly. However, that is not the point. Queensland's tourist attractions need to be promoted and developed so that other States do not overtake us. Facilities should be provided in the west and the north. Because Lawn Hill Gorge is 400 km from Mount Isa, tourists need to know that there are adequate facilities provided and that they can enjoy a cold beer or an air-conditioned room. Such facilities should be provided in the west, but unfortunately that has not been done. I hope that the Minister will consider taking action under the provisions of the amendment moved by the member for Ipswich West.

Mr VEIVERS: I am rather amused that the National Party is not supporting the amendment.

Mr De Lacy: It might support it.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, it might.

I am led to believe that the National Party believes in the decentralised development of Queensland. The amendment provides that one corporation member comes from north Queensland, one from central Queensland, one from western Queensland and one from southern Queensland. That is a very sensible approach to the authority and the effect it will have on the tourism industry. It is common knowledge that Government members are agrarian socialists. They should therefore support such a philosophy.

The general thrust of the corporation and the Government is more towards self-interest than the promotion of tourism in this State. If the system suggested by the Opposition were adopted, the State would get good feedback and the correct information. The amendment provides for the good, balanced development of tourist facilities throughout Queensland.

If honourable members opposite want evidence of self-interest, I will refer again to those who went overseas on the Enterprise Queensland tour—Sir Francis Moore, John Bartlett, Denis Pye, Noel Smith, David Graham and Geoff Wilson. Their primary interests must be their business activities. Have they the interests of tourism in this State at heart? The amendment will help the Minister and the corporation.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. I point out to the honourable member that Mr Graham, the merchant banker who went on the Enterprise Queensland mission, is not the Mr Graham who is a board member of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr VEIVERS: The amendment will assist the Minister and the corporation to overcome those conflicts of interest that the Opposition has consistently referred to during the debate. The amendment is a good, sensible one and will assist the corporation staff to get good, reliable feedback and information.

I would also be interested to hear the Minister's remarks about the incentive scheme for staff and why the corporation has a serious shortage of staff.

Mr McKECHNIE: The members of the corporation are chosen very carefully. They are achievers who have an interest in the whole of Queensland. I can assure the members of this Committee and the people of Queensland that I will recommend to Cabinet that the members of the corporation be achievers who have an interest in the whole State and will do a very good job. I am rather amazed that the Opposition wants to provide legislatively for the geographical diversification of appointments to the corporation. If that is what the Opposition wants, why does it not ask for legislative changes to ensure that the members of the Federal Cabinet are selected equally from all the States of Australia? Only one member of the Federal Cabinet comes from Queensland. The Opposition cannot argue as it does on this issue and not get stuck into the Prime Minister for selecting only one Queenslander to be a Federal Cabinet Minister. Exactly the same argument applies.

Mr Underwood: They are accountable every three years.

Mr McKECHNIE: The membership of the corporation comes up for review every three years.

The argument put up by the Opposition is that it is not in the interests of Queensland to have what the Government considers to be the best people on the corporation. The

Opposition believes that it should be enshrined in legislation that the members come from specific areas of the State. There is no difference between the selection of the members of the corporation and the members of the Federal Cabinet. The Prime Minister has seen fit to have only one Queensland Cabinet Minister, so I do not think that the Opposition's amendment is relevant.

Mr De LACY: Mr Booth——

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The question was that clause 5——

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has replied and I will put the amendment.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr LICKISS: I rise to a point of order. At the Committee stage, a reply by the Minister does not finalise debate on a clause.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I am sorry. I stand corrected and I call the honourable member for Cairns.

Mr De LACY: I did not try to get the call before the Minister spoke, because I was interested to hear his response to some of the issues that have been raised. He has not addressed himself to many of them, and I should comment on what he has just said. He claims that the board of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation comprises achievers, and he used the ludicrous parallel of the Federal Government having only one Cabinet Minister from Queensland.

The Government is attempting through this legislation to develop the Queensland tourist industry by expanding the powers of the corporation. Reference was made to drawing parallels, and I suggest that the Minister should look at organisations that have been set up to develop other industries. I cite the Queensland Cane Growers Council as an example, because the legislation under which it was set up provides that it be made up of people from all the different cane-growing areas throughout the State. In every single case where a statutory organisation has been set up to look after the interests of an industry the enabling legislation has provided that it be made up of people from different areas.

I want to develop that point a little further. As the member for Cairns, it is important that I have my 20c worth. The Minister said that he had selected achievers, but the way he did that and the way I would have done it are two different things. Perhaps he looked at which political party they belonged to or how much money they contributed to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. If the Minister is saying that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is made up of great achievers, I consider that to be a slight upon north Queenslanders. Because each region has different attractions to offer, the tourist industry must be developed on a regional basis. I do not support the notion that regions should actively compete against each other. They must co-operate. I have never supported the continuing argument of Surfers paradise versus Cairns, or Cairns versus Townsville. I accept the notion that first and foremost overseas visitors come to Australia and not to Cairns, Surfers Paradise or Sydney. So the different regions have to get their acts together and co-operate. But I cannot see how the regions can work co-operatively when every member of the Tourist and Travel Corporation is based in the south-east corner of the State. I call it the Surfers Paradise push.

At times I worry about the way in which the tourist industry in north Queensland is developing. North Queensland has some unique attractions, but if the State is to develop a reasonably diversified tourist industry it must promote the attractions that north Queensland has to offer such as the Reef and the rain forests. On that basis I am worried about the mentality of the members of the corporation who, being based in

Surfers Paradise, see tourist development in terms of bricks and mortar in large prestige buildings. Infrastructure needs to be developed, but there is also a need to preserve the kind of attractions——

Mr McKechnie: Perhaps I can save you worrying. I can assure you that not all the new members will be from the south-east corner.

Mr De LACY: I accept the Minister's assurance on that point. But, as a member from north Queensland who believes in decentralisation, it should be——

Mr McKechnie: Don't talk yourself out of what you might get.

Mr De LACY: Is that a threat?

Mr McKechnie: I am just trying to help you.

Mr De LACY: I accept the Minister's assurance, but I still believe that the amendment is worth while. It should be enshrined in the legislation so that the different regional areas can be given membership of the Tourist and Travel Corporation.

The Opposition spokesman on tourism raised some very important points about the incentive scheme that the corporation operates. The Minister did not answer the questions asked by the honourable member. I will be interested in his response.

Mr McKechnie: What scheme?

Mr De LACY: The honourable member for Ipswich West mentioned the incentive scheme and the corporation's staff problems.

Mr BORBIDGE: I had not intended to comment on the points made by honourable members opposite, but I resent the criticism that is being levelled, by implication, at the integrity of some of the finest people in this State. This Committee should be saying "Thank you" to those people who are prepared to serve on the board of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. Their successes speak for themselves. They are very successful businessmen in their own right, and not just in the south-eastern corner of Queensland.

Mr Jennings: They are achievers.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the member for Southport says, they are achievers, and they are making their valuable time available to the tourist industry and to the Tourist and Travel Corporation.

We are looking at people of the calibre of Sir Francis Moore, Mr Jim Kennedy, who was formerly involved with Australia Post——

A Government Member interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: As has been pointed out, he was an ALP Government appointee. Mick Borzi is now representing this Government in Bahrain. Few people have made a greater contribution than Mick Borzi to tourism in north Queensland. I was surprised to hear the member for Cairns, in effect, criticise the efforts of the corporation when someone such as Mick Borzi has represented that area so well.

Mr I. J. Gibbs: The international airport.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Minister for Mines and Energy has referred to Mr Borzi's interest in the Cairns International Airport through his chairmanship of the Cairns Harbour Board.

The other members of the corporation are Mr Driscoll, Mr Duthie, Mr Peter Graham, Mr Callaghan, Mr King and Mr McGill. Honourable members should be saying, "Thank you" to those very honourable gentlemen for the outstanding contribution

that they are making to tourism in this State. I am quite disgusted with some of the nonsense from Opposition members this afternoon.

Mr McKECHNIE: The simple reality of life is that it costs many of these men money to be members of the corporation and their time is very valuable, but I do not expect Opposition members to believe that.

The incentive scheme is simply an incentive scheme. There is nothing wrong about that. Will the honourable member for Cairns tell shearers, for instance, that they should not be paid so much per sheep? If he suggested that, they would cut his throat. It is an incentive scheme, and that answers the honourable member's question.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 5 (Mr Underwood's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 22		NOES, 40	
Burns		Ahern	Knox
Comben		Alison	Lee
D'Arcy		Austin	Lester
De Lacy		Bailey	Lickiss
Eaton		Borbidge	Littleproud
Fouras		Chapman	McKechnie
Gibbs, R. J.		Cooper	McPhie
Hamill		Elliott	Menzel
Kruger		FitzGerald	Muntz
McElligott		Gibbs, I. J.	Newton
McLean		Glasson	Randell
Milliner		Goleby	Row
Shaw		Gunn	Simpson
Smith		Gygar	Stephan
Underwood		Harper	Stoneman
Vaughan		Harvey	Tenni
Veivers		Henderson	Wharton
Warner, A. M.		Innes	
Wilson	<i>Tellers:</i>	Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>
Yewdale	Davis	Katter	Lingard
	Palaszcuk	Kaus	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.7 to 7.15 p.m.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—Amendment of s. 13; Functions of Corporation—

Mr INNES (7.15): This Bill incorporates perhaps the most significant change of principle in relation to the hospitality industry since a Labor Government bought the State Hotel at Babinda in 1917. That was the last time that a Government enacted legislation to give itself a part of the action in a going concern in the hospitality industry. At that stage it was part of a network of socialist enterprises.

In 1929, notwithstanding that the State Hotel at Babinda had managed to return a profit in most of its years of operation, the Moore Government, as one of its first acts, passed a special Act called the Babinda State Hotel Sale Act. The hotel was disposed of because it was contrary to free enterprise principles for the Government to own it.

If the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts wanted an indication that he is on the wrong track, he should have found it in some of the speeches that came from members on the Opposition benches. I cannot recall hearing speeches, such as those made by Labor Party members, in which an instinctive belief in socialism was so strongly registered. I refer particularly to the speech of the member for Mackay (Mr Casey), who strongly, instinctively and passionately believes that the State should be in the business of owning enterprises.

Once again the Government is adopting principles that it claims, by all its publicity, it does not believe in. A member of the Labor Party used the term "agrarian socialists", which is also used by some unkind critics in referring to the National Party. I thought that a difficulty arose in understanding the problems of orderly marketing, which is a special province in rural matters. When the Government moves away from orderly marketing into direct State participation and ownership of enterprises, it is entering the area of active socialism. That is why this Bill was so warmly welcomed by people such as Mr Casey.

Last week, at a certain birthday party, the Premier and Treasurer said that it was great not to have to spend his time trying to outwit members of the Liberal Party. It is not a question of outwitting the Liberals. The problem that the Liberal Party frequently has in this place—it used to have it in the party room—is making the people who should know understand the significance of what they do.

The Ministers and members of the Government use a special sort of double-talk to convey something that is completely different from the actions that they are taking in the legislation that they are passing. The will of the Government becomes the will of Parliament and the will of Parliament is expressed in the legislation. Senator Gareth Evans engages in an incredible socialist exercise and claims that the intention of Parliament can be found in a reading of parliamentary debates. That is not the way that it is done in Queensland and that is not what the Government stands for. The legislation is an expression of the Government's will and philosophy. By using special euphemisms, words or phrases, Government members either deceive themselves or intend to deceive the people and other members of Parliament, because the words that they use are not statements of truth and accuracy.

I will give an example of some phrases and words that were used in this debate. Being owners of an active concern is dressed up by the use of the word "equity", as though equity is something different from having a direct participation in ownership of an active commercial concern.

The Minister, in his second-reading speech, said—

"Earlier I mentioned to the House that the State Government is prepared to transfer selected parcels of Crown land to the corporation so that it may proceed to encourage private sector developers and financiers to complete these prime international resorts."

The Liberal Party does not necessarily disagree with those principles. The Leader of the Liberal Party has foreshadowed an amendment that will go well along the way towards achieving that purpose, that is, the transfer of selected parcels of Crown land to the corporation to commence the process of development of prime international resorts.

Of course, farther down the track we part company. One would have thought that with the numerous enterprises and companies that seek prime land in Queensland—there are strings of them—on which to build international resorts, it would be a question of offering the land at tender or perhaps getting an annual lease fee if the corporation desires to create its own income. Apparently that is not the scheme of things.

The Minister went on to say—

"Clause 7 of the Bill, therefore, provides for a minor change in the functions of the corporation to allow this course to proceed."

Unless the Minister misunderstands his own Bill, that cannot be said to be an accurate statement of what the Bill does. As indicated by the honourable member for Nundah, the provision to which that is added is all about the promotion and marketing of tourism, to make tourism and travel arrangements, to provide tourist and travel information and to encourage development. Until that provision appears, there is not one word about being actively involved in the business of running tourist facilities.

I remind honourable members of the words. Do not worry about equity or about developing land in conjunction with private enterprise, which is part of the policy speech of the National Party. The vehicle is—

“to engage or participate in tourist or travel ventures or developmental projects”.

The corporation is going into business. That is what it is all about. That is what it says, and that is the intention.

Sir William Knox: And that is what they want to do.

Mr INNES: Yes, that is what it wants to do. It is not a minor change; it is a radical and major change, the like of which has not been seen in this State since the purchase of the Babinda Hotel by the Labor Government in 1917.

Mr Wilson: What you are saying is that they do not believe in free enterprise.

Mr INNES: That is exactly what I am saying. I am saying that the corporation is prepared to buy into free enterprise.

What are the motives? I will take a stab at what they are. The motives are that the aggressive entrepreneurial hearts and bodies in the Tourist and Travel Corporation have ambitions that go far beyond their budgets. Mr Menzies, I understand, had a reservation about appointing the captains of private enterprise to Government corporations because, armed with their good old get up and go aggressive competitive sense and with the full might of legislation and Government behind them, they could take over the world. They could do anything they wanted to do.

I do not deny that the corporation has among its officers a number of dynamos—people who have done an excellent job within the limits of their budget. Their ambitions are way ahead of their budget. There are millions of things they would like to do; because of their budget, they cannot do them. They are frustrated, and have been frustrated for some years, by the inadequacy of their income compared with what they would like to do in advertising overseas.

I will bet that that is the real nub of the intention to advertise overseas, and that the shortfall in the money provided by the Government is the genesis of the exercise. What does it start? There is a discrepancy already of several million dollars between what the corporation would like to do and what it can do within its existing budget. Quite clearly it wants to go into the business of generating millions of dollars. When it is in the business of generating millions of dollars, it is in the market-place and competing.

I ask the Minister not to engage in more small chains of euphemisms. I ask him specifically about the concept of equity and of putting the land in as the equity that has been floated around. I want to know specifically what the vehicle is. Will the equity be converted into shares, or will it operate in partnership? What is the percentage of profit? What is the percentage of risk? What financial arrangements will be entered into by the Government or the corporation in terms of guarantees, loans, shares or percentage of partnerships? What sort of money are they looking for? Is it the many millions of dollars per annum that I am talking about for the reasons I have given? If that is so, it means that they are in business, and it is big business. They intend to be in big business. The Minister has referred to some resorts being 3 000 accommodation units in size. That is big business. Even if it is one-third or one-sixth of that, that is still big business. In some parts of this State that will provide major competition for the people whom the corporation has traditionally served as agent and promoter. It is a very different situation to look after general interests, albeit that some people participating in the corporation are active entrepreneurs in the field and actively in charge of a vehicle that competes, because some capital that might be sought by somebody else will be taken out of the available market.

The Government will be forced into a situation of protecting its own interests. What happens if it gets a brumby, such as a Federal Hotels type situation involving multimillion

dollars that does not do as well as it should? The Government will be asked by its partner to protect its investment. What happens if its partner is subject to major corporate change, a raid or take-over? They are the dangers. They are the reasons why, unless there is an overwhelming public need, free enterprise Governments do not become involved in socialist exercises.

If the Government had an Ayers Rock and a Uluru situation in which the population basis is small and the capital base is small, it might consider a venture involving some Government participation. However, we are not talking about that; we are talking about Port Douglas, which is one of the prime tourist spots on the Queensland coast. Magnetic Island is already the subject of a major development. It is situated close to a major Queensland city. Honourable members have heard about Noosa for some time. That is a future possibility. The corporation will be a major competitor among a myriad of small operators. They will not be happy, and for good reason.

Let us be honest and let us understand what the legislation says. It must be understood that the intention of the legislation is to enable the corporation to go into major business and to make many millions of dollars. I do not blame the corporation for that. The Government has a responsibility to keep a lid on the corporation's ambitions.

I can recall that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was established and asked to carry out monumental public works. For years it was given no money. That is why it came up with crazy schemes, such as constructing high-rise buildings in the middle of the Broadwater at Southport. Imaginative, energetic men desperately looking for some way in which to make money were asked by the Government to perform a task for which no resources were given. That is the sort of pond out of which these creatures emerged. The Queensland Government should not be in the business of tourism, particularly when one hears the warm support and approval that this proposal receives from the Opposition.

I will be supporting the amendment that the honourable member for Nundah has foreshadowed that he will move. It proposes that the corporation may be in the business of facilitating in every way the hand-over and preparation of Crown land to a major tourist developer. There is a need for that sort of provision. The corporation should be a facilitator, a cutter of red tape and an organisation with a special interest in the general promotion of tourism. However, the corporation should not be in the business of entering into equity with all the compromises and with all the injustices that will follow.

The old saying is that justice must be seen to be done. The reason for the Act provision of a declaration of interest is to engender confidence that fair dealing and openness are being engaged in. If the corporation is a major equity-holder, a major interest-holder, an active participant and a profiteer as a major competitor in several regions of this State, confidence in fair dealing and openness cannot be maintained. The Liberal Party proudly adheres to its basic principles. This Government should do as the Moore Government did. Notwithstanding that the State Hotel, Babinda, traded reasonably profitably—no doubt because it was armed with the only licence for the area—the Moore Government got rid of it.

As a result of the Bill, the corporation will grow. In tourist terms it will attract the same sort of opprobrium as the State Government Insurance Office. Members of the National Party have been talking about dismantling the SGIO.

In tourist terms, that is what the Government is on the brink of conceiving. The ingredients of the Bill represent the sperm and the ovum. When assented to, the legislation will give birth to something that will grow into an aggressive young brat in the tourist industry. As it grows, the Government will not be thanked for what it has done, however many years down the track that happens to be. The legislation is wrong-headed, and the Government is deluding itself by trying to hide from what it is really doing. If the ramifications have not been understood until now, the Government should have second thoughts and withdraw the Bill.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The foreshadowed Liberal amendment reads—

“to advise the Minister upon any proposed tourist resort or tourist venture which will utilise Crown lands and to facilitate the development of any such tourist resort or tourist venture of which the Governor in Council approves;”.

What are the functions of the corporation? Section 13 lays them down as follows—

“(1) the functions of the Corporation are—

- (a) to promote and market tourism and travel;
- (b) to make tourism and travel arrangements;
- (c) to provide tourism and travel information services;
- (d) to encourage the development of the tourist and travel industry;
- (e) to advise the Minister on matters relating to the foregoing paragraphs that are referred to the Corporation by the Minister for advice.

(2) In carrying out its functions under this Act the primary responsibility of the Corporation shall be to promote, market and arrange tourism and travel to and within Queensland.

(3) The Minister may issue directions to the Corporation on matters of policy and the exercise of its powers and functions and the Corporation shall observe and carry out the directions so given.”

The Opposition fails to see how the Liberal Party amendment will alter the functions laid down in the Act. It may elaborate on them. I suppose the word “facilitate” is a slight elaboration of the functions. However, we see no basic difference between the functions laid down in section 13 and the Liberal proposal.

As the Labor Party has clearly stated, its intention is to oppose the Government’s proposal, which the Labor Party supports, to facilitate the corporation’s involvement in tourist and travel ventures or developmental projects. Therefore, Opposition members oppose the Liberal amendment. In our opinion, the foreshadowed amendment is superfluous.

The ceiling of the Chamber would fall in the day the member for Sherwood passed compliments about me or any other member of the Opposition, regardless of what we might have said or done. Therefore, we take no notice of his attempted criticism.

Mr Borbidge: Do you think he is trying to have two bob each way?

Mr UNDERWOOD: As I have pointed out several times during the debate, the Liberal Party’s approach to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is hypocritical.

At the second-reading stage the Opposition asked the Minister to respond on the functions of the corporation and whether the corporation, in its part in the negotiations so far, particularly in relation to the Port Douglas enterprise, has breached the Act. I outlined the tourism objectives contained in the book “Queensland Achievement”, which was published just prior to the last State election. The National Party claimed that the Government, through the corporation, would be going into partnership with private enterprise to establish major tourist developments on Crown land. Quite clearly those negotiations are well in hand and the Minister has made public that work has been done in conjunction with local authorities. I ask the Minister to explain why, if the corporation has not breached its current functions, it is necessary to bring forward the Bill? It seems to enable the corporation to do what it has already been doing, so I ask the Minister to explain that.

The corporation is accountable to the Minister. Although I do not want to rehash the question, I note that the Minister has not used the hackneyed phrase that is used by his colleagues, particularly his ministerial colleagues, that the Auditor-General checks everything, so there is no need for a parliamentary public accounts committee. I have already outlined that the Auditor-General himself is calling for more public accountability.

Before the dinner recess I mentioned the incentive scheme, and the Minister made the ridiculous statement that shearers have an incentive scheme. That is not so; they have a tally scheme, which is totally different from the incentive scheme operated by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. The people on the counters receive a salary and, in addition to that, they receive what might be described as a bonus. Shearers do not work that way.

Mr McKechnie: My friend, I have shorn in sheds and I know what happens.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have worked in sheds, too.

Mr McKechnie: Have you shorn more than 100 sheep a day?

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have picked up fleece from more than 100 sheep per day.

Shearers operate under a tally scheme, and obviously the Minister does not understand that. The Minister has either never shorn or was working for some miserly cocky who would not pay him the award rate. The Minister must have been a scab shearer.

I wish to hear him say what he intends to do about the staff problems, which he obviously does not understand. As an example of the competency of the Minister to administer the functions of the corporation, I will quote from the "Townsville Bulletin", that bastion of the Labor Party! In its editorial, not once, but twice, that newspaper has seen fit to criticise and attack the Minister. The editorial column of that newspaper carries the slogan "Proudly serving the North." The editorial of 24 October is headed, "Let the Florence Bay issue fade" I am sure the Minister has read it.

Mr McKechnie: Have you got confidence in the editorials of the "Townsville Bulletin"?

Mr UNDERWOOD: That newspaper buckets the Labor Party just as much as it buckets the Government. I thought the Minister would have picked up my sarcasm about that newspaper supporting the Labor Party. In the past the "Townsville Bulletin" has tended to side with the conservative elements of politics.

Mr McKechnie: Only the other day that newspaper said that the Premier would win the next election because this is such a great Government.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That shows how far out of touch the Minister is with these issues. That has absolutely no relevance to the problems confronting the tourist industry, and shows the degree of incompetence of the Minister. The editorial to which I have referred states—

"It is surprising that the Minister for Tourism, Mr McKechnie, continues with his assault of the Townsville City Council over Florence Bay. Why does he keep dishing out unprovoked insults? What does it achieve?

The council's estimate that he makes only himself look inadequate seems a reasonable conclusion. If he has decided that Florence Bay is at the bottom of the list, so be it. There is no one in Townsville, apart from the good Minister himself when he makes flying sorties into the city, who has any faith in it becoming a reality anyway, at least not on present indications.

If we can't get our casino up and going within a reasonable time scale with the State Government, the council and the developers right behind it, then what hope is there for a \$100 million (or \$200-300 million) project for which there is nothing certain except a piece of land? Such a proposition, in the present cynical climate of Townsville, is stretching credulity too far.

There could hardly be a topic of controversy in Townsville and environs less deserving of hash words than Florence Bay.

As the invective flies, Florence Bay nestles on the coast of Magnetic Island in sublime ignorance, much the same as the day it was created, available for the

enjoyment of those who care to make the trek to its isolated, sandy shores. It is one of many beautiful bays—perhaps the finest.

Has Mr McKechnie been there? If he did, it might fill him with the wonderment that he now reserve for the Townsville City Council's alleged lack of commitment. It would be a more noble feeling than the one he tries to force on others.

The Minister would better serve the interests of tourism in the North if he came up with attainable goals, then supplied the assistance and encouragement for people to achieve them rather than rehashing dreams he has inherited from others who preceded him, in rapid succession, as the Minister for Tourism.

Otherwise, it merely looks like the Nationals are indulging in some old-fashioned Labor bashing for the entertainment—or annoyance—of the electorate."

To back up that editorial, an article headed "Mayor sees red over comments", states—

"The Mayor, Alderman Mike Reynolds, said yesterday that the State Government should be embarrassed by the 'disgraceful' comments made by the Minister for Tourism, Mr McKechnie, on the proposed Florence Bay resort."

I will not continue to embarrass Government back-benchers, especially the member for Surfers Paradise, but the Minister is way off beam. He must be doing something wrong because I have an article that mentions Dr Jeffreys of the North Queensland Conservation Council. It is headed "Government stand praised by Jeffreys", and states—

"The North Queensland Conservation Council has congratulated the State Government for recognising that Florence Bay was the most unsuitable tourist resort site in Queensland."

Will the Minister answer my questions, or will he remain seated and show how ignorant he is by allowing the member for Surfers Paradise to continue to outshine him in the debate?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I move the following amendment—

"At page 2, omit all words on lines 42 and 43 and insert the following words—

'(e) to advise the Minister upon any proposed tourist resort or tourist venture which will utilise Crown lands and to facilitate the development of any such tourist resort or tourist venture of which the Governor in Council approves;'

When I was drawing up the amendment I remembered that I was the Minister who introduced legislation a couple of years ago to abolish the last vestiges of State enterprises, and I was very pleased to be able to do so. It took many years to get rid of the State enterprises that were created just after World War I. I know that members of the Labor Party made a lot of fuss about that legislation and said that if they ever gained power they would legislate to re-establish those enterprises—the butcher shops, the coal mines and the hotels.

Originally the Brisbane City Council was created as a vehicle. It was to be the corporation that handled State enterprises. That is what it was all about. The Brisbane City Council was not set up for local government purposes; it was set up as a corporation with a view to handling and managing State enterprises.

The present situation is remarkably parallel to the setting-up of State enterprises under a Labor Government. It is true that the amendment appears to be insignificant; it contains only a handful of words. Yet, when those words are read in their true context and knowing the ambitions of the corporation, the amendment is of enormous significance.

It is true that the corporation is motivated by the very best of intentions. As the honourable member for Sherwood pointed out, when the corporation's charter is changed in as dramatic and extensive manner as is proposed in this legislation, the corporation's whole philosophy and the attitude of the people who run it are changed.

For some time the Tourist and Travel Corporation has been trying to get the Government to accept a proposal along the lines of the one set out in the Bill. For more

than 12 months, the Government has resisted moves to have it incorporated in the legislation, but it has now capitulated and it proposes to include it in the charter of the corporation.

It is not good enough for the honourable member for Ipswich West to say that the Liberal Party supported the original legislation that involved trading operations. The original legislation that set up the Tourist and Travel Corporation also provided for the take-over of the operations of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. The bureau was incorporated into the corporation. That move was accepted by every honourable member in this Chamber, by the community, by the unions and by the travel industry as being a very desirable and progressive step. As the annual report of the corporation points out, that legislation enables the corporation to adopt a modern and businesslike approach to its responsibilities. It has been very successful. In fact, as I said last night, the corporation has been a success story, and those people associated with it should be very proud.

The members of the board of the corporation are people with impeccable reputations. I am sorry that members of the Labor Party have criticised them, because they are people of outstanding integrity. They are very worthy people.

Mr De Lacy: We did not criticise them.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is rubbish. The honourable member's colleague who sits next to him made the most derogatory remarks about the members of the board of the corporation. Because they are people of quality, I would be one of the first to defend their reputations. I am sure that they would bend over backwards to avoid conflicts of interest. But, unfortunately, with this change in the corporation's charter, those conflicts of interest will loom very large in the daily activities of the members of the board of the corporation.

We are not just talking about the three sites of which the Minister spoke. Those sites are not mentioned in the legislation. They are only part of a big program that the corporation has in mind. Once the corporation starts to own and run facilities, it is inevitable that members of its board will find that they have conflicts of interest because of their geographical location, because of their financial interests, because they are dynamic businessmen and because they and their families have a multitude of interests.

Mr De Lacy: You are talking the same way as we did.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, I am not. I am just warning of the problems. I do not know why the honourable member is getting so upset about the members of the board of the corporation, because two of them have had a very high profile in the Labor Party. They have been proudly associated with the Labor Party for many years. One was a Labor Party lord mayoral candidate in a Brisbane City Council election. Another one was for many years president of the Young Labor movement and, as far as I know, still has close links with the Labor Party. Members of the corporation are responsible and have impeccable reputations. They also have a very big responsibility. It is inevitable that, if the charter is changed and because of the wide range of interests of the members of the corporation, conflicts will arise.

Since its foundation the corporation has smarted under the controls laid down by the Parliament, the Auditor-General and the Treasurer. The corporation is part of the budgetary system and the checks and balances that apply under that system. For some time the corporation has wanted to break out from those budgetary controls.

The proposal contained in clause 7 of the Bill broadens the charter of the corporation, and that in clause 8 allows the corporation to become a substantial operator in the financial world and gives it status that it does not have at the moment in the way it can handle money and investments. Through these clauses, an entirely new philosophy is injected into the running of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

If the Parliament passes the legislation—and I refer specifically to clause 7, which I feel is the crux of the Bill—the charter of the corporation will be changed and a body will be created that was not envisaged by the Government and Parliament of the day when the corporation was established. It will be quite a different organisation and I counsel members of this Parliament to consider carefully what they are doing. It is a very dangerous step that the Parliament is being asked to take. It is contrary to the philosophy of Liberal Party members and I believe that it is contrary to the philosophy of members of the National Party.

Already evidence can be found in the community that the corporation has moved in on private enterprise. I understand that some of the statutory bodies that make travel arrangements have been told that all those travel arrangements will be made through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. Private travel agents who were operating in some of those establishments have had to close their offices and the corporation has taken over their business. That is rather sad, because the statutory bodies and semi-Government authorities have been well serviced by private travel agents, including bank travel services, and they have been forced into the narrow funnel of service that is offered by the corporation. That is just a sign in the sky of the sort of things that can happen when quangos get too big.

I agree with the philosophy of the Minister as stated in his second-reading speech. Because I agree with that philosophy and because I believe that he sincerely believes in it too, the amendment that I will move will help to make this legislation conform to the philosophy that the Minister expressed. The Liberal Party does not want the corporation to engage in the day-to-day operation of tourist facilities, and the Minister said that he hoped that that would not happen. To achieve that end, the amendments proposed by the Minister in this Bill will need to be substantially amended, and that is why I will be moving an amendment to this clause.

Mr McKECHNIE: The honourable member for Ipswich West asked me whether the corporation had breached the Act by carrying out negotiations or advocating certain things before this Bill amended the Act. It is very clear that there is a great difference in a legal sense between talking about something and actually owning something. The Bill will allow the corporation to have a share in the ownership of some projects. There is nothing wrong with negotiating or talking about what might happen, so there clearly has been no breach of the Act.

The honourable member took me to task for comparing shearing with the incentive scheme in the tourist industry. It is a straight analogy. I know that shearing is piece-work. I have shorn 100 sheep a day, and I do not think that too many members in the Opposition have done that. I have shorn in sheds for a contractor. I might add that I have been an AWU member and because I was young, I was conned into paying two years' membership instead of one. But that is another matter.

I could be academic and argue all night the whole matter of incentive schemes and piece-work rates. One is a wage plus incentive; the other is straight-out piece-work.

Mr Underwood: What about the problems in the incentive scheme?

Mr McKECHNIE: I support the incentive scheme. There will not be any incentive scheme that everybody is happy with, but the majority of people are happy with this scheme and I support the corporation in regard to it.

I turn now to the comments of the two Liberal members who have spoken. I make it clear that the concept that is being debated tonight was in the Premier's north Queensland policy speech and it was well publicised. It is a matter of history that at the last State election the National Party did just a little better than the Liberals. I hope that Liberal members will accept that. It is a policy matter that was debated at election-time, and the people of Queensland accepted that policy. With due respect to the Liberal Party, its problem is that it wants two bob each way. That is what Liberal members are on about tonight.

Earlier tonight a member spoke about co-operatives and agrarian socialists. The National Party believes in co-operatives and orderly marketing. Co-operatives are different from collectives, which are what the socialists are all about.

The honourable member for Sherwood mentioned that the Premier said how lovely it is that the Nationals do not have to outwit the Liberals any more. I say that it was not very hard to do that in the past; the Liberals made it very easy for us.

As to whether the Tourist and Travel Corporation trades—we want it to earn some money; we are quite open about it. We will not be putting tax-payers' money at risk. Surely that is a much better philosophy than that advocated by the Liberal lord mayoral candidate in Brisbane, which is the imposition of tourist taxes. I might add that is also advocated by some ALP mayors. The Government does not want to increase taxation.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. The Minister's statement about ALP mayors is absolutely untrue. He cannot name them. By way of interjection he was asked to name them, and he has tried to qualify his comments. I ask him to withdraw them.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! A point or order can be taken only if the remarks used are personally offensive to an honourable member. I cannot see that the Minister's comments are offensive to the honourable member for Ipswich West.

Mr UNDERWOOD: He is trying to qualify his attack on the Liberal Party by including the ALP in his attack.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr McKECHNIE: The Liberal Party says that it is OK to regulate shop leases but the regulation of bread is socialism. Quite frankly, the Liberal Party likes to have two bob each way. If it suits it politically to go one way, it will say perhaps that that is controlling monopolies or use some similar high-falutin term, but if it is something that it does not want to do, it claims that is socialism.

What about the SGIO? I did not hear the Liberals going on about the SGIO.

Sir William Knox: It is owned by the policy-holders.

Mr McKECHNIE: I know that it is owned by the policy-holders, but the Government has some control over it. What about Queensland Railways? When the coalition parties were in Government, did the honourable member for Nundah want to disband the Railway Department and hand it over to private enterprise? What about his colleagues in Canberra? When they were in power, did they want to sell TAA, Qantas, the Australian National Line the Australian National Railways, Telecom or the Australian Postal Commission? The Liberal members can all say that maybe they did want to sell those instrumentalities, but the simple reality of life is that when the Liberal Party was the dominant party in government in Canberra it did not want to sell any of those instrumentalities.

The Government is putting up four pieces of Crown land. No tax-payers' money will be put at risk. The Government will take some equity in that venture to the value of the land and it will receive a share from those ventures. The Government will not be involved in the day-to-day running of those ventures. I do not think that honourable members can call that socialism.

Mr Innes: Will you borrow money?

Mr McKECHNIE: The corporation will not be borrowing money.

The honourable member asked what the equity will be. I will not encourage the corporation to limit the imagination of private enterprise when it responds to expressions of interest. The Government's equity in each venture will depend upon the expressions

of interest. Some people and some companies will offer better deals than others. They will be examined at the appropriate time. Cabinet will decide which is the best deal for the people of Queensland. It is a pity that the people of Port Douglas must now learn that they would not have that development if the National Party was in coalition with the Liberal Party.

The National Party is determined to do it this way. If the Liberal Party was in coalition with the National Party, it would have tried to veto the legislation. I strongly reject the amendment moved by the member for Nundah.

Mr HARTWIG: I was a member of the Government when the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation was established by Mr Max Hodges, who was then Minister for Tourism. On that occasion, I stressed that there was no representation from the central and northern part of the State on that corporation. In due course, I was responsible in getting Mr Duthie from Rockhampton appointed to the corporation.

When I was a boy, I remember my father telling me about the Labor Government that at the time was taking over butcher shops, stores, hotels, and making one heck of a mess. As I see it today, power is being given to a quango. I think that at present there are 864 quangos in Queensland. They have been the subject of criticism by the Premier of this State. He said that their activities must be tightened up. He said that Parliament will tighten up the overseas travel and that it will tighten up the spending power of those quangos.

This evening a quango is being established. Power will be delegated away from this Parliament to a body of men, most of whom are very astute businessmen. They are very smart persons. I know that they look after their own interests while they are on some of their overseas trips. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation was established to look after and to promote tourism in Queensland.

I remember when the British Food Corporation came to Queensland. It was going to take over half this State and show farmers how to plough the ground, tend the soil, run cattle, and so on. After about five years, it was glad to get out of the State. The British Food Corporation failed.

During a debate on other legislation in this Chamber, it was stated that all islands off the coast of Queensland would become national parks, apart from those areas that had been excised for various resorts. How good is that legislation? If areas of national park are to be resumed and given to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, what is the Government planning to do for the average Queenslander? This legislation is running against the tide a little. A Small Business Development Corporation has been set up. What chance does a small businessman have in this instance? Who will get the nod for areas of land for resorts? I remind honourable members of the forestry lease that was referred to in Parliament recently, for which tenders should have been called but were not. An application was made and granted, but no tenders were called and no auction was held. Will there be a repetition of those circumstances many times over?

I bring honourable members back to their senses. The more authority that is delegated away from Parliament, the greater the problems that are created. It is not necessary to look for support from case studies, because that has been proven. The Peanut Marketing Board is an example. That was a quango. The manager travelled round the world three times. What control does the Government have over the executives? Members of the Tourist and Travel Corporation go round the world now, so what will happen when the Government allocates funds?

The Small Business Development Corporation has not loaned a cent in the interests of small business. In 1982-83, the allocation to the Small Business Development Corporation was \$284,000, but since that time the Government has not provided financial assistance to one small business enterprise in this State. How many small businesses have gone to the wall?

The Government is prepared to eternally prop up corporations by making available tax-payers' money. Because of the actions of Parliament, Expo will disembowel this city.

Mr Fouras: Tell us about Sir Francis Moore and how he got Expo into South Brisbane.

Mr HARTWIG: Expo will disembowel Brisbane. It will leave a gaping hole in the middle. However, that is another argument.

In approximately 1974, I went on a trip with the former Minister, Mr Max Hodges. Our vessel pulled into Cid Harbour in the Whitsunday group. Two of the officers from the Department of Harbours and Marine were talking at one end of the boat while the Minister was sunbaking at the other end. I heard one say, "We could give him 10 or 15 acres of the island." I said, "Wait a minute. What are you giving away? That is national park." I was told that an entrepreneur from Sea World was interested in that little island. It was 10 acres for a start; subsequently, it was increased to 15 acres because he wanted a run-off for water. I said, "How did Keith Williams get hold of an area of national park?" I was told, "Oh, you would know who to approach." I do not know who I should approach. Many times I have tried to get an island but I cannot get one.

In 1975, I visited Hamilton Island. Machines were roaring all over the place. I said to Keith Williams, "How did you get this island?" He said, "It's a pastoral lease." When I looked round, the nearest dung I saw was, on my observation, 20 years old. I said, "What sort of pastoral lease?" He said, "I've got wallabies on it." He paid only \$300 a year in rent.

Everybody knows what has happened on Hamilton Island. That was done by free enterprise and Mr Williams is handling it all right. I see nothing wrong with that, but when the Government begins buying into property, that is different. When a Minister delegates authority to a statutory authority of any sort he is losing his power in the Parliament. All honourable members know how hard it is to get a reply from a statutory organisation.

Mr Littleproud: No trouble.

Mr HARTWIG: Those organisations will not answer letters; they do not have to.

They are not answerable to Parliament; they are answerable to the Minister only once a year. The State has 850 quangos, so the Ministers cannot possibly read all the reports. The Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) nods his head. Because of a lack of control, the quangos get bigger and stronger. Who is delegating authority to those statutory organisations? Parliament! Before the formation of the statutory authority controlling fishing in this State, I could go to the Minister responsible for fisheries and get something done. Now it is almost impossible to get a master fisherman's licence for somebody. That is because the power has gone from this place.

I have been in this place a little longer than some honourable members. They cannot see that the power of the Parliament has been dwindling. The power of the Parliament has been eroded. The Minister can shake his head, but the very thing that the Government is trying to do tonight is a repetition of what has happened on more than 800 occasions in this place when statutory organisations have been set up. Because they are answerable to the Minister and not to the Parliament, the power is taken away from this place.

Mr D'ARCY: Not often in this Chamber do I agree with the member for Callide, but I do tonight because one of the problems is that the Parliament is losing control of the corporation. Taking on a complex tourist industry development through a quango is much more difficult than the Government realises. Other than in the spectacular tourist growth areas such as the Gold Coast, Cairns or Townsville, very few recent developments have been successful. To some extent the Government is putting the resources of the State at risk. That is the crux of the matter.

What the member for Callide said about the Government losing control of the development is quite true. The personnel on the boards of quangos do not matter because from time to time they change. The Government can change them at any time. Quangos make only limited reports, but their actions are tremendously important to the taxpayers of the State. The Government is committing the people of the State to tremendously costly tourist projects, and it is tending to lose control of them.

The member for Callide mentioned his involvement with the establishment of Hamilton Island. As many people in this place would know, over my 10 or 12 years in this place I have been very critical of Keith Williams, whilst at the same time being a friend of his. Despite the Government and the criticism from the Opposition, Keith Williams has spent many, many millions of private dollars to establish on Hamilton Island a worthwhile Queensland resort. We must admire the man for what he has done. Those members who have read between the lines in the newspapers recently are very well aware of what has happened. I will not go into that in detail.

It is a fact of life that when an investor contemplates a development of the nature referred to by the Minister, whether it be on Crown land or on privately owned land, that investor is looking at the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money. The Minister has not really come to terms with that.

Mr McKechnie interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: I do not think the Minister has. Since he became the Minister, the one thing he has not come to terms with is the complexity of the tourist industry.

Every single investment made in the tourist industry must be linked to another investment or enterprise, not just to the airlines or other large companies that provide services. That is why Keith Williams has had to face tremendous problems in developing Hamilton Island. The problems associated with island development are immense. The tourist industry has the potential to employ a large number of people and to become the most rapidly expanding industry in this State, but the Government has to understand the massive problems associated with its development.

As the Opposition spokesman said, not only is the Government to some extent avoiding its responsibility by giving the Tourist and Travel Corporation massive power, but also in allowing it to take over and develop Crown land and sell it, the Government is exposing itself to a terrible risk. Why is the Government doing it?

A Government Member interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: I will tell members the reason. They know it, and I know it.

The Government has starved the corporation of funds. In the years since it was established, it has been a toothless tiger. This Bill is an attempt, and a pretty sorry attempt, to give this tourist and travel quango a sound financial footing. What annoys me more than anything else is that the Government is not saying to the corporation, "Develop Queensland for the tourists." It has not looked at that aspect. It has not looked at the overall position. It is really saying, "For God's sake, get out of our hair. Don't come to us asking for guarantees. We don't want to know you any more. We can't fund you through the Budget, because you are only a drain on us. We will give you some Crown land. You organise it and do your own thing and make a profit out of it and establish your own financial base."

Anyone who has an in-depth knowledge of the tourist industry knows that the Government is moving into an area that it does not really understand. Tourism is the one area in which even hard-nosed financiers are likely to come to financial grief. I have seen it happen before. This State's tourist operators are progressive, but there have been massive failures in the industry. The Government will not get what it really wants by avoiding its responsibilities, and that is what the Minister is doing. He is saying, "We don't really want to know. We intend to avoid our responsibilities and just hope that the whole thing will work itself out."

The Minister has named certain sites, even though they are not dealt with directly in the Bill, and said that they will be developed by the corporation. When the Minister named the first site at Noosa and said that it would be given to the corporation to develop, there was almost a riot.

Mr Simpson: That area has never been proved stable, though.

Mr D'ARCY: I could not agree with the Noosa site. I am looking at it from a financial point of view. What the Government is attempting to do with the sites that it has chosen——

Mr Simpson: You are talking about the major capital input that has to go into it.

Mr D'ARCY: No, it goes even deeper than that. For once, I respect what the honourable member says. He understands the difficulties.

Mr Simpson: That is what international entrepreneurs will be looking to in these joint ventures.

Mr D'ARCY: Those people have to be found. People who have money are smart. They will not invest in projects that have problems of the magnitude that will be associated with developments of this type.

The Minister must reorganise the Tourist and Travel Corporation. By introducing this Bill, he is abrogating his responsibility. He has named sites. That is part of the boom mentality of this Government. It says, "It is going to happen because we have said that it will happen." The complexities of the tourist industry are great. Heavy costs are involved in any tourist development.

I am concerned also about the use of Crown land. The spokesman for the Opposition mentioned that. The Government owns premium waterfront land in Queensland, and it should not be looking only at making a quick quid. It must look 5, 10, 15, 20, 30 or 40 years ahead. The Government is trying to keep itself in office with a boom mentality.

Mr Menzel: You do not seriously suggest that we would try to let ourselves go out of office?

Mr D'ARCY: I agree with the honourable member; that is not something that the Government would want to do. But the fact of life is that the Government will not continue in office by creating a boom mentality. The Government knows the problems that private enterprise has encountered in undertaking some projects in this State, yet it is saying, "We will mention a couple of names. We will take Crown land, give it to the Tourist and Travel Corporation and let it organise and develop it." I say quite frankly that the Government does not really understand the complexities of the tourist industry.

Mr McKECHNIE: I appreciate the comments of the member for Woodridge. He said that the Government must look 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ahead. That is exactly what it is doing. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will ensure that the proposed developments are something of which the people of Queensland can be proud. They will be world class. Future generations will say, "Thank goodness there was a far-sighted Government that organised developments in these areas along those lines." That is what people will say in a few years' time. They will be proud of the developments.

I was amazed to hear the honourable member for Callide speak about the way in which Keith Williams got his land. I have been to that area. As I travelled past the island next to Keith Williams's island somebody said to me, "That is in the hands of private enterprise." If that person wants to do what Keith Williams has done, he is at liberty to go up there and try to buy that island. It ill behoves people to try to cast aspersions, as the member for Callide did.

Queensland will be proud of the developments, and they will not be socialist developments, as some people would have us believe. The corporation will not be involved in the day-to-day management of tourist facilities. All the Government is trying to do in this Bill is help private enterprise to put a package together so that more jobs can be created through development in many parts of Queensland. I move—

“That the question be now put.”

Motion agreed to.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. Mr Row, I rose to a point of order before you put the question. The Minister's attitude is typical of the treatment that Opposition members have been given all afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 7 (Sir William Knox's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 58		NOES, 6	
Ahern	Lingard	Knox	
Alison	Littleproud	Lee	
Austin	Mackenroth	Lickiss	
Booth	McElligott	White	
Borbridge	McKechnie		
Burns	McPhie		
Cahill	Menzel		
Chapman	Milliner		
Comben	Muntz		
Cooper	Newton		
D'Arcy	Palaszczuk		
Davis	Randell		
DeLacy	Shaw		
Eaton	Simpson		
Elliott	Smith		
FitzGerald	Stephan		
Fouras	Stoneman		
Gibbs, I. J.	Tenni		
Gibbs, R. J.	Turner		
Glasson	Underwood		
Goleby	Vaughan		
Goss	Veivers		
Gunn	Warner, A. M.		
Hamill	Wharton		
Harper	Wilson		
Harvey	Yewdale		
Henderson			
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Kruger	Kaus	Gygar	
Lester	Neal	Innes	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 7, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 55		NOES, 6	
Ahern	Lingard	Knox	
Alison	Littleproud	Lee	
Austin	Mackenroth	Lickiss	
Booth	McElligott	White	
Borbidge	McKechnie		
Cahill	McPhie		
Chapman	Menzel		
Comben	Milliner		
Cooper	Muntz		
D'Arcy	Newton		
Davis	Palaszczuk		
De Lacy	Randell		
Eaton	Shaw		
Elliott	Simpson		
FitzGerald	Smith		
Fouras	Stephan		
Gibbs, I. J.	Stoneman		
Gibbs, R. J.	Tenni		
Glasson	Turner		
Goleby	Underwood		
Goss	Vaughan		
Gunn	Veivers		
Hamill	Wharton		
Harper	Wilson		
Harvey			
Henderson			
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Kruger	Kaus	Innes	
Lester	Neal	Gygar	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 8—Amendment of s. 14; Powers to discharge functions—

Mr UNDERWOOD (8.46 p.m.): As the clause is one of the two most important aspects of the Bill, the Opposition moves the following amendment—

“At page 3, line 15, omit the words—
‘in fee simple’.”

As has been outlined on a number of occasions during the debate, the legislation deals with prime, world-class tourist sites that are the heritage of today's Queenslanders and of Queenslanders to come. The Labor Party can see no good reason why the land tenure of these sites should be changed to freehold, which would basically take them out of the control of the people of the State. Whether or not they be on former national parks or other types of Crown land, the State already has many, many tourist resorts on leasehold tenure. Admittedly some tourist resorts hold a freehold title. One of the closest resorts to the Brisbane area is Tangalooma, and it is on leasehold land. In fact, for the Government to freehold the land for these resorts is contrary to the policy of the Lands Department.

A Government Member: No, it is not.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Is the honourable member who interjected the Minister or the head of the department? If he is, that information came from his own Lands Department.

The Opposition has already canvassed some of the problems that can arise from the freeholding of this land. I will assume for the purposes of argument that these projects will fail or proceed at a snail's pace. The Minister has already mentioned that the resorts require an overall management plan for the development of tourism in their particular regions. Once the land has been converted to freehold tenure, by the very nature of the definition of “freehold”, the land can be used for any purpose. Other tourist operations could be substituted for the original resort. Some developments could be a hazard to the environment and conflict with surrounding development. Businesses other than tourism could be developed on the land. They are just three types of

development that could be conflicting and detrimental to the tourist region involved and to those already in business in the region. Honourable members should not forget that local authority town plans are involved in the overall management plans for these resorts.

Proper development was supposed to take place at Mr Iwasaki's resort. I refer again to an article by Meredith Chaplin, which I mentioned earlier in the debate. She said—

“A shock is in store for those arriving at the resort site expecting well-equipped motels, a golf course, attractive landscaping and recreation facilities.

Instead, there are bulldozer tracks through sand isolated and empty accommodation buildings—one of which has all the visual impact of a prison farm building—a few piles of building materials and not much else.”

That was to be one of the State's prime tourist resorts, but it has not eventuated. Imagine how little control the Government would have if that land were converted to freehold title. I raise again the question that the Minister has not yet answered—that Mr Iwasaki can still freehold his land by doing a deal with the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Various Crown lands and national parks can be deregulated and used for mining. It might be unlikely, but it is feasible. A developer can say, “Right, we are going to put a large complex in this area. There is a valuable asset under the ground, and it will not matter if we mine it first and then build.” That could be one way of mining part of a national park.

Mr McKechnie interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I did not say it was a probability; it is a possibility.

Mr McKechnie: It is against the Act.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Against which Act?

Mr McKechnie: Don't worry. Carry on.

Mr UNDERWOOD: It cannot be done in a national park?

Mr McKechnie: Of course it can't.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right. The Government merely allows the national park to revert to vacant Crown land, and then grants a mining lease. That is what will happen if the Government grants freehold title to tourist resorts in or on the edge of a national park. The Minister obviously does not understand the Act.

Mr McKechnie: We are not talking about freeholding a national park.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Where is that set out in the Bill?

The Minister holds the record for the annexation of national parks.

Mr McKechnie interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Exactly. The Government has the numbers in this Chamber and it can force the issue, just as it has done on many previous occasions. The Minister does not understand the Act or the ramifications of the Bill.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I suggest that the honourable member return to the Bill.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I was answering an interjection from the Minister.

It is quite clear that once again the Minister does not understand the legislation, let alone the industry. He does not understand how a national park is deregulated and what can happen to it once it becomes vacant Crown land.

I will conclude by dealing with the safeguards to protect the heritage of Queensland from being sold off as freehold land. None other than the member for Fassifern said in the debate at the second-reading stage—

“I disagree with the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox). Freehold title cannot be given to vacant Crown land. Therefore, it is necessary for the QTTC to retain a measure of equity and control over the Crown land. The immediate aim is to provide tourist facilities of international standards at places such as Magnetic Island, Shute Harbour and Port Douglas in north Queensland.”

The very definition of “freehold title” is that the Government does not have control unless it introduces specific legislation to amend the Land Act.

The Liberal Party also wants to give away Crown land holus bolus, and Queenslanders will get absolutely nothing. It is a sell-out by the Liberal Party and a sell-out by the Government in return for some recompense that has not yet been outlined. Government members have used the usual jingoistic clichés and referred to jobs, jobs and more jobs and making heaps of money for Queensland, but all it has done is introduce legislation without adequate protection for the people of Queensland or the operations of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Mr EATON: I am greatly concerned about the new subsection (4). I have attempted to help a large number of young Queenslanders who have applied for Crown land, usually small parcels of State forest or vacant Crown land, to add to their farms to make them viable. But on each occasion they have been knocked back.

This legislation, which the Government says will benefit the Tourist and Travel Corporation, is really giving the opportunity for long-term benefit to people who will be able to make a quick buck by acquiring land that is otherwise unobtainable. If those people develop a tourist project, they can then apply to freehold the land. Once that occurs they can go into liquidation and so end up in the position where they can demand in some instances up to millions of dollars through the sale of that land.

I point out to the Government that the Opposition is not opposed to the intent of the Bill. Opposition members would love nothing better than for this legislation to work because, if it does, Queenslanders will benefit. But we are afraid of the regulations, particularly when the provisions of clause 8 come into effect.

I will cite one example of what can happen, and the Minister can check the details through his department. Many years ago in Tully an application was made to develop a tea-growing project on Crown land. The developers were given the Crown land conditional upon their carrying out certain developments. They said they wanted more finance and, to obtain that finance, they said that they needed to freehold the land. They went to the Government and said that they had begun to carry out improvements and that they intended to employ a qualified person from overseas who would be a great help to the project. I might add that a large number of people in north Queensland at the time were in favour of the project.

The developers received freehold title to that land. Suddenly it was found that the area was not suitable for growing tea or anything else. Officially, they did not find out until later that that land was not suitable for growing tea. If those people had been given a title in perpetuity, they would have been forced to carry on growing tea or return the land to the Government. That is the type of provision that the Opposition would like to see written into the Bill. In that way, the title of the land would be protected for all Queenslanders. It is not my land or the Minister's land; it is the land of the State, and the Government is the custodian of that land.

Opposition members have seen what has happened in the past, and that causes us great concern. As I have said, land was given to people for growing tea. A few years ago it was cut up into 5, 10, 15 and 20-acre blocks and sold for more than \$1,000 an acre. Originally, the title to the land was granted for a few shillings an acre.

Mr Jennings: We are not as stupid as that. That is in the Bill.

Mr EATON: The honourable member can check out what I am saying. The Lands Department will be only too willing to verify what I have said.

I now refer to King Ranch. Probably no company has done a better developmental job in Queensland than King Ranch. It has turned a few thousand acres of State forest into some of the best grazing land in Australia. I know that the company has been offered millions of dollars for the land. King Ranch obtained that land in bits and pieces. The member for Southport can check out these figures. Under the original agreement, the company was allowed to freehold 24 000 acres and the other 24 000 acres was leasehold. What happened? Because the company did such a good job, the Government granted it a little bit more leasehold land. It then freeholded that land. It now has more than 48 000 acres freeholded. Every few years, the Government gave King Ranch a bit more land. It felled the rain-forest and developed the land. It did a great job. As I say, it is some of the best grazing land in Australia.

Every year thousands of young Queenslanders are writing to the Government asking for a bit of land on which to grow bananas or to engage in dairying. The Government that is including this clause in the Bill tonight is saying to those young people, "It is Crown land. It is not available." When the Government is approached by certain big companies, it can make land available. That is not doing the right thing by young Queenslanders. They deserve the same opportunity. Government members can check out the facts and figures that I have mentioned.

The Minister would be aware of what has happened in the Kennedy Bay area. Under this legislation, the Tourist and Travel Corporation could find itself in a bit of a bind and be short of money. The legislation provides that the corporation can go to the Government and apply for land. It does not matter whether it is State forest, vacant Crown land or national park. The corporation then enters into a partnership. The other partner could say, "You do that bit. That will be your equity. We will put in \$1m." The corporation would get title to the land; the other party would put in the money. If the corporation gets into trouble again, the other party could buy out the corporation and receive full title to that freehold land.

These days, big companies carry out big developments and make big profits; but when they get into trouble, they go bankrupt and owe large amounts of money. All honourable members remember the collapse of the Reid Murray Corporation years ago, when millions of pounds disappeared. Those people tried to blame a computer for the disappearance of the money. The amount involved was \$16m. Today, that would be equal to \$100m. That sort of money just does not disappear overnight. Even now, nobody knows where that money went.

Problems can arise, and I am sure that in some areas they will arise. The Opposition hopes that what it is suggesting here tonight will not happen. It is right behind the intent of the Bill, because Queensland can only benefit from it.

If I may comment again on the Kennedy Bay region—I am sure that the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing are aware that 60 per cent of the shire is unrateable and that the council is trying to service the local authority area and give the rate-payers value for money.

A company saw the opportunity to gain freehold land at Kennedy Bay. Not only is it a beautiful piece of land; it is also of historic value. The company was prepared to give the local authority large sums of money if the Government would give the company freehold title to the land. Because the Government did not act very quickly, the company went broke. Had the Government acted quickly, it would have found itself in a bind when the company that had freehold title to the land went through the bankruptcy court. The land would have been up for auction and a subsidiary company of the company

that went broke could have been in a position to buy that land and scrap all of the projects that had been proposed.

The point that I bring home to the Minister is that he is the caretaker and watchdog for the people of Queensland in relation to land-holders. I hope that the intent of the Bill is carried out and that it is successful. However, I draw attention to these anomalies because they could bring the Government down, especially if it becomes involved in scandals involving large amounts of money.

Mr LICKISS: Clause 8 amends section 14 of the Act, which deals with power to discharge functions. Before clause 8 can be dealt with adequately, a review of the functions of the corporation must be made.

Let me say at the outset that the Liberal Party opposes the amendment moved by the Labor Opposition. I take this opportunity to speak lest the Minister, in his usual style, applies the gag.

An Opposition Member: You have a suspicious mind.

Mr LICKISS: My suspicions are adequately founded.

Firstly, the functions of the corporation must be considered. In his second-reading speech, the Minister referred to clause 7, which enlarges the functions of the corporation in this way—

“Clause 7 of the Bill, therefore, provides for a minor change in the functions of the corporation to allow this course to proceed.”

The Minister said *inter alia*—

“I mentioned to the House that the State Government is prepared to transfer selected parcels of Crown land to the corporation so that it may proceed to encourage private sector developers and financiers to complete these prime international resorts.”

That is the minor amendment in clause 7 to which the Minister referred.

I turn my attention now to the functions of the corporation as provided for in section 13 of the principal Act. That section reads as follows—

“13. Functions of Corporation. (1) The functions of the Corporation are—

- (a) to promote and market tourism and travel;
- (b) to make tourism and travel arrangements;
- (c) to provide tourism and travel information services;
- (d) to encourage the development of the tourist and travel industry;
- (e) to advise the Minister on matters relating to the foregoing paragraphs that are referred to the Corporation by the Minister for advice.”

The section then details subsections 2 and 3.

By virtue of the so-called minor amendment to the Bill that the Committee just carried, a subclause has been added in these terms—

“(e) to engage or participate in tourist or travel ventures or developmental projects;”

It was an understatement for the Minister to refer to that as a minor amendment. It adds a completely new dimension to the powers and authority of the tourist corporation. It enables the corporation, for the first time, to involve itself in a commercial enterprise in relation to development of the tourist industry by owning or having an equity interest in bricks and mortar in competition with others who also participate in that industry.

In the debate on the earlier clause, the Minister stated that the corporation would not be allowed to raise money. If that is so, why does he see fit to include in the Bill clause 8, which amends section 14 and is headed “Powers to discharge functions”?

Obviously the Minister believes that the functions of the corporation must extend beyond the mere allocation of Crown land to the Tourist and Travel Corporation to allow it to establish its equity. He believes that its functions extend to the means by which the corporation is allowed to move outside the ordinary budgetary arrangement and, subject to Treasury control and Loan Council rules, raise money by a method that, prior to the passing of this Bill, could not be adopted. I wonder whether that is a minor amendment in terms of petty cash or one that will enable the corporation to raise millions of dollars so that it will have an equity interest in tourist enterprises.

I want to know how the corporation will secure its equity by virtue of having Crown land handed to it for investment in a project. Will it take in shares or by way of a mortgage the value of Crown land to be allocated to a particular site development? How will it secure that equity interest? I suggest that, if a public company or a private company is involved, it will have to secure its equity by way of equity shares. If it obtains equity shares, will it require a seat on the board of the public company? What will happen in the normal thrust and parry of corporation management? Will the corporation become part and parcel of take-over arrangements involving other public companies? Will other public companies approach the interest in which the corporation is involved in an attempt to take over that interest? Will the corporation become another SGIO? It was not established in the same way as the SGIO was established. The SGIO is an investment corporation that deals with premiums, the funds of the policy-holders. That is a different situation altogether.

The corporation was not set up to do other than what I mentioned in the first instance in relation to its functions and powers. However, that dimension has been widely extended. It has a new perspective. It seems that clause 8 is designed to enable Crown land to be handed to the corporation and, in turn, to be handed, in whatever form, on to the development in order to establish the corporation's equity. The clause is designed also to enable the corporation to engage in fund-raising and to extend beyond the budgetary restrictions that were imposed previously. I wonder whether time will prove that the corporation will be able to move into fund-raising.

It is appropriate that I say these few words to the Minister: When he found that he could not attack the argument put forward by the members of the Liberal Party, he decided to play the old game of attacking the person. I suppose that I am the third-longest or fourth-longest serving member, and I have seen that game played many times. By playing that game, the Minister has not enhanced his stature.

There is also an old saying that those who are to be admired are those who can accept victory with modesty and defeat with dignity. Tonight the Minister has demonstrated quite clearly that he has accepted victory with arrogance. Arrogance rides before a fall.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr LICKISS: Time will tell. We are not political opportunists. We try to stand by our principles.

Having witnessed today something that I have not witnessed very often in the last 21 years, I wonder whether some intense hatred is being developed by our erstwhile friends.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr LICKISS: I am just asking questions. I am not saying that the honourable member is doing that; I hope that he is not. The members of the Liberal Party do not bear any such feelings towards the honourable member.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I suggest that the honourable member return to the clause.

Mr LICKISS: I accept your ruling, but I thought that, as the Minister was given latitude to attack members of the Liberal Party, I would at least have the right of reply.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I think that the honourable member is reflecting on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw that statement. I have not allowed the Minister any latitude. No member in this Chamber will be given any latitude while I am in the chair.

Mr LICKISS: Mr Randell, I will withdraw it if you believe that I am reflecting on the Chair. However, I do not think that I reflected on the Chair.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to withdraw his statement.

Mr LICKISS: I withdraw it.

During the course of the debate the Minister reflected on the party that I represent in this Chamber. Surely, in fairness, one ought to be able to answer those statements. I say no more.

Liberal members oppose the amendment to clause 8 that was moved by the Opposition. In the future, the so-called simple extensions will manifest themselves in greatness and cause the Government a great deal of embarrassment.

Mr VEIVERS: It is about time that the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party was exposed.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I mean hypocrisy, and its two bob each way——

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I ask the honourable member to speak to the clause.

Mr VEIVERS: I will. I am referring to the powers to discharge functions.

Today, we have heard a great deal from the honourable member for Sherwood. I will now refer to the debate on the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Bill that took place in this Chamber on 17 April 1979. The following report appears in "Hansard"—

"Mr INNES: The conclusion is simply that I support the Bill. I share the reservations that have been expressed relative to the personnel who will fulfil the directorship, and I believe that the personnel must reflect the full extent of the tourist industry over the length and breadth of Queensland and not be concentrated only in the south-east corner."

How did the member for Sherwood vote this afternoon? Honourable members can talk about two bob each way! I have referred to the original debate on the Bill that appears in "Hansard". It refers to the powers and functions of the corporation.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member does not speak to this clause, I will ask him to resume his seat.

Mr VEIVERS: I am referring to the powers to discharge functions. I wish to refer to speeches made by members during the debate on the original Bill. I should like now to refer to some comments made by Sir William Knox. I also wish to refer to some comments made by Mr Peter White. I understand that he is the present Federal Liberal member for McPherson. In 1979 he was the member for Southport. Before I refer to his comments concerning those powers and functions, I wish to refer to comments made by the member for Nundah when he referred to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Bill as being non-socialist in concept. I believe that Mr Peter White was a member of the Minister's committee.

In "Hansard" on 17 April 1979, Mr Peter White, who was speaking about the powers to discharge functions, said—

"I have two reservations about the measure. One is that it provides yet another statutory authority in this State. The other is that to a certain extent it competes

with private enterprise. However, no legislation is perfect. Nothing that can be produced satisfies everybody. Although I have reservations on those two grounds, I am quite convinced that the great advantages this Bill will bring to the tourist industry in Queensland will far outweigh the disadvantages of another statutory authority and an element of competition with private enterprise."

I raise the point because the Liberal Party is trying to have the best of both worlds. It is grandstanding. Statements by members of the Liberal Party are proof of all that I am saying, and I hope that the media takes note.

I make two further comments on the Minister's second-reading speech. At one stage he said—

"In each case it is intended that the project will be advertised seeking expressions of interest, after which the basic conditions will be laid down, including the corporation's commitment and/or percentage equity involvement in the venture by way of the contribution of land and public tenders then called where applicable."

I ask the Minister: What conditions? We do not know anything about conditions. That is a very grey area, and has been the subject of a great deal of discussion.

Another comment made by the Minister in his second-reading speech was—

"It is also expected that in some cases the conversion of certain sections of some properties to freehold will be considered, based on specific development works being completed and in operation for a period of years."

Again I ask the Minister: What are the specific development works referred to, and by whom will they be undertaken? That is what the Opposition has been attacking in this Parliament this afternoon.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: This clause has to be considered in the context of the amendment to clause 7 that has been approved by this Committee. I think the Minister said that the corporation will not borrow money. He can correct me if I misheard him. I ask the Minister: Is that right?

Mr McKechnie: I said that the corporation would not be putting tax-payers' money at risk.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Whatever the actual words were, I am sure the Minister will correct it. At page 3, clause 8 states—

"For the purpose of discharging its functions and exercising its powers, the Corporation is empowered to enter into financial arrangements within the meaning of the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangement Act 1982. . ."

Let me explain what that means and how big the corporation would become. I refer honourable member to the definition section of the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982. "Financial arrangements" covers the following matters—and I think it is worth setting them out in full—

"'financial arrangements' means arrangements that provide for, relate to or are directed towards—

- (a) the borrowing of money, the raising of money or the obtaining of all forms of financial accommodation in Australia or elsewhere, including by the issue of debentures, bonds, inscribed stock and other securities;
- (b) the lending of money;
- (c) the entering into and performance of deferred payment arrangements as debtor or creditor;
- (d) the undertaking of leases of any term whatsoever of land, buildings, plant, machinery, equipment and any other property as lessee, lessor, owner or tenant;
- (e) the entering into partnerships and ventures and the formation of companies;"—

that illustrates how big the corporation could become—

"(f) the acquisition, holding, dealing with and disposal of—

- (i) shares in any body corporate, company debentures, bonds, stock and other securities including debentures, bonds, inscribed stock and other securities issued by the statutory body itself;
- (ii) land, buildings, plant, machinery, equipment and any other property and any interest thereon or charge in respect thereto; and

- (iii) foreign currency,
and the incurring and performance obligations concerning foreign currency;
- (g) the taking of land or any interest in land;
- (h) the acceptance of money on deposit;
- (i) the entering into of covenants, undertakings, arrangements, promises, guarantees and indemnities to meet obligations or liabilities incurred by or to any person, whether or not that person is a party to the covenants, undertakings, arrangements, promises, guarantees and indemnities;
- (j) the entering into of arrangements directed at the granting of financial accommodation by or to any person whether or not the person is a party to the arrangements;
- (k) the entering into of purchase obligations as purchaser or sale obligations as seller, to purchase or sell, as the case may, be any output or other product of any kind whatsoever,
- (l) the investment of moneys,
and any other arrangements of a financial nature approved by the Treasurer . . .”

That indicates the magnitude of the corporation that the Government is creating under this clause. The corporation will be quite enormous and will have tremendous powers, which few bodies in this State have. Although the Liberal Party has made its stand in relation to the absolute charter of the corporation, when one looks at that change in the charter and at the powers that will be given to it under the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982, one sees that the Government is certainly creating one of the biggest quangos the State has ever had.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I want to know why the Liberal Party has not defended itself against the serious challenge from the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers), who exposed the member for Sherwood as having totally reversed his position since the Bill was introduced. He also exposed the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox), who said that when the legislation was first introduced it was a free enterprise Bill, yet the leader of the Liberal Party who spoke in the debate back in 1979 said that it was not a free enterprise Bill. Let the members of the Liberal Party stand and deny what is contained in “Hansard” That exposes the members of the Liberal Party for the hypocrites that they are and shows how they are twisting their positions to try to score a few cheap points.

Mr McKECHNIE: The point that has to be made about the amendment before the Committee is that these powers fulfil those previously contained in sections 41 to 48 of the Act, which the Bill repeals. The Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982 was brought in to standardise the financial arrangements of all statutory authorities. That is included to give power to discharge the functions as per the amendment to section 13.

In relation to what the leader of the Liberal Party was saying—what he did not read out was subsections (3) and (4) of section 22 of the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act, which state—

“(3) Before entering into negotiations for financial arrangements a statutory body shall obtain the sanction of the Treasurer and for that purpose shall furnish to the Treasurer such information as he requires.

(4) A statutory body shall not enter into financial arrangements without the approval of the Governor in Council first had and obtained, on such terms and conditions, if any, as the Governor in Council thinks fit.”

Sir William Knox: I read all that out.

Mr McKECHNIE: I have read it again.

In reply to the honourable member for Mourilyan—some of the safeguards that he is looking for are contained in those subsections.

The Government will look very carefully at each and every application for the freeholding of the land. It will not be entered into lightly. I accept that the honourable member for Mourilyan is genuine in his concern, but I think he is wrong. He should not worry about people and companies wanting to freehold land, because that is the only true ownership of land.

I can understand that Opposition members are worried about legislation of this sort because of their experiences with ACTU-Solo and Bourke's Store, which went broke. I assure them that the proposed developments will be a great success. Some of them may be freeholded in part or in whole. That will depend on what is appropriate and what is the best for the people of Queensland.

Mr Eaton: Once it is freeholded, you lose all control over the land.

Mr McKECHNIE: All I am saying is that the ALP has an in-built fear of freehold. We on this side of the Committee do not have such a fear.

Mr Eaton interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: I know that the honourable member has cited a number of instances in which problems have occurred, but I can cite a number of instances in which people have gone broke because they have been too scared to spend money to develop leasehold land. In my electorate freeholding has led to smaller properties, not larger ones, because people are often removed from the restrictions imposed by the Lands Department, market forces take over and more people are able to enjoy the wealth of the country by owning their own land. I repeat that the Opposition has a hang-up about freeholding. I do not accept that amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 8 (Mr Underwood's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 40		NOES, 24	
Ahern	Lester	Burns	
Alison	Lickiss	Comben	
Austin	Lingard	D'Arcy	
Booth	Littleproud	De Lacy	
Borbidge	McKechnie	Eaton	
Chapman	McPhie	Fouras	
Cooper	Menzel	Gibbs	
Elliott	Muntz	Goss	
FitzGerald	Newton	Hamill	
Gibbs	Row	Kruger	
Glasson	Stephan	Mackenroth	
Goleby	Stoneman	McElligott	
Gunn	Tenni	McLean	
Gygar	Turner	Milliner	
Harper	Wharton	Shaw	
Harvey	White	Smith	
Henderson		Underwood	
Jennings		Vaughan	
Kaus		Veivers	
Knox	<i>Tellers:</i>	Warner, A. M.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lane	Neal	Wilson	Davis
Lee	Simpson	Yewdale	Palaszcuk

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 and 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

INDUSTRIAL (COMMERCIAL PRACTICES) BILL

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to make provision with respect to conduct injurious to trade or business and protection of the supply or acquisition of goods or services and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (9.38 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to curb secondary boycotts against traders and interference with trade and commerce. It has been made necessary by the actions of the Federal Government in repealing the secondary boycotts legislation of the Trade Practices Act.

The Hawke Labor Government is greatly in debt to the union movement and the ACTU for its election in March 1983. The Labor Party gave all sorts of promises to the union movement before its election and, since then, the unions have been extracting their pound of flesh. Ever since that infamous day in March 1983, the unions have been calling in their markers and the Labor Government has been succumbing to their every demand.

Many of the unions' gains have been achieved under the guise of the accord. That wicked document, written by the union movement in most elastic language, is capable of satisfying almost any demand that the unions might make on the Government. The unions have made demands and they will continue to make them, regardless of the ability of this country to pay.

One of the promises that the Hawke Government made to the unions, which it is now in the process of fulfilling, is the repeal of sections 45D and 45E of the Trade Practices Act. These sections have had a strong, sobering effect on militant unions and have discouraged trade unions from boycotting businesses—innocent parties to industrial disputes—and bringing them to the verge of bankruptcy.

The Hawke Government invited public submissions on sections 45D and 45E. It received them, and the overwhelming view of the business community and the major employer organisations was that the sections should be retained.

Many of the businessmen who pleaded for the retention of the boycott legislation were the same people or organisations who attended the National Economic Summit Conference organised by Mr Hawke soon after his election. They were lauded on that occasion for their understanding of industrial relations and the need for consensus. Now that the honeymoon is over, they are told that they do not understand industrial relations, and their views are ignored. When it comes to choosing between the demands of the left-wing unions and employer interests, the Hawke Labor Government will succumb to union pressure every time. So much for consensus!

The Hawke Government passed legislation through the House of Representatives repealing sections 45D and 45E of the Trade Practices Act. The intention was to replace such legislation with provisions under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act applicable

to Federal unions and Federal awards. I am happy to say that tonight such legislation was defeated in the Senate. However, it is important that the Queensland Government have the legislation in place in case a future Federal Government wishes to bring in such iniquitous legislation. Queensland is leading the rest of Australia and will be ready should the Federal Government move to repeal certain sections of the Trade Practices Act.

The proposed Federal legislation would have exposed substantial areas of business to attack from union strikes and boycotts. The Queensland Government will not sit idly by and allow business to be attacked unjustifiably, in many cases as a result of disputes that have nothing to do with them. They will have their right to a day in court, and the unions that cause the damage will have to pay.

The Bill proposes to introduce the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act 1984, which is designed to replace if necessary or to operate concurrently with sections 45D and 45E and related sections of the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act.

The Bill prohibits the interference in the supply or acquisition of goods or services and conduct by a person alone or in concert with another for the purpose of interference with a person's right to engage in trade or commerce.

Additionally, the Bill will prohibit a contract, arrangement or understanding between a union and another person to prevent or hinder the supply of goods or services to a third person, or the acquisition of goods or services from that third person. These provisions apply only where the second person is accustomed or under an obligation to supply or to acquire the goods or services.

The Bill provides a limited defence to any proceedings which might be brought. A person or a union is not regarded to have contravened the Act where the dominant purpose of conduct engaged in is substantially related to remuneration, conditions of employment, etc., of the persons engaged in such conduct.

The expressions "remuneration", "conditions of employment", etc., do not include certain issues related to superannuation schemes or various union membership issues, except where such membership is a condition of a contract of employment.

Persons and associations acting contrary to the legislation will be liable to be brought before the Supreme Court of Queensland. That court will have the power to grant restrictive or mandatory injunctions. Provision is made that, where the court considers it desirable to do so, it may grant an interim injunction pending the determination of any application for an injunction.

The court will also be empowered, upon the application of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs or of any party to the proceeding, to order the stay of operation of an injunction. This could occur where proceedings are pending in another court or tribunal, including the Industrial Commission of Queensland.

The pecuniary penalties prescribed in the Bill for contravention of the provisions mirror the penalties presently applicable in the Federal Trade Practices Act.

Where a person has been involved in a contravention of the provisions, the Supreme Court will be empowered to order the person to pay to the Minister, for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, a pecuniary penalty not exceeding—

\$50,000 in the case of an individual; or

\$250,000 in the case of an association of persons.

Those penalties are the same as those in the Federal legislation.

A person who suffers loss or damage as a result of interference with supply or acquisition of goods or services will be able to recover damages by common law action.

The Government considers that the Bill will have a deterrent effect on irresponsible actions made against innocent businesses caught up in disputes which are not of their own making.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr McLean, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9.47 p.m.