

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 21 AUGUST 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 21 AUGUST 1985

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

PRIVILEGE**Appointment of Member for Mount Gravatt to the Council of Griffith University**

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (11.1 a.m.): I rise on a point of privilege in accordance with Standing Order No. 46 of this House, which clearly states—

“An urgent Motion, directly concerning the privileges of the House, shall take precedence of other Motions as well as of Orders of the Day.”

Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the Queensland Government Gazette of 19 January 1985—

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I recognise the member for Mackay.

Mr CASEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to the Queensland Government Gazette of 19 January of this year, No. 18, at page 151, a copy of which I now table.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

In that Government Gazette, it will be seen that Ian Henderson, MLA, was appointed by the Governor in Council, to the Council of the Griffith University in pursuance of the provisions of section 8 (1) (g) of the Griffith University Act.

Mr Speaker, I further draw your attention to section 8 (1) (g) of that Act, which simply states—

“six members appointed by the Governor in Council”

That is unlike the provision in the University of Queensland Act, which deliberately specifies that two members of the Legislative Assembly may be members of the Senate of the University of Queensland.

I further draw attention to section 7A (1) of the Legislative Assembly Act as amended in 1978, a copy of which I will make available. It states—

“A member of the Assembly is not eligible to accept or hold any office or place of profit under the Crown or any position of the prescribed description.”

Section 7C (1) of the Act states—

“If at any time it is resolved by the Assembly that any position of the prescribed description should be one to which section 7A (1) shall not apply, the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, specify that position accordingly.”

Section 7C (5) indicates that such orders are to be held by the Clerk of the Parliament. No such resolution has been carried by this House.

The Government has had a full session of the Parliament to enact its own law regarding the Order in Council of 17 January 1985, as gazetted on 19 January 1985, relative to the appointment of Ian Henderson. As I say, no resolution has been passed by this Chamber and no Order in Council has been made. The Government does not obey the rules of its own Parliament. It has a complete and callous disregard for the rules and conventions of Parliament.

The privileges of this Parliament have been breached. The member for Mount Gravatt is not entitled to be present in this Chamber today. Therefore, on a point of privilege, I move—

“That, in accordance with section 7B (2) of the Legislative Assembly Act, the seat of the member for Mount Gravatt shall become vacant forthwith.”

Mr HENDERSON: I rise to a point of order.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I point out to honourable members that this is not a good start to the session.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I assure honourable members that I will take the appropriate action, and I mean it.

Mr HENDERSON: I rise to a point of order. How could a position for which no money is received be an office of profit under the Crown?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable member for Mackay moved a motion?

Mr CASEY: Yes. I moved—

“That, in accordance with section 7B (2) of the Legislative Assembly Act, the seat of the member for Mount Gravatt shall become vacant forthwith.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is there a seconder for the motion?

Mr BURNS (Lytton): I second the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I shall put the question.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I rise to a point of order. I wish to speak to the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have put the question.

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

AYES, 30		NOES, 49	
Braddy	Wilson	Ahern	Lee
Burns	Yewdale	Alison	Lester
Campbell		Austin	Lickiss
Casey		Bailey	Lingard
Comben		Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud
D'Arcy		Booth	McKechnie
De Lacy		Borbidge	McPhie
Eaton		Cahill	Menzel
Fouras		Chapman	Miller
Goss		Cooper	Muntz
Hamill		Elliott	Newton
Kruger		FitzGerald	Powell
Mackenroth		Gibbs, I J.	Randell
McElligott		Glasson	Row
McLean		Goleby	Simpson
Milliner		Gunn	Stephan
Palaszczuk		Gygar	Stoneman
Price		Harper	Tenni
Scott		Harvey	Turner
Shaw		Henderson	Wharton
Smith		Hinze	White
Underwood		Innes	
Vaughan		Jennings	
Veivers	<i>Tellers—</i>	Katter	<i>Tellers—</i>
Warburton	Davis	Knox	Kaus
Warner, A. M.	Prest	Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

PAPERS PRINTED DURING RECESS

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that the following papers were ordered to be printed and circulated during the recess—

Reports—

Department of Works 1983-84

Commissioner for Water Resources 1983-84.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE**Death of Mr E. J. Beardmore, MBE**

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.15 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“(1) That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Edwin James Beardmore, MBE, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland.

(2) That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained.”

Edwin James Beardmore served in this Assembly from 3 August 1957 until his retirement on 17 May 1969.

Eddie Beardmore, in his quiet, unassuming way, as all honourable members know, had a considerable impact in this House and was a tireless worker for the electorate of Balonne, which he represented so faithfully.

Born in Victoria in 1891, he moved to Queensland in 1914 as a stock-dealer at St George and lived the remainder of his life in that area of the State. He served on the Balonne Shire Council for 15 years and was its deputy chairman for eight years. Politics and the desire to help others were in Eddie Beardmore's blood, one might say, and, in fact, when he entered Parliament it was a case of like father, like son. His father, Mr Henry Beardmore, was a member of the Victorian Legislative Assembly many years earlier.

It was a real tragedy when, in 1969, Eddie Beardmore was seriously injured in a car accident, as many honourable members will recall, and was forced to retire from the House. But, although the accident impeded his movements, it did not affect his sharp and agile mind. The old desire to help others still burnt brightly. He continued to give to people as much assistance as was humanly possible. He was, like so many of his generation, a very straightforward man.

Eddie Beardmore was succeeded by the late Harold Hungerford, and since 1972 his place in this Chamber has been filled by our colleague Don Neal, who I am sure joins with me in this very sincere tribute.

I am certain that members on both sides of the House wish to join with me in this motion of condolence for a man who selflessly served his constituents and this State.

Proof of Eddie Beardmore's untiring work for the people of the Balonne area can be seen in the numerous streets, hospitals and schools that are named in his honour. The most notable of those projects is, of course, the E. J. Beardmore Dam.

In 1971 he was honoured with life membership of the National Party and in June 1973 Eddie Beardmore's community service was most fittingly recognised when he was awarded an MBE.

This most respected member of State Parliament was also something of a poet, and posterity will remember him through his "Book of Ballads", which was published in 1974. That publication contains all of the very interesting writings of Eddie Beardmore.

All honourable members know that Eddie Beardmore was one of the most interesting story-tellers to have entered this Chamber. One of his stories has stuck with me. He told me that one afternoon he came home from mustering sheep all day. His wife said to him, "Dad, I have a job for you" Young John was then a small boy; today he is more than six feet tall. She said, "John is under the house where the floor-boards almost touch the ground. Dad, go under there and get him out. He has to be chastised. He has been a very naughty boy. I could not catch him before he went under the house." Eddie described how he got down on his stomach, wriggled and crawled until he was close to John. John turned to his father and said, "What, Dad, is she after you also?" That was typical of the many stories that Eddie told. They are legion.

I am indeed saddened at Eddie Beardmore's passing. On behalf of the Government of Queensland, I extend my deepest sympathy and that of my colleagues to the members of his family on the occasion of such a sad loss.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.20 a.m.): I second the motion moved by the Premier and Treasurer to express sympathy to the family of the late Edwin James Beardmore.

In August 1957, in the election that saw the defeat of the Gair Government, Edwin Beardmore was elected to Parliament. Like many past and present members of the Queensland Parliament, his move into politics came as a natural extension of his service to local government and to the community. For 15 years, Edwin Beardmore was a member of the Balonne Shire Council, and during that period he spent eight years as deputy chairman.

The 1957 election saw Edwin Beardmore defeat the sitting Labor member, John Taylor, by a small margin. The substantial increase in his vote at succeeding elections reflected the attention that Mr Beardmore paid to the problems of his constituents.

Edwin Beardmore was a proud rural Queenslander. He fought hard for the men and women who made their homes away from the amenities available to city folk. In 1957, when Mr Beardmore took his seat in Parliament, not one school in the Balonne electorate had a secondary department. Only a few fortunate children had a hope of continuing beyond primary school, because many parents could not afford to send their youngsters to boarding school. Within 10 years, not only were there six secondary schools in that electorate but also eight new primary schools were provided in the remote areas of the electorate of Balonne.

Mr Beardmore once told Parliament that a love of the land cannot be acquired; it is something that people are born with. His own love of the land and country people was nurtured by a lifelong association with rural Australia.

In his early twenties, Edwin Beardmore worked on Dunlop Station on the Darling River. A year later he took charge of 32 000 Dunlop agistment sheep that were en route to the St George district.

The association of the Beardmore family with the Balonne area went back to the late 1850s, when a great uncle, G. O. Beardmore, settled at "Cooroorah" on the Moonie River. It was not surprising, therefore, that, in 1921, Eddie Beardmore chose to purchase a St George property, "Rosehill", to which he later added "Glenmuir" in the Mitchell district.

As the member for Balonne, Mr Beardmore never missed an opportunity to put the case for a better deal for rural Queensland. In his maiden speech, he spoke of the difficulties of leaseholders faced with increased rentals as a result of successive seven-year reviews. His was an early voice in the debate, which continues, over the damage caused to rural areas by kangaroos.

Mr Beardmore was actively associated also with expansion of the St George irrigation scheme and, in particular, with the move to increase the size of the blocks that had been found to be not viable. He believed that the Government had a moral obligation to ensure that men who were given the opportunity to go onto the land were allocated areas large enough to provide a reasonable living.

Eddie Beardmore will be missed by the many friends he made in Parliament and in the community. He was awarded an MBE for services to State and local government. His name will live on in the dam, hospitals, streets and schools in the Balonne electorate named in his honour.

I join with the Premier and Treasurer in expressing my condolences to the family of Mr Beardmore.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.23 a.m.): It is always a very sad occasion when a person who has been a member of this Assembly passes away. Perhaps it could be said that it becomes a time for reflection.

Edwin James Beardmore ceased to be a member of this Assembly at the time of the 1969 State election, and no members of the present Opposition were members of Parliament during Mr Beardmore's 12-year term in this place. In common with many members of Parliament from both sides of politics, Mr Beardmore was actively involved in local government, during which time he rose to the position of deputy chairman of the Balonne Shire Council, a local authority of which he was a member for some 15 years. He was in the later years of his active political life when he entered this Parliament, having reached the age of 66 in 1957.

Honourable members are aware that Mr Beardmore was well known for his interest in poetry. That has been mentioned already, as has the fact that he had a deep interest in rural matters.

To all concerned, the Opposition extends its very sincere condolences.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.24 a.m.): Members of the Liberal Party associate themselves with the motion moved by the Premier and Treasurer.

Eddie Beardmore was, of course, well known to me. He was a colleague of mine during the whole of his time in the House. He was one of those rare people who endeared themselves to all other members of the House and was both respected by and popular with everybody in and associated with the Parliament.

His long record of service has been read out by the Premier and Treasurer and that, certainly, is only the tip of the iceberg of a magnificent career in local government, in this Parliament and also in many other public duties in which he was involved. The members of his family are also highly regarded wherever they have settled, and, of course, some of them are in the United States, where, by keeping in touch with his family, he was a frequent visitor.

Perhaps he would be best remembered by the many anecdotes that he cited. The Premier and Treasurer mentioned one, and I am sure it is not out of place to mention another. A colleague of ours was taking a party round Parliament House, and among the party was a reverend gentleman. I happened to be close by in the foyer when the party bumped into Eddie Beardmore and Eddie was introduced to the various gentlemen in the other member's party. The reverend gentleman said to Eddie that he had heard a lot about his electorate and that it was very dry out there. Eddie replied, "You are familiar with that passage in the Bible that says it rained for 40 days and 40 nights?" The reverend gentleman responded, "Yes." To that Eddie said, "Well, we only got 25 points!" That sort of repartee from Eddie at very short notice certainly endeared him to very many people and also helps us to remember him. There are many occasions on which, whenever Eddie Beardmore's name is mentioned, many of the stories that he told are recalled. Some of them were apocryphal, but that did not matter. They were interesting, particularly in the way in which Eddie recorded them.

I am pleased to learn that many of his stories and poetic efforts have been recorded, not only in print but also on tape. For some time now, various people have been collecting these anecdotes, and I hope that they are published. It would be a pity if they were lost, because many of the wonderful contributions to society come from members of Parliament, not in this place but in their private lives. Very useful things are added to our culture, happiness and sense of belonging to our society. I have encouraged the people who are doing this work—I hope that others encourage them—to complete it and to publish the information as a lasting memory of a very wonderful man whose company we have enjoyed, and a man who was a most respected member of this House.

To his family and to his close friends, the members of the Liberal Party extend our condolences.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (11.27 a.m.): I rise to join with the Premier and Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Liberal Party in expressing condolences to the family of the late E. J. Beardmore, MBE, who was the member for Balonne from 1957 to 1969.

I recall that my brother and I first met Eddie Beardmore not long after his election when we were on the road droving cattle. A utility pulled up, and a large, elderly gentleman stepped out and said, "Hello, boys. My name is Eddie Beardmore. I am the State member for this area." He had a chat to us, and that is how I met Eddie Beardmore. I know that many people in my electorate, or in that part of it, met Eddie Beardmore under similar circumstances.

From time to time I saw him at various functions, and then I was closely associated with him through the Country Party, as it then was. I got to know him extremely well. When I won endorsement for the seat of Balonne, after the death of the late Harold Hungerford, Eddie Beardmore assisted me in the subsequent election campaign. Once elected, I came down here, and it was Eddie Beardmore who brought me into this building, took me into the office at the end of the hallway on the first floor, and installed me at a certain desk. He said, "This is where I sat. This is where Harold Hungerford sat. This is where you sit." With that, he put some of my gear on the desk and it was not until afterwards that I found out from the then Chairman of Committees that I had done a little bit of claim-jumping.

Be that as it may, he also made sure that I had a bedroom at the Bellevue Building, and he told Kathy Thurbon that, as I came from out in the good country, she had to make sure that I had a very good room. He saw to that as well.

Whenever I needed him for advice and guidance he was always available, and for that I will always remember him fondly. Eddie Beardmore became a legend in the south west in his own lifetime. He was a tireless worker on behalf of all his constituents. He fought for a better deal for the people of the inland. Notable among those things for which he fought were increased living areas, as his wide experience on the land had taught him the hard lesson that substandard living areas were nothing short of a recipe for disaster.

During his term of office he fought for the needs of education in the area, and under the late Jack Pizzey as Minister for Education there was a tremendous expansion of education facilities and school-bus runs in the area. In addition, high-tops were established in a number of towns, which increased the educational opportunities for many children in the area. They were able to go on to Year 10, whereas previously they had to either complete their schooling at Year 7 or continue it by correspondence.

I recall that after oil was discovered in the area the township of Moonie was established. The surrounding area had been subdivided into blocks for ballot, and as a consequence a number of children required education facilities. Apparently Jack Pizzey said to Eddie Beardmore, "If you can find a suitable building, we will provide a school." So he set out and found a school on the Downs that had been closed down. The local people shifted it to the Moonie area. Then Mr Pizzey said, "If you have sufficient

children, you get a teacher." Mr Pizzey kept his promise, and on the appointed date, as Minister for Education, he arrived to open the school. There was a doubt as to whether there were sufficient pupils to justify the appointment of a teacher, so on the opening day the pupils were lined up in a guard of honour. Mr Pizzey noticed that there were some very large boys with mature legs, and he asked, "How many ring-ins have you got here today?"

Roads were another one of his priorities. He was a very charitable man. I know of instances of Eddie Beardmore assisting financially those people who found themselves in unfortunate financial circumstances, for whatever reasons. He endeared himself to the people. He will be remembered with great affection for his services to the electorate and the south west. His service has been commemorated either by the many facilities that are named in his honour or by the foundation stones and plaques that bear his name.

As the Premier and Treasurer indicated, he was honoured by Her Majesty a few years ago. That was a richly deserved honour. Eddie Beardmore was a man of the people in every sense. I am pleased to support this motion, and on behalf of my wife and myself wish to extend our deepest sympathy to his family.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.34 a.m.): I join in this motion of condolence and express my sympathy and that of my wife to the relatives and friends of Eddie Beardmore. If I was asked what was the greatest distinction a person could achieve, I would say without question that it was to serve his fellow-man. Eddie Beardmore did that in a great many ways. Other speakers have elaborated on his involvement in local government, Parliament and public life. He was a man of vision and led a very active life. He left behind many examples of that vision, such as the Beardmore Dam, which will serve the area for many years to come.

I believe that this State is a sadder place for his passing. He will be long remembered, particularly in the Balonne electorate for the contribution that he made to the area, and in the west in general.

The member for Balonne (Mr Neal) summed it up when he said that Eddie Beardmore was a legend in his own lifetime and a man of the people. I join with the other speakers in expressing my sympathy to his relatives and friends.

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (11.35 a.m.): I join with the Premier, the Deputy Premier and other members who have spoken to the motion of condolence for the late Eddie Beardmore, in extending the sympathy of my wife and me to his relatives and friends.

I owe a great deal to Eddie Beardmore. Probably few honourable members know that the Balonne electorate council was the first political meeting I attended. When I was a teenager, Eddie Beardmore impressed me immensely. I have not forgotten that he believed passionately in principles such as those mentioned by the member for Balonne, including decent-sized living areas. Eddie Beardmore also believed that every one of his constituents was important. He went out of his way to make himself known to every one of his electors.

I remember the old Ford utility—I think it was a Mainline—that he drove round his electorate. He regularly visited the Lockyer Valley during the pumpkin season to half fill the back of his utility with pumpkins. He then drove round his electorate and gave them to the fettlers. He did many other things that endeared him to the people of the Balonne electorate.

He often told a story about a parliamentary colleague—I forget the member's name—who did a big favour for a constituent. By making representations he saved the man from going broke. However, about three years later, the man decided to plebiscite the member concerned. The member went to the man and said, "You are a bit rough. I saved your bacon. I made representations that saved your family farm and now you

are plebisciting me.” The man said, “Yes, you did, but what have you done lately?” Eddie Beardmore’s record proves to us that we must be on our toes at all times; that it is useless to stand on past records. We have to serve our electorates and the people we represent at all times, and continually convince our electors that we have their best interests at heart. Eddie Beardmore was an expert at doing that. That is why he was loved by virtually all people in his electorate, and that is how he built Balonne into one of the safest seats in this Parliament.

Members for Balonne who succeeded him, including the present member, followed his example by getting round the electorate and showing people that they cared for them, whether they were the humblest wage-earners or the largest graziers.

At times Eddie Beardmore acted as the representative for my electorate. On behalf of my electors I extend their sympathy, together with that of my wife and me, to the relatives and friends of the late Eddie Beardmore.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.38 a.m.): I think I should indicate how Eddie Beardmore played a role in the shaping of my life. I well remember that, in 1959, I was an apprentice in the bakery at Tara. One morning I was pulling bread from the oven when a man came in at about 6 o’clock to speak to the boss. He then came over to talk to me. In those days I was not at all important. I was very impressed by him. He wanted to know all about making bread. From time to time after that he came and gave me a good deal of helpful advice. I followed much of his advice to good advantage.

I should place on record the way that Eddie Beardmore played an important part in my life, and for that I thank him.

Motion (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

PAPERS

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

Report of the Public Accountants Registration Board of Queensland for the year ended 31 December 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977 and the State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981

Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Act 1985

Orders in Council under—

Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1971-1983

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Public Service Act 1922-1978

Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1981

Breakwater Island Casino Agreement Act 1984

Meat Industry Act 1965-1984

State Housing Act 1945-1984

State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act 1957-1984

Electricity Act 1976-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Mines Regulation Act 1964-1983

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Industrial Development Act 1963-1981

Regulations under—

Public Accountants Registration Act 1946-1975
Land Tax Act 1915-1985
Stamp Act 1894-1985
Public Service Act 1922-1978
Soccer Football Pools Act 1976-1982
Builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act 1979-1983
Explosives Act 1952-1981
Electricity Act 1976-1984
Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Act 1985
Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act 1985
Retail Shop Leases Act 1984-1985

Rules under—

Soccer Football Pools Act 1976-1982
Lotto Act 1981-1984
Coal Mining Act 1925-1981

Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 6 June 1985, containing a proclamation by His Excellency the Governor notifying and declaring that in respect of a Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly of Queensland intituled "A Bill to amend the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979 and the Queensland Marine Act Amendment Act 1981 each in certain particulars" and assented to by His Excellency on 20 March 1985, Her Majesty has signified Her pleasure that the Act may come into operation.

Queensland Government Gazette of 20 June 1985, containing a proclamation by His Excellency the Governor to the effect that Her Majesty The Queen has been pleased, by an Order in Council made on 15 May 1985, to declare Her Assent to the Bill intituled "A Bill to amend the Governors' Pensions Act 1977 in a certain particular".

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Sugar Industry**

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.43 a.m.), by leave: My Government has sent to the sugar industry, for its consideration and return advice, the 100-day committee report on that industry.

The Government's approach differs markedly from that of the Leader of the Opposition, who has criticised this action and would prefer the industry to be locked out of any further discussions on its future while decisions are made in remote Canberra. My Government and I totally reject the attitude of the ALP Opposition in this regard. The sugar industry has every right to participate in the final determination of its future and to comment on and assess the full ramifications of the committee's recommendations.

The Leader of the Opposition and several of his ALP colleagues are also on record as advocating joint funding to assist the industry on a fifty-fifty basis between the Commonwealth and State Governments. This would amount to double taxation on Queenslanders and in promoting such a course of action, the Leader of the Opposition and the ALP are abdicating their responsibilities to protect Queensland tax-payers and to stand up for the interests of this State.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that when a ministerial statement is being made, it should be heard in silence.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I was just saying that the sugar industry has every right to participate in the final determination of its future and to make comments in that regard. This proposition of funding on a fifty-fifty basis, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, amounts to double taxation on the people of this State. Of course, the Government is opposed to anything that the ALP is saying or doing in that regard. The ALP is abdicating its responsibility to protect Queensland tax-payers and to stand up for the interests of this State. Of course, the only interest of Opposition members is to follow the directions they receive from Canberra on this issue.

Mr Warburton: It is about time that you stood up for the sugar industry.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Does the honourable member want to hear what he said on the ABC? I have it all here if he would like to hear it.

Mr Warburton: I know what I said.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes, the honourable member does know what he said.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Sandgate that he will listen to ministerial statements in silence.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I do not want to provoke the honourable member any further by reading what he has said on this issue, but I have it all here in case he or other honourable members suggest that I read it.

The Queensland Government is opposed to double taxation. The Opposition's only interest is to follow directions received from Canberra. The State Government has a long and enviable record of assistance to the sugar industry, including the allocation of about \$31m in assistance in the current sugar crisis. The Government has always played its part and will continue to do so. The industry knows that, in this Government, it has a receptive partner that has always reacted positively to genuine and realistic requests coming to it from the industry.

However, the Federal Government must accept the financial obligations of price support, as it did for the steel and car industries when they were in trouble. There is no reason to treat the sugar industry on any different basis.

When the steel and car industries needed help, the Federal Government recognised them as national industries vital to our national economic structure. It committed over \$500m in aid; without any suggestion that the State ALP Governments in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, where the industries have their bases, should contribute towards the cost. There cannot be one rule for Queensland and the sugar industry and a separate rule for troubled industry in the Labor States.

Funds derived from Queensland tax-payers were used to assist the steel and car industries in the other States. We paid our share in what we recognised as a national responsibility. Now it is Queensland's turn for significant help from the rest of the nation through Canberra.

If the ALP and the Leader of the Opposition have their way, Queensland tax-payers will have to foot half the bill alone. That amounts to double taxation and more discrimination against Queensland by Canberra. The Federal Government has a clear responsibility to be consistent in this regard. Canberra must recognise its responsibility to meet the major share of funds required because benefits from the sugar industry impact on the national economy and are not confined to Queensland.

Mr Warburton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Warburton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. I have asked him to desist from interjecting across the Chamber.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If anybody can be accused of selling out Queensland it is honourable members opposite. They are the greatest promoters of Canberra against Queensland.

Mr Prest: Tell us about the marijuana, Joh.

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

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Obviously that is about all that the honourable member has in his head—marijuana. That is about all that ever seems to come out of it.

The State Government will not make final decisions until the industry has had time to consider fully the ramifications of the report. My Government expects reaction from the industry following its meeting scheduled for early September.

I am advised that the first payments under any price support scheme from Canberra cannot flow until June next year. Obviously, Governments and the industry will need to move and make policy much before then so that farmers can make planting decisions and the context of any restructuring can be set.

I am confident that the various sections of the industry can find common ground for agreement within the report. The Government hopes so. Some will not agree with some parts; others will not agree with other parts. But I am satisfied that there are enough reasoned and capable men in the industry to recognise what is best for its future viability.

The industry leaders recognise the problems. They know that the future of the industry is a challenging one. They know that it will need to be a different industry as it comes out of the current market situation if it is to survive.

Canberra has made it clear that the industry will need to restructure in order to attract Government funds. It is essential that the voice of the industry be fully heard in any restructuring proposals.

I repeat that the Queensland Government will certainly continue to play its part. My Government is prepared to take its share of the responsibility for the financing and administration of the best possible rural adjustment scheme under which, among other things, cheap-interest loans could be made available for farm buildup and debt reconstruction.

The State will press the Commonwealth to recognise that these loans will need to have interest rate concessions down as low as one-quarter of the interest costs and that the terms of the loans will need to be longer than the present arrangements. The State Government will negotiate with the Federal Government for the best concessional arrangements for this special rural adjustment scheme and will meet its share of the costs for the best deal that can be done for the industry in this regard.

My Government now awaits the response of the industry to the report and will consider fully the industry's views in the discussions with Canberra and decision-making processes that will take place from that time.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON BILLS BROUGHT OVER FROM PREVIOUS SESSION

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

“That, pursuant to Standing Order No. 276, the following Bills, which were presented in the second session of this Parliament, be resumed in this, the third,

session at the stage reached in the previous session and thereafter be proceeded with as if no prorogation had taken place—

Administrative Boundaries Terminology Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (13 November 1984, Mr Milliner).

National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (19 March 1985, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Real Property Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (19 March 1985, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Rural Lands Protection Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (19 March 1985, Mr Goss).

Disposal of Unexecuted Warrants Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (26 February 1985, Mr Burns).

Criminal Investigation (Extra-territorial Offences) Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (26 February 1985, Mr Burns).

Roman Catholic Church Land Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (26 February 1985, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Save the Steam Car Fund Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (26 February 1985, Mr R. J. Gibbs)."

Motion agreed to.

SITTING DAYS

Sessional Order

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

"That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business."

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Appropriation Bill (No. 1)

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

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

Mr WARBURTON proceeding to give notice of a motion—

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that he is a bit late. A committee inquiring into third-party insurance has already been appointed. The Leader of the Opposition is out of date.

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

Mr WARBURTON: His antics never cease to amaze any of us.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Economic Performance of Queensland Government

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (12 noon): I can well appreciate why Government members are today sitting round like stunned mullet. The Federal Budget that was announced last night has done what the Queensland National Party Government will not and cannot do, that is, provide competent economic management. It is about time that the economic drones on the Government side got off their butts and did something to ensure that our State takes its proper place with respect to national economic recovery.

Yesterday the Government had its chance to say its piece. Today, the first full sitting day of this Parliament, I take the opportunity to serve notice on the Queensland Government. I assure Government members that the next four months will not be very pleasant for the National Party.

I give the people of Queensland a guarantee that the Opposition will continue to expose the National Party for what it is—a disgrace to responsible government, a disgrace to democracy and a disgrace to Queensland. The Labor Party might not have the numbers in this Assembly, but it will use the opportunities available to it to demonstrate why the National Party is not fit to govern this State.

Opposition members have a responsibility to the people of Queensland to question and scrutinise the actions of their State Government. In this, the people's House, the Labor Party plays a vital role on their behalf.

Labor Party members pledge that they will be the people's voice and that they will ensure that the voice of the people will be heard. It will be heard on the issues that matter most—

The high-tax policies of the National Party Government, especially in the areas of electricity and third-party insurance charges, fire insurance levies and stamp duties.

Its failure to act against the unemployment crisis in this State.

Its attack on the standard of living of Queenslanders through plans to erode employees' wages and conditions.

Its active cultivation of industrial unrest to the detriment of the economic performance of Queensland.

Its refusal, as the Premier and Treasurer has indicated today, to put its hand in its pocket to help the stricken sugar industry in this State.

There was not one mention yesterday in the Governor's Opening Speech about the most serious rural problem that has faced this State for a long, long time—the sugar industry! This morning honourable members witnessed the impertinence of the leading political figure in this State in cutting off any chance of the sugar industry's receiving State assistance.

Lastly, its cynical disregard for the predicament of tens of thousands of youths in this State—in this the International Year of Youth.

The list of the misdeeds of the National Party is endless. Its mishandling of Government administration in Queensland verges on the criminal. Honourable members need look only to the appalling standard of essential State Government services in Queensland for conclusive evidence of its wilful neglect.

The performance of the National Party since this Parliament last sat has been atrocious. It has been what might be termed "a mess in recess" In the four months since Parliament was abruptly shut down—when the kitchen got too hot for the Cabinet—the Government has bumbled and stumbled from one crisis to the next. Very few

Cabinet Ministers sitting across the Chamber today have not in that time been embroiled in some form of controversy or conflict, and in due course they will be aptly reminded.

Today I will draw attention to some of the major instances of the misrule of the National Party, its incompetence, its deceit, its arrogance and its betrayal of the people it professes to serve. As this is commonly known as the Budget session of the Parliament, I will concentrate on several key areas of the State Government's spending priorities—or, should I say, its non-spending and twisted priorities.

I begin with its 1984 Budget hoax, namely, the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program—a sham from start to finish. Probably no other Government program better reveals the National Party for what it is. It is fraudulent and it is capable of being a confidence trickster.

The Premier promised that the program would provide 40 000 new jobs. However, it was all lies. The Queensland Government spent less on capital works in 1984-85 than in the previous two financial years, and that is even before taking inflation into account.

Queensland's unemployment figures reinforce the fraudulent nature of this so-called special program to create jobs. Last month more people were out of work in Queensland and fewer employees occupied full-time jobs than 12 months previously.

So what about the 40 000 new jobs that the Premier promised? Not even 1 000, not even 100 has shown up, and, I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, not even one has shown up.

The truth is that there are now 2 000 more people out of work in Queensland than there were this time last year, and 1 000 fewer are in full-time occupations. With more than 100 000 Queenslanders out of a job, the National Party Government continues to do nothing of any consequence.

Its unemployment task force, born out of the Rockhampton by-election earlier this year, was another farce. It failed to commit one extra dollar to combat unemployment or specify one extra job that initiatives, contained in its report, would create. The task force report did, however, identify that there has been a small net outflow of job-seekers who were originally lured to Queensland by this Government's false advertising. The majority of imports are in fact retirees. Despite this, the Government continues to blame migrants from interstate for our State's unemployment problem.

For the eighth consecutive month now, Queensland has recorded the highest unemployment of any of the Australian states. This demonstrates the National Party's incapacity to come to grips with our State's lagging economy.

The Bjelke-Petersen Government's only answer to our economic woes is to slug the ordinary tax-payer—the average car-owner and electricity-consumer—through higher and higher charges. The National Party runs a discredited high-charge/low-service government. At long last, thankfully, there is widespread acceptance of that fact. Electricity charges have shot up by 191 per cent since 1978. Third-party insurance premiums have increased by 220 per cent since 1980. These are State taxes. They are two of the biggest bills that ordinary citizens must meet, and they are the highest bills of their kind in Australia.

Even one of the National Party's own trustees, Sir Roderick Proctor, has publicly attacked this Government's high-taxing policies. Sir Roderick made particular mention of the State Government's coal rail freights and its proposed 20 per cent casino tax. These, he pointed out, were the highest of their kind in the world and he said, "So much for our so-called low-tax State."

Even when a person dies in Queensland, the National Party State Government is standing there ready to collect. It thumps people when they are alive and it thumps them when they are dead. In one recent example of which I have evidence, the State Government's greedy tax fingers removed almost half the deceased person's estate. The estate totalled a little over \$1,000. After the National Party had extracted—would you

believe it—\$516.99 in State fees, taxes and charges, which is almost a 50 per cent rake-off, only \$580 was left. They included the certificate of death, advertising, Supreme Court fee, stamp duty on life policy, incidentals, distribution fees, Titles Office search fee, stamp duty on death record, registration record of death, and Public Trust Office charges. On and on the charges go, and they account for 47 per cent of a miserable estate worth a little over \$1,000. And this National Party Government has the gall to say that it does not tax people when death occurs.

The National Party pretends that it has nothing to do with taxing the people of Queensland. In reality it is leading the charge.

At the same time the pitifully low level of State Government services to the Queensland public is a scandal. Police authorities say that people are dying on Queensland roads because of insufficient staff and resources. The police themselves say that they are only able to operate a Clayton's highway patrol, and people are being killed in road accidents as a result. Our prisons system is in turmoil because of understaffing. Our ambulance and fire brigades are desperate for more staff; so, too, are our hospitals. More nurses are urgently needed.

The National Party Government spends the least of any State on health, education and welfare, and Queenslanders are suffering the consequences. The State Government also spends the least on a range of other services, including assistance to industry, and spent \$2.46 per head in 1983-84 on industrial development, compared with the national average of over \$8 and Victoria's spending of over \$14.

I ask, finally: How does the Government hope to stimulate job creation if it gives such lousy assistance to the private sector? The National Party Government has run its race in respect of tricks and cons, and I am sure that the Queensland public is about to react accordingly.

Sugar Industry

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (12.10 p.m.): In recent months, honourable members have heard much more about sugar than they have heard even about the fights between the factions in the Australian Labor Party. I therefore intend to make a few comments about the 100-day committee report, which the Federal Government tried to railroad the cane-growers of Queensland into accepting before they even saw it. I endorse the remarks of the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) that that is a disgrace, totally undemocratic and typical of the standover tactics of the Trades Hall, which supports the old guard majority in the Labor Party in this Parliament.

The amount of \$220 a tonne suggested in the report is far too low, and must be increased to at least \$240 as requested by the sugar industry. The amount should increase every year and not decrease as the report suggests. The Savage report is correctly named; it is savage by name and by nature. It is an insult to the intelligence of the ordinary cane-grower and sugar industry worker who is trying to make a living out of the industry.

The suggested deregulation is a load of rubbish. The regulations, which I have always supported inside and outside this House, have not contributed to the low returns for cane-growers and millers; the low world market prices are the cause.

It is interesting to hear and read of the ALP old guard faction leader in this House, namely, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton), saying what Canberra tells him to say and demanding that the report, including deregulation, be acted upon. If one adopts the report, one adopts deregulation. ALP members of this Assembly have always said how good regulation is for the sugar industry; but now, because Canberra says so, they want to sell out to Canberra, and throw regulation out the window. Is it any wonder that the Leader of the Opposition's stocks are at an all-time low if he allows himself to be dragged down by Hawke and Kerin. It is about time that he stood up for Queensland and demanded a better deal for Queenslanders rather than be seen as protecting Canberra.

Mr Randell: He's fighting for his own position.

Mr MENZEL: He could be. It is ridiculous to suggest that the State Government finance half the price support, which will go to support three New South Wales sugar-growing areas as well. On top of that, the amounts of \$220 a tonne for this year, \$215 for next year and \$210 for 1987 are far too low.

In the mid-1960s, when the sugar industry was in a price slump, the then Liberal-Country Party Federal Government, which cared for the sugar industry, made available through the Reserve Bank a loan of \$19m at 3 per cent interest, which was paid back in 1976. However, the Hawke Labor Government is not prepared to make a similar loan to the industry. It is apparently prepared to play politics with the future of thousands of Queenslanders and not make such assistance available. What about the \$360m grant to BHP, the \$180m grant to the car industry and the \$30m for the America's Cup—\$17m of which was announced in the Federal Budget—but nothing for the sugar industry?

Mr Randell: It didn't ask the States for a cent.

Mr MENZEL: No, it did not ask the States for a cent.

The Hawke Government is prepared to act fast when imposing sanctions on South Africa and other places but is not prepared to help the starving cane-growers and their wives in Queensland, which is still part of Australia. It seems that the Federal Government thinks more of people overseas than it does of Queenslanders, who are Australians. The credibility of Bob Hawke and John Kerin is about as high as that of the BLF. However, if the BLF says that it intends to do something, it can be relied on more than can Hawke or Kerin.

On 28 February 1983, Mr Kerin was reported in "The Cairns Post" as saying—

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

The industry made the request when the Labor Party won office in Canberra after that lying statement. It made many requests but nothing happened, except that the price of fuel was increased. That put further hardship on the sugar industry. The Budget gave the industry a slight advantage, but the Federal Government has taken away much more than it has given back.

John Kerin misled the sugar industry. He did nothing other than say that he would put up a case to Cabinet; but he knew that Cabinet would reject it. I call upon Mr Kerin to resign, because he is the worst paper tiger ever to hold office.

Page 11 of the report to which I have referred includes this statement—

"Growers and millers would negotiate an individual contract on the basis of this award."

In suggesting that the report be implemented, the Federal Labor Government is saying that the protection afforded to growers in the previous legislation will be stopped. Growers will then be open to exploitation by millers as they were 60 years ago. Why does not the Labor Party say, "We will deregulate wages and trade unions.", or, "Now that we have unemployment and an over-supply of labour, the principles of supply and demand apply."?

Labor in Canberra, with the support of its local comrades, is advocating deregulation of the sugar industry because of over-supply. It is saying that the market must find its own level on the basis of supply and demand. But the sugar industry has to pay regulated wages. The Labor Party will not say that, with an over-supply of labour, wages should be set in the market-place.

A committee comprising people who do not know what they are talking about is not needed to tell the Government what is needed. Firstly, the delivery price should be raised from \$150 to \$180 a tonne and the interest paid by the Government. Some people may ask, "Which Government?" Only one Government is prepared to pay the interest, because the Federal Government has rejected that suggestion in the past.

I have a list of recommendations that should be adopted relative to the sugar industry. I seek leave to table them and incorporate them in "Hansard".

Leave granted.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

What should be done—

- (1) Lift the delivery price immediately from \$150 to \$180 with the Queensland Government paying the interest.
- (2) Arrange borrowing overseas of about \$90m to \$100m which is needed to bring the No. 1 pool price for this year to \$240 and indexed to, say, \$245 next year and \$250 in 1987.

The interest and redemption would have to be guaranteed by the Queensland Government with no repayments from the industry till at least 1988, or at a time when the industry can afford to meet repayments.

- (3) The State Government should legislate for a stabilisation scheme with a guaranteed minimum price of \$240 and a maximum of, say, \$300—or a figure to be worked out—and both the minimum and maximum figure to be indexed with inflation or actual production costs.

If the figure exceeded the maximum and no money was owed by the industry, then any excess would be put into a reserve fund where interest could be earned and that would stabilise the sugar industry and lead it out of any further crisis.

- (4) The Rural Reconstruction guidelines need to be relaxed to assist growers with excessive loans with banks, so that they can be taken over by the R.A.S., with interest charges reduced so that they can service their debts.
- (5) The immediate appointment by the Queensland Government of a Select Committee of three Government Members with sugar experience to work out ways of implementing the above with a commitment to the principles outlined.

Mr MENZEL: Basically, I have recommended—

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. The member for Mulgrave has asked that certain recommendations be incorporated in "Hansard", but he has not told us what the recommendations are.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The document in question has been sighted by Mr Speaker. He has approved of it, and the House has agreed to its incorporation.

Mr MENZEL: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Unfortunately the member for Brisbane Central is wasting my time. I was trying to speak to the recommendations.

Basically, the recommendations involve the lifting of the delivery price immediately from \$150 to \$180 a tonne, with the Queensland Government paying the interest. So far as the report is concerned, Canberra should be told to go to hell, because Labor has demonstrated that it is simply playing politics with the sugar industry. At the same time, the State Government should borrow \$90m to \$100m overseas to bring the No. 1 pool price for this year to \$240 a tonne, with the price indexed so that it will be \$245 next year and \$250 in 1987. That recommendation involves interest and redemption on the loan being guaranteed by the Queensland Government, with no repayments by the industry till at least 1988.

Time expired.

Closure of Power Stations

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (12.20 p.m.): On Monday, 29 July 1985, the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) announced that early in 1986 the Queensland Electricity Commission would shut down the Bulimba "B" and Tennyson "A" Power Stations in Brisbane and half the Collinsville Power Station in north Queensland.

The Minister claimed that Bulimba "B" and Tennyson "A" were old power stations which were originally scheduled to close in 1978 and that their capacity would be replaced by more cost-efficient plant which was recently brought into service at Tarong and Wivenhoe. He said that the closure of these older power stations would save the Queensland Electricity Commission \$17m annually and a further \$15m over the next five years from less coal purchases.

The Minister also announced that the start-up of the Stanwell Power Station, which was originally scheduled for 1987, would be deferred to 1992.

The Minister's announcement about the State's power industry is only part of the story. I want to take this opportunity today to let the people of Queensland know the full details of the situation in this vital State industry.

First, regarding the closure of Bulimba "B" and Tennyson "A" early next year—although the Minister tries to justify this action by claiming that these two power stations were originally scheduled to close in 1978, the fact is that, in January 1978, a State Electricity Commission report on electricity development to 1988 stated that energy output from Brisbane and Swanbank Power Stations would progressively increase from 1982 to meet probable forecast energy requirements. The report mentioned these power stations operating through to 1987.

The State Electricity Commission annual report for 1980-81 referred to Bulimba and Tennyson generating until at least the end of the 1980s. The 1981-82 State Electricity Commission report stated that, to reduce pollution, contracts totalling \$26.5m had been let for the installation of fabric-bag filters at Bulimba and Tennyson.

The report also stated that Bulimba and Tennyson were being refurbished to ensure that they would be capable of providing extended service. The 1982-83 State Electricity Commission report also referred to the refurbishing for extended service. The installation of the fabric-bag filters, which cost \$26.5m, was only completed in 1984.

Well over \$30m of Queensland tax-payers' money has been spent on power stations which are now going to be closed down. Contrary to what "The Courier-Mail" editorial said on Wednesday, 31 July, this is a case of bad planning by the Government. In fact, I was astounded that the editorial merely stated that it was "unfortunate" that so much money had been spent on stations that were now being closed down.

Unfortunately, the wastage of millions of dollars at Bulimba and Tennyson is only part of the sad power industry story. Because of extremely bad planning, the State currently has power stations capable of generating 4 800 MW while the maximum demand is about 3 500 MW.

Because of Government propaganda about all of the industries flocking to Queensland from the rest of Australia and overseas, the Queensland Electricity Commission has had to plan the power needs accordingly. These phantom industries, which include two coke plants, a chemical plant, a pulp mill, a steel mill, a coal-to-oil plant, an oil-from-shale plant, two or three aluminium smelters, a uranium enrichment plant and numerous other power-consuming industries, have of course not materialised, and electricity consumers have been left with a huge bill to pay.

Modern power stations such as Tarong, Wivenhoe, Callide "B" and Stanwell, cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Tarong, which will have a generating capacity of 1 400 MW, will cost over \$1,200m. Although electricity-consumers contribute substantially (\$193m in 1983-84) towards the cost of these new power stations, many more millions of dollars has to be borrowed each year. As at 30 June 1984, the total loan debt of the power industry was \$2.6 billion. I understand that, as at 30 June 1985, the figure had exceeded \$3 billion. In 1983-84, the interest bill on money spent on new power stations was \$324m, almost \$100m more than in the previous year.

The Minister claims that the closure of Bulimba "B", Tennyson "A" and half of Collinsville—400 MW of generating capacity—will save \$17m a year. However, he

neglects to state that the cost of 400 MW of new generating capacity is approximately \$350m, and the interest bill on that amount would be at least \$40m a year.

The Minister also claims that a further \$15m will be saved over the next five years from less coal purchases. The Minister chooses to ignore the fact that, because of the deferment of the Stanwell Power Station, whose capacity will now not be needed for many years, the power industry has contracts for coal that it does not need.

For example, since October 1983, the Curragh mine at Blackwater has been under contract to supply 2.2 million tonnes of coal a year to the Gladstone Power Station. Although to date this tonnage has not been taken, the stockpile at Gladstone Power Station as at 30 June 1984 was 1.1 million tonnes and the total amount of coal stockpiled at power stations round the State was 2.4 million tonnes, which is 600 000 tonnes (40 per cent) more than required for fuel supply security.

The value of this stockpiled coal was \$81m, which has grown from \$27.9m in 1981-82 and \$61.5m in 1982-83. It is interesting to note that, in 1983-84, 0.5 million tonnes of coal valued at \$13.2m was added to the Gladstone Power Station stockpile. This works out at \$26.40 a tonne, which is substantially more than the price paid to the coal-mining companies for the coal, and can only mean that the Government is charging electricity-consumers close to export rail freight rates for coal carried to the State's power stations.

That is another Government rip-off of electricity-consumers, who are paying approximately 20 per cent of their electricity bill towards the cost of new power stations. It is another hidden Government tax.

In relation to the amount of coal that is stockpiled at power stations round the State—on 5 April this year, the Minister announced that the Government would sell about a million tonnes of coal stockpiled at power stations. However, on 10 April when he was asked the question, "How much coal in excess of requirements for electricity generation in Queensland is currently stockpiled?", the Minister answered, "None." That does not add up.

According to page 6 of the 1983-84 Queensland Electricity Generating Board annual report, coal stocks as at 30 June 1984 were 2.4 million tonnes, which is 40 per cent above the level needed for fuel supply security. On page 24, the 1983-84 State Electricity Commission annual report stated that, as at 30 June 1984, stocks were about 600 000 tonnes (40 per cent) above requirements for coal supply security.

As I said earlier, on 5 April this year the Minister announced the sale of a million tonnes of this coal. Therefore, how could he say on 10 April that no coal was stockpiled in excess of requirements for electricity generation in Queensland? Either the quantity of coal stockpiled at 30 June 1984 had been substantially reduced to that required for fuel supply security by 10 April this year and, according to the Minister's statement on 5 April, the Government will reduce that security supply further by selling the coal for export, or the Minister misled the House in his answer on 10 April. The Minister owes the House an explanation. In fact, the State's power industry is in such a mess because of bad planning and incompetent management that I believe that the Minister should stand down or should be stood down.

Since the reorganisation of the industry in 1977, the situation in this vital State industry has not been good. Because of Government policies, electricity charges have sky-rocketed and many consumers are finding it difficult to pay their accounts. Electricity charges for Brisbane domestic consumers have increased by 191 per cent since 1977. Although Queensland has an abundance of cheap steaming coal for power generation, electricity-consumers have never received the benefit of this cheap coal and now pay the highest electricity charges in Australia.

Because of bad planning and incompetent management, the industry has a huge surplus of expensive power-generating capacity, a debt of over \$3 billion and a large annual interest bill. It spends over \$30m refurbishing old power stations and then closes

them down. It has contracts for millions of tonnes of coal that it cannot use. To cap it all off, last February, on his own admission, the Premier, supported by his Cabinet Ministers and the National Party, disembowelled the largest electricity distribution authority in the State for political purposes—to get at the Hawke Labor Government.

As I have pointed out, the situation in the State's power industry is far from good. Unfortunately, things will get worse before they get better, and consumers should prepare themselves for further substantial electricity increases in the near future.

Federal Budget

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (12.30 p.m.): On the day after the delivery of the Federal Budget, it is appropriate to discuss some aspects of that Budget and how it affects the people of this State and Australia generally. Some of those who have already spoken today have alluded to that.

The Budget has been built round the high tax rates that exist in this country—among the highest in the world.

Mr De Lacy: Can you justify that?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I will proceed to do so. In excess of 50 per cent of the tax revenue obtained by the Federal Government is from income tax, well over 30 per cent of the gross domestic product accounts for outlays of the Federal Government, and the marginal tax rate is now in excess of 47c in the dollar.

It is very nice for the Federal Treasurer to be able to dispense some goodies round the community when, because of the very high tax rates in this country, in fact the community is absolutely burdened to the point of private enterprise and private individuals having no incentive to work. The whole strategy of the Federal Treasurer's Budget is built on the fact that Australia is enjoying "one of the highest tax rates in the world".

Mr De Lacy: Howard said it was a good Budget.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, he did not.

The Budget stands or falls on two things. It is very interesting that the whole responsibility for the success of the Budget is to be moved on to the shoulders of the executive of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The ACTU attended the summit conference, made a deal with the Prime Minister in the early hours of the morning at the Lakeside Hotel and now it is being asked to co-operate with the Federal Government in regard to a wages application to the Australian Arbitration Commission. The Treasurer said that if he does not get success in this regard, the Budget will be in tatters.

Usually taxes, the method of taxation and the structure of taxation are debated in the Budget presentation. In the Federal Treasurer's report to the nation last night, there was none of that. The Treasurer said that there will be a statement on these matters in September. That means that the nation will have a mini-Budget presented in September, the effects of which will not apply to the arithmetic of the Budget for this financial year. The Treasurer said that whatever is done in September will not affect the Budget for this financial year. That means that whatever relief may be forthcoming in September from restructuring the tax system of this country will not be felt until the 1986-87 financial year. There is no tax relief in sight for the little people in the community—the wage-earners and private enterprise. What was the tax summit all about? It was simply a facade, some sort of cosmetic presentation of being concerned about the tax structure in this country, whereas in fact the executive of the ACTU is really running the country.

It has already been mentioned, and should be mentioned again, that there are suggestions in the Budget of help to be given to young people to find jobs. That means hand-outs to young people and special concessions to employers who are employing

young people, but I might say that the small print—and that is how it appeared—spelt out that all those concessions would be subject to means-testing. Very few people will be entitled to the benefits that have been talked about. At the same time as the Government speaks of those benefits, it does not provide funds for the tertiary institutions required in this country to give these young people the opportunity to be trained.

Mr Innes: A reduction.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Yes, in real terms, a reduction.

At the end of this year more than 200 000 young people in Australia will be turned away from tertiary institutions in this country because there are not enough places for them. These are motivated young people, the sons and daughters of parents who are prepared to make sacrifices to assist these young people in their further studies, but they will not be given the opportunity of undertaking those studies. Is it any wonder that Australia has one of the lowest participation rates of young people in tertiary education of all the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries? In Australia the participation rate is between 45 and 49 per cent whereas, in North America, Japan and many other countries, it exceeds 70 per cent. In some countries it exceeds 80 per cent. The young people of this nation will not even be given the opportunity to be trained to take on the jobs of the twenty-first century.

I turn now to the sugar industry. One would have thought that a Federal Labor Government would be concerned about the future of the sugar industry, because much of the area that is cultivated for sugar-cane is represented by Federal Labor members. As well, some sugar-growing areas are represented by Labor members of this Assembly. The Federal Government obtained a 100-day committee report. It did not need an inquiry to be told what the problems were. It did not need to conduct an examination, prepare reports and send papers backwards and forwards. The sugar industry leaders told the Government what the problems are. Advice has been given as to the solutions.

Last night, the sugar industry did not rate a mention in the Federal Budget. However, several other industries, including the horse-racing and greyhound-racing industries, received help. Good luck to them! However, one of the industries that create wealth for this State and nation did not even rate a mention in the Federal Budget. Opposition members have a great deal to answer for.

Mr Veivers: Did you hear anything about it in the speech yesterday?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: What speech?

Mr Veivers: The Governor's Opening Speech.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Nobody heard about the honourable member's speech. Honourable members will probably not hear from him between now and Christmas, unless it is written for him by the PR department of Trades Hall.

I am referring to critical issues facing a large area of Australia. The sugar industry exists not only in Queensland but also in the Northern Rivers District of New South Wales. Many people are facing ruin. However, in the Federal Budget no mention was made of the sugar industry.

The Federal Treasurer can talk big about making hand-outs all round the nation with little bits here and there. He expects revenue from taxation this financial year to increase by 11.8 per cent. He could have also given real relief to the tax-payers of this nation. By giving private enterprise the opportunity and the incentive to expand and take up some of the slack in the employment area, he could have created many of the jobs to which young people are looking forward. That could have been done by giving some taxation relief.

The ALP is a high-tax party. It advocates high taxes because it sees taxes not as a means of raising consolidated revenue but as a social weapon to redistribute the incomes

of this nation. The Federal Treasurer, in his speech, said that the social objective of the ALP is to redistribute wealth. That is what the ALP is after, and that is why it likes high taxes.

**Denigration of Federal Government by Liberal Party Leader;
Advanced Life Support System**

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (12.38 p.m.): Considering the mess in which the Malcolm Fraser-led Liberal Government left this nation, I find it extraordinary that the leader of the Liberal Party in Queensland sought to denigrate the economic performance of the Hawke Labor Government. That mess occurred in the days when Sir William Knox was in a position to exert some influence on a Federal Government of his political complexion.

Today I wish to join the call for the introduction of an advanced life support system into this State. This is a subject that has received considerable attention in the media during the last two weeks, and deservedly so.

“The Sunday Mail” article of 11 August reported that 6 000 Queenslanders die of heart attacks each year. Another 1 000 die as the result of a motor accident or from some other form of accident.

Of course, it is not possible to plan for every emergency. By definition, an emergency will occur suddenly and demand an immediate response. What Governments must do, of course, is seek to ensure that every possible effort is made to provide the best possible services to deal with such emergencies.

“The Sunday Mail” reported that, in Brisbane, only one in 50 people who suffer cardiac arrest away from a hospital will survive. In Sydney, because of the availability of a paramedic ambulance service, the figure is one in three. In Brisbane, one in 10 people who receive severe head injuries will survive, while in Sydney the figure is one in two.

Remembering my earlier statement, of course, we cannot expect to win with every emergency, but clearly we are not doing anywhere near our best. I am aware of a case where a single bearer was transporting a heart attack victim to hospital and the vehicle had to be stopped twice during the journey to administer cardiac massage. The patient did not survive the journey. I cannot say with certainty that that life could have been saved, but surely we can do better than we are doing. Our best must be done in all emergency situations.

The Committee of Review of Ambulance Services, whose inquiry was completed in August 1980, considered that the primary objectives of an ambulance service were—

“To foster and maintain the highest standard of emergency care for the community by the following means—

1. To initiate and maintain life support with the intention of preserving life and preventing further harm;
2. To provide ambulance transport;
3. To provide effective first aid;
4. To provide teaching of first aid.”

I believe that the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade excels in regard to criteria 2, 3 and 4 but that much more needs to be done in regard to criteria 1, specifically the initiation and maintenance of life support.

I again quote the 1980 report—

“Advanced life support techniques could possibly be carried out by ambulance employees if the need could be confirmed and appropriate training given. It is not done at present because such work does not come within the existing guidelines.”

I believe that the need has been confirmed. The latest statistics on the road toll indicate that the number killed on Queensland roads to date this year is 311, compared to 285 for the same period last year, while for Brisbane the figures are 72 and 37 respectively. How to stop the carnage on our roads is another matter, but surely everything possible must be done to assist the victims. The necessary legislative and financial support is up to the Government. Undoubtedly, Queenslanders who should not die are dying at the roadside and in ambulances.

What is a paramedic? A paramedic is a specially trained health-worker who is authorised, under strict guide-lines, to administer intravenous injections, intravenous fluids to replace blood loss, to perform intubation of patients to maintain breathing, and to administer cardiac massage and shock therapy. A paramedic is not a doctor; he or she commences medical management of a patient until a doctor is available to treat the patient.

Ambulance officers are not presently authorised to perform any of the procedures to which I have referred, with the exception of external cardiac massage. A paramedic would normally travel to the scene of an emergency in a specially equipped ambulance vehicle, so it could be said that he is taking the hospital to the emergency.

The popular concept that extreme emergencies are best taken to hospital as soon as possible is often wrong and, in fact, can ensure a fatal outcome. Most of these types of patients require resuscitation and/or stabilisation at the scene and should often be moved only under skilled supervision.

Two different approaches have been used interstate and overseas with success—

- (a) advanced trained ambulance officers, for example the paramedic system that has been adopted in New South Wales and Victoria; and
- (b) teams comprising a medical officer, nurse and ambulance officer operating out of hospital casualty sections.

Proponents of both schemes claim success, and certainly the statistics clearly indicate the value of the New South Wales paramedic system. That system depends upon a very intensive training program for selected ambulance officers and a considerable degree of trust in the ability and expertise of that officer.

During the first 12 months of their operation, the New South Wales paramedics depended on instructions by radio from a hospital. However, today each officer is issued with a "protocol" which authorises the officer to administer prescribed drugs or carry out minor surgical procedures to suit the circumstances of each case.

It will require detailed consideration to determine the most effective scheme for Queensland, although I suspect that the hospital-based service would be the more appropriate for provincial areas.

It is interesting to note that five former New South Wales paramedics are presently working in the Queensland ambulance system. As I understand it, they are exerting whatever influence they can within their own areas to try to have emergency services upgraded.

I do not seek to detract in any way from the marvellous work done by the hundreds of ambulance officers operating in this State. However, I am sure that they would join with me in demanding the best possible training, equipment and procedures to cope with the real world in 1985.

I consider that, as with other emergency services, the ambulance has suffered because of its history of voluntary service to the community. The Government has sought to place more and more responsibility on ambulance committees to be self-sufficient and has neglected the changing demands on the service.

As I travel round Queensland, I find that some of the local ambulance committees are quite affluent and have all of the facilities and services to which I have referred,

with the exception of paramedics, of course. However, others are finding it difficult to provide even basic services and impossible to provide the sort of in-service training that is necessary. The New South Wales experience shows that an ambulance can be, and must be, more than a transport to a hospital. It must be the primary means by which lives are saved.

This is a major challenge to the Queensland Government, and one which must be tackled immediately. It must be done urgently and it must be done properly. We must not have a repetition of the highway patrol fiasco in the police area. An advanced life support system has to be much more than a sign painted on the side of a vehicle.

This question is not about public relations, but about the saving of lives. In its submission to the Government in respect of the 1985-86 State Budget, the Combined Professional Emergency Services Organisation referred to enormous problems in the area of training of ambulance officers. The submission referred to the lack of staff to conduct sufficient courses and the inequality of access to training courses for officers employed by different autonomous committees throughout the State.

I referred to that earlier. Some committees simply do not have the funds to provide relief staff, which would allow officers to attend training courses in other parts of the State.

It is particularly gratifying that a new training centre has recently been opened at South Brisbane, funded by community groups and service clubs. From my observations, that appears to be an excellent facility, as is the centre in Rockhampton, which I recently examined. However, the problem of getting sufficient officers into those training schools to cover the whole State still remains.

It is beyond the resources of the brigade to introduce any system of advanced life support. It has to be a total and meaningful commitment by the Queensland Government.

The Queensland ambulance system must be brought up to date. The increase in the incidence of road accidents is a fact of life about which the Opposition is deeply concerned. As I mentioned, the way to cope with that particular problem is the subject of another debate, but while people are becoming victims of such accidents, it is necessary to ensure that the ambulance service is able to cope with the greatest of such emergencies. That happens successfully in other States and in other nations, and I believe it is the responsibility of the Queensland Government to ensure that the funds are provided to bring the service up to date.

Performance of Federal ALP Government

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (12.48 p.m.): I rise to expose the deceit of the Labor Party, which was perpetrated once again, in its orchestrated and theatrical performance in the Budget last night. While the Labor Government is trying to make out that it is a wonderful Budget, at the same time it is taking incentive away from those people in the community who are producing. The Labor Government is short-changing the State of Queensland.

Mr De Lacy: What did they do with the deficit—a deficit that the Government you supported left of \$9.6 billion?

Mr SIMPSON: Under Labor there has been a 29 per cent increase in taxation and this country's deficit now surpasses that of Mexico. Members of the Opposition are walking out; they are hanging their heads in shame because they realise they are party to the deceit. ●

Members of the Opposition ought to watch out. They are under new direction from Canberra. The Labor Party in this State has to take the same attitude of deceit as is adopted in Canberra. Today in this Chamber, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) was under review and he had to come out and make deceitful statements.

He now has to go round Queensland making out that he is in favour of business, whereas in fact he supports strikes. He is trying to reduce productivity in this State.

One sees in the public gallery Mr Leon Pearce, press secretary to Bill Hayden. He is here keeping an eye on the Queensland Labor Party because its members are seen not to be performing correctly. They are to be made to toe the line.

Mr Vaughan: Where is he?

Mr SIMPSON: He is now in the Leader of the Opposition's room attempting to bring him into gear. He is telling him, "If you blokes in Queensland don't do it the way they do it in Canberra, your day of reckoning will come." I can understand why Opposition members are leaving the Chamber. They are worried that they will be identified with the various party factions in Queensland. Who is really running the Labor Party in Queensland? Canberra, of course! Opposition members are being shown up for what they are trying to do.

Last night, the Federal Treasurer said that everything is all right; yet taxes will go up and incentives for business to employ young people—remember they are the only real jobs—are being removed and replaced by bandaid measures that do not create any new jobs.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members have just been talking about the strikes in this State. They are deceitful. When Hawke came to power in Canberra, he said that he would lower the price of fuel. What happened? The price went up. He said that he would create new jobs. He did not.

He said that he would not float the dollar, but he did. Everything he has done is the opposite of what he said he would do. He is deceitful.

Opposition members are the same. They come into this Chamber and say that they are worried about jobs, yet they support strikes. What about Queensland's exports? The wheat industry has lost over \$100m in exports because Labor Party supporters would not load the ships. Opposition members supported those strikers who were denying wheat-growers the opportunity to export their produce. That action also affects jobs.

Tourists are affected by airline stoppages. It is bad enough that interstate tourists coming to Queensland are affected; but what about international tourists who come to Queensland and are bothered——

Mr Mackenroth: Those are the ones going to Iwasaki's resort.

Mr SIMPSON: I refer to tourists travelling all over Australia. Is the honourable member happy about that? How dare he come into this Chamber and talk about jobs when ALP supporters lock people out of airports and go on strike and disrupt businesses! International tourists returning home from Australia say, "What a place to be in. It is run by the ACTU."

Opposition members have now been told that they have to obey the unions in Queensland, just as their Federal counterparts obey the ACTU. The Federal Government has short-changed Queensland with regard to Medicare. That is the sort of deceit and unfairness practiced by Canberra. Now the Federal Government is cutting off money required for the roads that are essential to this State. Independent surveys have shown that, because of the tremendous area that has to be serviced, Western Australia has the worst roads in Australia. Queensland also has a tremendous area to serve, high rainfall and difficult soils. But what does the Federal Government do? It cuts off money for rural arterial roads. It is really shameful. It must be remembered that that action also reduces jobs. The Federal Government is denying jobs for Queenslanders.

I turn now to the sugar industry. Opposition members should remember that 100 days ago the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and the Minister for

Primary Industries (Mr Turner) went to Canberra. Before they went, they said to the industry, "Don't be conned by any delaying tactics." They fell for the Kerin-Hawke card trick of setting up another inquiry. The sugar producers want to know whether they should fertilise their ratoon cane for the next year or whether they should plant new cane. They want action now on the floor price of \$240 a tonne. They have asked repeatedly for action but they have been stalled by the Federal Government.

The Leader of the Opposition asked what Queensland is going to do about it. When about \$350m was made available by way of grants and loans to the steel industry, about 90 per cent of which is in New South Wales, the Commonwealth Government did not say to the New South Wales Government, "It is your industry; you pick up \$350m." But the Labor Government is suggesting that Queensland has to contribute to the national sugar industry in order to bring in a floor price. That is simply not on, and Opposition members know it.

Mr Mackenroth: You will walk away from the sugar industry.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member is not fair dinkum.

Mr Mackenroth: If you support the sugar industry, your speech today should be advocating that the Queensland Government put money into it.

Mr SIMPSON: I would ask the honourable member whether New South Wales should put \$350m into the steel industry, but he has double standards. The sugar industry is an Australian industry but he will not support it in the same way as Labor supported the steel industry, the wool industry and the cattle industry.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you support it?

Mr SIMPSON: I thought the honourable member's leader in Canberra said that we must have unity.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you support it?

Mr SIMPSON: I support it.

Mr Mackenroth: How do you support it?

Mr SIMPSON: Through all the structures and legislation. When I think about legislation, who keeps to the rules and supports legislation and who does not, it becomes obvious to me that Opposition members should hide their heads in shame. Their mates in the Northern Territory support the people who break the law in the Mudginberri meat dispute. Opposition members may well hide their heads in shame. Even the Federal Primary Industries Minister said, "We do not agree with the unions but we will not do anything about them." That is condoning the breaking of the law. The Queensland Government does not believe in that. It supports the Queensland sugar industry, the sugar legislation and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in regard to secondary boycotts. By supporting secondary boycotts, Labor is stopping people from getting jobs. That is the sort of deceit practised by the Labor Party.

Western Australia is to get \$17m for its defence of the America's Cup and South Australia is to get \$5m for its race-track. That is typical of the unfair treatment meted out to States such as Queensland.

Time expired.

Federal Liberal Party's Inaction on Taxation Reform

Mr VEIVERS (Ashgrove) (12.58 p.m.): I wish to comment on the hypocrisy of the leader of the Liberal Party in commenting on the taxation system in this country, about which he complained. I remind the House that the Liberal Party was in Government for 30 of the last 35 years. An admission has been made by the federal president of the

Liberal Party that the Liberal Party did not have the guts to do anything about reforming the system. Mr Valder also said that the Labor Party ought to do something about reforming the system in Australia. However, the responsibility rests fairly and squarely on the Liberal-National Party coalition that was in power for 30 out of 35 years.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that His Excellency the Governor, on Tuesday, 20 August, delivered to Parliament an Opening Speech of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. I presume honourable members will take the speech as read?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (2.16 p.m.), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!", said: I move—

"That the following address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this, the third session of the Forty-fourth Parliament of Queensland—

'May it please Your Excellency—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.' "

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to formally move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech.

For some time now, Mr Speaker, we have been hearing a continuous and determined campaign by the Opposition to criticise and undermine the Queensland economy. I need not remind honourable members of this fact, for the mass media seem to delight in highlighting this criticism. Rarely, however, do they present any information which points to the achievements of the Queensland Government.

I want to spend some time examining the Queensland economy. In particular, I want to spend time advancing recent statistics which may point to the fact that we, here in Queensland, have a sound economy and an economically well-managed State. I do, however, admit that there are problems. I would be foolish were I to ignore the fact that our great sugar industry is in a difficult situation, a situation which, I believe, will not improve over the next one or two years. But it is a great industry and I believe strongly in its future. The current slump is, perhaps, cyclic and we can look forward to better things in the future. Heaven help us if ever the sugar industry collapses! The effects on the Queensland coastal economy would be catastrophic.

But that will not happen, thanks to the genuine concern shown, and generous assistance given, by the Queensland Government. What a tragedy it is to note that the socialists in Canberra looked like turning their backs on the cries for help from this industry. I am sure that, at the next Federal election, sugar producers will not forget Canberra's delays and attitudes.

Were our sugar producers to be manufacturing cars in Victoria or steel in Newcastle, the coffers of Canberra would open wide and countless millions of dollars would flow

into the industry without any matching help being demanded or expected from socialist State Governments. Simply because they are not among those industries situated in socialist States, they are discriminated against in a most blatant and disgraceful way, and so is the State Government of Queensland.

However, changes are on the way and our rural producers are organised and determined. The Hawke socialists ignore the so-called "rural revolt" at their own peril. Indeed, all parties do, and I would remind my own party, the National Party, of this growing rural movement.

There are difficulties in other industries also, but they are not as severe. One of the major sources of employment in recent years was to be found in the billions of dollars spent on the infrastructure for the resources boom. Whole towns, railways, roads, ports, service industries, schools, hospitals and other development projects costing many billions of dollars were launched. But they are now completed, and it is unlikely that, in the immediate future, any major projects of the magnitude of those of the 1970s will be commenced.

The resources boom has passed for the time being. We are now in a period of consolidation and restructuring.

The Queensland Government admits that this period of consolidation has not been without its economic traumas. We note with profound regret that there has been an unusually high number of bankruptcies and voluntary liquidations among dozens of small businesses, most situated in the sugar belt or in the mineral belt of Queensland. There has never—I repeat, never—been a resources boom, or major agricultural downturn, anywhere in the world which has not been followed by a shake-out. Hence, there is nothing unusual in the statistics on the bankruptcies. They are historically a feature of every shake-out, after every boom or downturn in every country at every time in the history of modern states. They do not indicate a weakness in the economy any more than the cessation of growth at the end of our youth indicates a weakness in the body. They are a pattern of growth and there is nothing that we as a Government can do that could prevent this cyclic problem from arising. Indeed, no country in recent times has been able to solve this problem.

If honourable members opposite know the solution, then please tell the world. Economic managers from every country in the world will knock on their doors to seek this elusive formula. Indeed, there will be such a rush of offers that the honourable member who has the solution will be offered a blank cheque to leave Queensland and go overseas to advise Governments. The fact that no reputable economic manager from any Government from any part of the world has sought the advice of experts such as the honourable Leader of the Opposition suggests that they are experts only in their own eyes. Their solutions to the world-wide economic problem that seems to be an integral cyclic characteristic of economic growth are naive, simplistic, hopeless, useless and irrelevant.

Let us now examine some of the positive aspects of the Queensland economy. The statistics that I shall quote have been compiled by officers of the Queensland Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs. They were prepared in July and are based on the major economic indicators derived from official figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. All figures have been converted to a per capita basis so that they can be more equitably compared State by State.

Let us look at exports. We all recognise that, like people, nations must earn and pay their way. Unless we do that, we must borrow money. Once we do that, we mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. Nation after nation has marched down the road to economic ruin by following this reckless path. Dozens of nations, especially in Latin America, are staring directly into the face of bankruptcy and ruin because reckless, careless, spendthrift Governments have borrowed money to pay their way instead of developing exports and industry to earn their way. The way the spendthrift socialists in

Canberra are behaving, I suspect that we in Australia could soon join them unless there is a change in Government.

Queensland can stand tall and proud for its contribution to Australia. During the 11 months to May 1985, Queensland earned export income of \$2,290 for every man, woman and child in Queensland. On the other hand, New South Wales earned only \$1,200 for every man, woman and child in New South Wales, or approximately 50 per cent of Queensland's contribution. Victoria earned \$1,360 for every man, woman and child in Victoria. South Australia earned \$1,350 for every man, woman and child in South Australia.

I could go on. Let me remind the House that the Australian average is \$17,200,000 for every 10 000 Australians, or, if you like, \$1,720 for every man, woman and child in Australia. Hence, even the most biased member opposite must admit that Queensland is making a most significant contribution to the economic welfare of this nation by doing more than its share in earning money to help the nation to pay its way.

Let me express all of these statistics as percentages. Queensland has 16.1 per cent of Australia's population, but produces 22.1 per cent of our exports in terms of value. New South Wales accounts for 34.8 per cent of Australia's population but produces only 24.8 per cent of our export earnings. Victoria has 26.2 per cent of our population and produces 20.4 per cent of our export earnings. South Australia has 8.7 per cent of Australia's population and produces 6.5 per cent of our export earnings. Therefore, the socialist States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia make up just under 70 per cent of Australia's population but produce only 50 per cent of the nation's export wealth. Come now; let us be reasonable! Queensland and Western Australia carry Australia on their backs.

I turn now to look at the value of total building approvals in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia during the 11 months to May 1985. In Queensland, approximately \$980 worth of buildings was approved for every man, woman and child in Queensland. In New South Wales, the figure was \$750 for every man, woman and child in New South Wales. In Victoria, it was \$850 for every man, woman and child in Victoria. In South Australia, the figure was \$830 for every man, woman and child in South Australia.

The national average is \$8,700,000 per 10 000 Australian people, or \$870 for every man, woman and child in Australia. Once again, Queensland is way above the national average.

Since the building industry is so important in our national well-being, I am sure that each of us must agree that this State is making more than its fair contribution. By way of interest, Queensland has 16.1 per cent of the nation's population and accounts for 20.3 per cent of the total value of all buildings approved in Australia.

I could go on comparing Queensland with other States, but let me now summarise major economic indicators for Queensland. I want this House to remember that we here in Queensland account for 16.1 per cent of Australia's population. Hence, if we make a contribution above 16.1 per cent, we are performing above our expected national contribution. In the nine months ended March 1985, 20 per cent of all dwelling unit approvals in Australia were in Queensland. In the same period, 21.9 per cent of the total value of all other buildings approved for construction in Australia were in Queensland. Retail sales, excluding motor vehicles, in Queensland were 16.2 per cent of the nation's total sales. 16.1 per cent of all new motor vehicles, excluding motor cycles, registered in Australia in the same period were registered in Queensland. 17.1 per cent of private fixed-capital expenditure in Australia in the period 1984-85 is expected to be made in Queensland.

Much has been said about unemployment in Queensland. I am mindful of the fact that unemployment can have a profoundly destructive effect on families and on the physical, mental and emotional well-being of individuals. The problems of unemployment

will not be solved in the long term by public sector spending and by pushing the State further into debt. This solution—if one could call it a solution—is very short-sighted and can only rebound on future generations. We may sell off our homes today to stave off hunger, but, unless we redeem our mortgage, we are going to end up worse than we were when we set out, for where once we were hungry, we end up being both hungry and in debt.

Long-term employment must be created by private enterprise, and I am delighted to see how private investment, especially in the tourist industry, is creating thousands of jobs in Queensland each year.

Unemployment in Queensland arises from two sources. First of all, the downturn in the sugar industry has not only produced record bankruptcies as mentioned previously but has also produced record unemployment in such cities as Bundaberg, Mackay and Townsville.

On top of the sugar problem, we have, as I also said previously, seen the end of the great construction boom in the resources industries, especially coal. No longer are thousands of houses, schools, shops, ports, railways, hospitals and so on being built. Hence, jobs have contracted and unemployment has resulted. As other industries such as tourism step into the vacuum and as the sugar industry climbs out of its international slump, employment will pick up. In addition, the Queensland Government's \$600m Capital Works Program will make a great contribution.

When we examine unemployment, we must look carefully at population movement and in particular to interstate migration. The most recent statistics are really quite revealing. Both "The Courier-Mail" and the "Daily Sun" recently pointed out that Queensland was one of only three Australian States to experience population growth last financial year. These figures are revealed in an analysis of statistics released by the Bureau of Statistics. There are now more than 2.5 million people resident in Queensland, up 33 500 on the past year. This is the sixth year in a row that Queensland has topped growth figures. The population of New South Wales fell by 11 632, Victoria by 3 743 and South Australia by 1 958 during the same period. As a matter of interest, in the same period the population of Brisbane increased by about 7 000. Other areas to experience rapid growth were Logan city (plus 5.7 per cent), the Gold Coast (plus 5.1 per cent) and the Sunshine Coast (plus 5.6 per cent).

Queensland, therefore, was faced not only with a marked downturn in sugar and resource development but also with an influx of 33 500 new residents, thousands of whom would, no doubt, be seeking work.

Despite these facts, we have continued to provide jobs and we even succeeded in reducing our unemployment over recent months. If people would stop moving to Queensland, maybe we could solve our unemployment problem. If everyone stayed at home, maybe unemployment in southern States would go through the roof.

We do, however, welcome our southern refugees from socialism. They are obviously voting with their feet. By way of interest, I mention that I read in a newspaper that recently a major company in the housing construction and real estate area is to move its headquarters from Sydney to Brisbane. The directors believe that there will be in Australia—as there is in the United States of America—a major population drift to the sun belt, reaching a peak in the 1990s. Queensland, they said, is the place to be. I agree with them.

I was somewhat amazed to hear the Honourable John Cain, MP, Premier of Victoria, comment at the Australian Constitutional Convention, which was held recently in Brisbane, that his State was sick and tired of funding parasitic States such as Queensland. He was referring mainly to the recent allocation of funds by Canberra to the States. Mr Speaker, you may recall that grants were substantially increased to New South Wales and Victoria at, our Government argues, the expense of non-socialist States. I want to examine the real position, not Mr Cain's imagined position. In order to do this, we need

to look carefully at the total extent of tax support for the States. One area about which Mr Cain and his socialist colleagues do not like to be reminded is the level of support given by Australian tax-payers to prop up industry and employment.

Information relating to the extent of Commonwealth funds made available to industry in the form of tariffs, subsidies, bonuses, etc., is not readily available. However, the Industries Assistance Commission carried out a comprehensive survey for the 1977-1978 financial year. No survey appears to have been done since then, mainly, we suspect, because socialist Governments in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia are deliberately trying to cover up the extent of tax-payer support for their economies.

Canberra seems to be playing the same game. The Industries Assistance Commission indicated that, in 1977-78, the net equivalent of assistance, which is defined as the amount that would have to be paid by way of annual subsidy out of tax-payers' funds to provide the same amount of assistance as is provided by tariffs, subsidies, quantitative import restrictions and export incentives was—

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

I stress that those figures are for 1977-78. Imagine what they would be today, for there is nothing at all to suggest that the relative positions have not been maintained. I remind the House that each year, above and beyond the annual grants made to the States, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia—but especially Victoria—continue to suck billions of dollars out of Australian tax-payers to prop up their States.

The Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales maintain that they are getting their fair share and that they are tired of propping up parasitic States such as Queensland. Heaven forbid! Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia are like giant leeches sucking the blood of Australian tax-payers to prop up their State economies. They are parasites living off States such as Queensland.

Imagine what would happen in Queensland if, instead of only \$123 per person, our great State was to be funded at the same level as the socialists in Victoria—that is, at \$430 per person—an additional \$307 per person per year. We would have more than \$750m extra a year to spend in Queensland. How pathetic it is, then, to observe that the Hawke centralists and socialists in Canberra begrudge about \$150m over three years to help out Queensland's sugar industry, despite the fact that they rip off the sugar industry to the tune of over \$350m every year in taxes, export levies and so on. The Queensland Government receives next to nothing from the sugar industry, yet it is expected to contribute upwards of \$50m of the \$150m. Victoria and New South Wales were asked to contribute not a single cent to the hundreds of millions of dollars spent to prop up their steel and automotive industries.

On Wednesday, 18 January 1985, the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer issued a press release on this issue. I read that press release into the records of the House—

“Queensland's ‘good management’ has made it a low taxed State, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, Mr Bill Gunn, said today.

Mr Gunn said this was despite the burden of having to help to subsidise New South Wales and Victoria as a result of Commonwealth tariff protection of their secondary industries.

'The Industries Assistance Commission estimated in 1980 that the subsidies arising from tariff protection amounted to \$430 per capita in Victoria and \$294 per capita in New South Wales, compared with \$123 per capita for Queensland,' he said.

'In other words, Victoria receives an extra \$307 per capita or more than \$1,200 million per annum and New South Wales an extra \$171 per capita or more than \$900 million per annum to support inefficient, uncompetitive manufacturing industries to the detriment of internationally competitive, export oriented industries located in States such as Queensland and Western Australia.'

Mr Gunn said even these figures greatly understate the extent of protection of the industrial structures in New South Wales and Victoria.

'If it was not for this protection much of the protected Victorian and New South Wales manufacturing industry would simply not exist,' he said.

'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, for example supplying and consuming industries, the benefit of Commonwealth assistance to these industries is enormous.'

Mr Gunn said such high and costly protection was a factor which provides New South Wales and Victoria with higher taxable bases, and therefore greater capacity to raise State revenues.

'The Grants Commission—an independent, expert body—concluded that Queensland had been getting a poor deal for years and this should be rectified immediately,' he said.

However, the Grants Commission's recommendations have not yet been fully implemented. Queensland is not yet receiving the full grants to which it is entitled under Federal tax sharing arrangements that were determined by the Grants Commission back in 1982.

'The extent of this disadvantage is about \$180 million per annum in 1983 values.'

I fully endorse the comments made by the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. Let us once and for all put to rest the misguided, misinformed and mischievous misinformation being spread by the socialists in Opposition in Queensland and others in Canberra and in other States. Queensland does not live off the rest of Australia; the rest of Australia, excluding perhaps Western Australia and the Northern Territory, lives off Queensland.

I remind the House of some relevant statistics in relation to Government spending. All Australians should be profoundly concerned at the trend in Government spending in Australia. Overgovernment and overtaxation represent an enormous threat to freedom and enterprise in Australia. All Australians need to be alerted to that fact. The House may care to consider the following—

Spending by all levels of government in Australia now totals \$80 billion per year. This is 20 per cent greater than the total market capitalisation of all companies listed on Australian stock exchanges.

Governments now consume 43 per cent of Australian national income. This means that the average Australian who starts working on 1 January has to work until 7 June just to pay for government.

Commonwealth taxes in 1983 were 163 times greater than the total profit of BHP. In that year, more than 90 per cent of Esso's income from oil production in Bass Strait went to Governments in taxes and levies.

Interest payments on the Australian national debt are now almost twice as large as our spending on defence.

The purchasing power of the Australian dollar has fallen to about 50 per cent of its 1970 value.

One-third of the work-force is on the Government pay-roll.

The number of tax-consumers now exceeds the number of tax-payers.

The National Party Government of Queensland is very proud of its contribution to this State. My colleague the honourable member for Roma will outline major projects being undertaken in Queensland outside the south-east corner. I, however, will also deal with major development projects in the south-east corner and more especially in the city of Brisbane.

We are soon to see the completion of the extension of the south-east freeway to Springwood. This freeway, together with the Riverside Expressway, has made a major contribution to solving the traffic problems of southern Brisbane. I am sure that all motorists are looking forward to its completion. I note with considerable interest that thought is being given to the possibility of extending the freeway to three lanes both ways. I hope that that plan is proceeded with, as I feel that it would assist motorists greatly.

We are, of course, immensely proud of the Gateway Bridge. We look forward to its completion next year. I am impressed with the work being done on the approaches to that bridge. I am sure that the Gateway Bridge and its associated expressways will make an enormous contribution to reducing traffic on the Story Bridge and in the Valley area.

I would be remiss were I not to draw the attention of this House to the recently completed Performing Arts Complex. This magnificent building stands as a great tribute to the foresight of those members of this House who have promoted its building. When the State Museum and the State Library are completed and added to the Art Gallery and Performing Arts Complex, we here in Queensland and especially in Brisbane will have one of the most magnificent centres for the promotion and support of cultural activities anywhere in the world. The Queensland National Party Government can feel proud of its achievements in this area.

All of us are, of course, looking forward to Expo 88. Work is proceeding quickly and visibly on the south bank of the Brisbane River. Regrettably, I must remind this House of the fact that the Hawke socialist Government has not seen fit to make any positive, concrete contribution to assist the National Party Government of Queensland with its financial obligations to Expo 88. I really wonder whether our colleagues opposite have discussed the matter with their Canberra colleagues at all. I guess we really need not worry, as there will be a change of Government in Canberra within 18 months and maybe the new Liberal-National coalition Government will help us in this exciting, nationally significant project.

As an example of what our National Party Government is doing in and around Brisbane, one has only to walk down George Street in the vicinity of the Government precinct. One can see not only beautifully restored buildings such as The Mansions and Harris Court but also great building activity on the massive new office block being completed just across the road.

Stroll further down George Street and one sees the old Government Printery. I am privileged to be a member of the committee set up by Cabinet, chaired by Mrs Anne Garms, to review the future development of that site. We are excited by the proposals being advanced and we hope that a nationally significant and innovative plan will emerge from our deliberations. The building will be wholly or substantially preserved and restored. That is beyond debate.

Mr Speaker, there are numerous other projects planned or under way. In excess of \$6 billion is currently being invested in additional tourism infrastructure in Queensland.

In all, there are 50 major developments under way with price tags ranging from \$4m to \$1 billion, ranging across the whole spectrum of real estate development. \$36m is being spent on the Southport bar stabilisation, which is one of the most impressive pieces of engineering in Australia today; \$60m is being spent in the area south of the Brisbane River on roads; \$5m on airport development; \$20m on the recently completed Southport hospital; millions of dollars on schools such as the new \$6.5m Runcorn State High School; millions on Jupiters Casino, which will employ 2 000 people; four major international hotels are to be built on the Gold Coast and three others are in the feasibility study stage; \$100m is being spent to develop the area in the vicinity of Cavill Avenue on the Gold Coast; new TAFE colleges and the Gold Coast CAE are to be built; new technology parks are being built including one at Mount Gravatt involving Government expenditure in excess of \$1.5m; a new chemistry laboratory is to be built at Nathan costing many millions of dollars, and so on.

Mr Speaker, we are very proud of our State's achievements. Queensland is moving ahead under a dynamic visionary National Party Government of which I am very proud to be a part.

Let me remind the House that recent public opinion polls suggest high levels of public confidence in this Government and, conversely, a total lack of confidence in the Australian Labor Party Opposition, despite the Opposition's litany of smear, rumour, misinformation, personal attacks, insults, fantasies, doom and gloom predictions, negativness, attempts to divide, trouble-making and jealousy directed against this Government and individual members of it.

In conclusion, may I once again assure His Excellency of the loyalty of this House and its continued service in the interest of all the people of Queensland.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (2.45 p.m.): I commend the member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) for so ably moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech commemorating the opening of this, the third, session of the Forty-fourth Parliament.

It is indeed an honour and a privilege to second the motion which, in part, reads—
“May it please Your Excellency—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.”

The various measures to which His Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.

In speaking of the prosperity of this State and its people I believe it fitting to expand further on the remarks made by the member for Mount Gravatt in relation to the Queensland economy. No other issue affects the interests and concerns of the entire population more than the economy and, as such, it rightfully requires further consideration.

Unemployment is falling and has shown a decline for the sixth month in a row. Queensland's unemployment rate has been boosted by a net gain of 13 000 unemployment benefit transfers by people moving into Queensland over a period of three years. This has added 1.1 per cent to the State's unemployment rate, pushing it up to 9.3 per cent.

If the net gain of unemployment transfers were deducted, Queensland's unemployment rate would be 8.2 per cent—a figure almost equal to the national rate. It is not a sin or a crime that Queensland just happens to be a popular place in which to live, but it does bring with it problems of a special nature. Southern States exporting their unemployment problems northwards exert extra pressure on the Queensland economy

and this Government's performance in dealing with this unusual situation has been exemplary.

Queensland now has the lowest annual inflation rate of 5.9 per cent compared with the national average of 6.7 per cent.

It has the highest population growth rate of 1.5 per cent compared to 1.2 per cent for the rest of Australia.

Queensland is well to the fore in job creation. In the six months ended June 1985, about 54 000 jobs, or 26 per cent of all jobs created in Australia, were created in Queensland.

Let us not forget that Queensland, with 16.1 per cent of the nation's population, consistently outperforms the national average in many areas vital to the Australian economy.

At the present moment Queensland has recorded the highest annual increase in retail sales with 14.1 per cent, considerably higher than the national average of 11.4 per cent.

Queensland also has the privilege of having a balanced Budget, having ended the year in fact with an accumulated surplus of \$166,000 in consolidated revenue. This is indicative, surely, of the State's sound economic management.

In spite of its critics, Queensland is demonstrably a low-tax State. Queensland does not have petrol taxes, financial institutions duties, tobacco taxes and the like, as do the other States, nor will those and other new forms of taxation be introduced in this year's Budget. Government charges by necessity have had to rise. Why would they not rise when the State has been deprived of \$310m from three previous Grants Commission recommendations and was refused a further \$110m still outstanding on Medicare?

Mr Hamill: Because your claim wasn't justifiable.

Mr COOPER: Opposition members are getting upset, but I have a long way to go.

I turn now to third-party premiums. Third-party insurance premiums are not Government charges, but are premiums required to keep the funds used by the State Government Insurance Office and the FAI Insurance Group actuarially sound. The system has put enormous pressure on these funds. It would not be economically responsible to permit the Victorian experience to occur in Queensland. Third-party pay-outs in Victoria have caused a \$1 billion deficit and some \$30m of funds derived from that State's fuel tax have had to be used to prop up the scheme in that State. Massive awards are of major concern to this Government and quite obviously measures will have to be taken to tighten control and to ease the burden of third-party premiums.

Significant problems are created by lump-sum verdicts, and they need to be looked at. The present system requires courts to assess damages once and for all. In a paper presented by Mr Jeffrey Sher, QC, a leading personal injury lawyer at the Melbourne bar, he states that, in making calculations, many predictions are made as to the plaintiff's future. In cases of seriously injured plaintiffs, awards, often of very large sums, are made to compensate for destruction of earning capacity and for the plaintiff's need for goods and services, such as medical care, hospitalisation and nursing. The problem here is that such awards are once and for all. Once awarded, they cannot be altered, however wrong the prediction turns out to be. Mr Sher goes on to say that no existing method of assessment can overcome that problem; only radical legislative intervention will suffice.

We as a State Government must be prepared to take radical legislative action so that we can put an end to these massive hikes in third-party premiums. Some lump-sum awards should be abolished, but not necessarily all of them. The area that calls for the greater attention is the provision of a fund to pay for the future costs of hospitalisation, medical care, nursing and so on. This eliminates the guesswork of predictions and emotional settlements in the form of huge lump-sum payments that eventually wind up

in the injured person's estate if he happens to die at an age earlier than expected. Much more needs to be said, and will be said, on this much-vexed subject, but time does not permit me to canvass the issue further.

Further on the economy—my colleague the member for Mount Gravatt mentioned bankruptcies. Our critics seize on anything negative in order to denigrate this State's economy and therefore some facts need to be clearly outlined. The number and nature of bankruptcies filed in Queensland do not reflect failing businesses. Indeed, an analysis of bankruptcies in this State for the 1984-85 year shows that the more numerous category is to be found among the unemployed and among housewives. This suggests that private individuals are having money-management problems. It reflects most poorly on the ALP and others that they use the plight of these unfortunate people to downgrade the Queensland economy. The ALP has stated that there has been a tremendous hike in bankruptcies. The reality is that in 1984 there were 863 and in 1985 there were 870. That is an increase of seven. What sort of tremendous hike is that?

Let us look at some of the more positive aspects. For the five-year period to December 1984, about 54 000 new companies were created and more than 101 500 new business names were registered in Queensland. That draws a parallel with the United States, where, since the recession struck bottom in 1982, jobs have been created at a pace unmatched in post-war history. The vast majority of these jobs, 6.3 million of them, have been created by the establishment of new small business corporations, 600 000 of them in the last two years.

A study of these mid-size growth firms has concluded that the secret of their success is, "an obsessed leader, the person who eats, lives and breathes his company" These leaders exist here in Queensland. What they do not need is interference by big government, by way of high taxation and regulation. What they do need is a framework provided by government, inclusive of incentives, within which these entrepreneurs are free to operate. What they also need is a flexibility in the labour market totally appropriate to today's economic circumstances, of a kind that this Government in Queensland is determined to ensure that we get. We need less emphasis on compulsory unionised labour, and more on direct agreements between employee and employer. Centralised wage-fixing, without taking into account economic circumstances, must be ended and more flexibility introduced. The private sector derives its efficiency through competition. This competition is being restricted by the rapid growth in the Federal Government sector over the last 10 years.

Between 1973-74 and 1983-84 the Federal Government increased its share of the national output from 32 per cent to 42 per cent. By the year 2000, if the present rate continues, that will become 55 per cent. Restructuring and reducing the size of the Government sector must occur if our economic health is to be fully restored. The recent abortive July tax summit did not include on its agenda any reference to ways and means of cutting Government spending. All emphasis was on how to rake in more money from tax-payers. The tax summit was a sell-out to the unions and union-inspired taxes, particularly capital gains tax.

The Federal Budget brought down last night was an anti-private-enterprise Budget. It was a highly political Budget aimed at quietening the rowdy left wing of the Australian Labor Party, with its emphasis on welfarism. The pittance handed to the rural sector in the form of a 2.4c a litre reduction in the cost of diesel fuel is nothing but a fleeting nod to the sector that provides \$11 billion in inputs, and creates a major source of revenue, growth and employment in the nation's service and manufacturing industries. The Federal Budget and the Labor Party completely overlook the fact that the agricultural economy sustains an estimated one million jobs in urban centres, where more than two-thirds of the population resides.

I represent the rural electorate of Roma. I know for certain that the transport costs will not be reduced by one cent in my electorate as a result of the Federal Budget of 20

August. It has to be made quite clear that fuel costs overall have not been reduced, avgas and petrol prices have not changed and indexation still applies.

Mr Randell: Why didn't they give us the full Budget and tell us the penalties that we are going to pay in the next statement?

Mr COOPER: I will definitely cover that.

The Federal Budget that was brought down last night was merely an accounting exercise. The real economic statement will be made in September, when we will find out the format of the new tax system. Capital gains tax has been foreshadowed, which fits in perfectly with the tax policy of the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

The ALP in Queensland is continuing with its discredited and rejected economic theory. Its major premise is to knock, and to continue knocking, growth and development. Its recently launched State and regional development policy is a disaster. I have examined it closely and can assure all honourable members that there is nothing in it that is worthy of being uplifted for possible initiation. The editorial in "The Courier-Mail" of 10 July 1985 stated—

"... the Opposition should take its State and regional development strategy back to the drawing board."

I simply concur with that statement. Yesterday, the Queensland Government gave the positive program for the immediate future. The Labor Party should learn from that.

My colleague the member for Mount Gravatt spoke about the infrastructure that derived from resource investment. For the past 10 years, \$1 billion a year has been spent putting into place the infrastructure within which dynamic expansion in the mining sector has occurred. Mines, ports and rail facilities have been opened and constructed. It has been clear for some time that such expansion could not continue indefinitely, and this Government has planned accordingly.

It should be pointed out, however, that the coal-mining industry is far from dead. Most mines are producing at record levels and the "Big Australian", the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd, is to invest in excess of \$130m in its Queensland coal interests.

Another positive area that is continuing to play a major part in the economy is the oil and gas industry. Roma, the major town in my electorate, is at the centre of the action. Apart from having significant supplies of natural gas in the surrounding region, with the interrelated infrastructure and service industries already established in the town, it is also a staging point for the Jackson oil fields. Honourable members will recall the recent construction of the Jackson-Moonie pipeline, which has a capacity to pipe 55 000 barrels a day, built at a cost of \$100m. Other infrastructure developments in relation to this pipeline have seen investments totalling some \$60m. The latest initiative is for a gas pipeline from the Denison trough north of Injune to Gladstone, to be completed by 1987. This is to be followed by another pipeline from the south-west Queensland gas fields to link up with and complement the Denison trough supply to Gladstone by 1989.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr COOPER: The honourable member for Cairns would not have a clue about the area to which I am referring. The card-carrying communist from Cairns should return to that city and stay there.

The south-west Queensland pipeline will link the Cooper/Eromanga, Surat/Bowen and Adavale gas fields so as to co-ordinate and provide Queensland industry and consumers with a competitive supply of alternative fuel. That project is very real. It is hardly the pipe-dream to which the member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest) referred so disparagingly.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr COOPER: That made the honourable member jump.

The cost is estimated at \$230m, and funding will be shared by consumers, producers and the Government. Distribution of gas is to be made readily available to any area in close proximity to the route taken by the pipeline, but subject to pricing and tariff guidelines. The Government and, in particular, the Co-ordinator-General (Sir Sydney Schubert) are to be commended for bringing all parties together to ensure such a real and positive result. New industry of major significance will be attracted. A \$300m chemical plant at Gladstone and a \$250m ammonium phosphate industry, which would involve processing operations in north and north-west Queensland, are certainly of some significance. Some pipe-dream!

Mr Prest: Don't you read the editorials?

Mr COOPER: The honourable member should make the most of it because, after the next State election, the seat of Gladstone will be ours.

Tourism is recognised as a major industry, and the Government foresaw the role it would play when considering the future of the economy after the mining infrastructure boom had cooled. It set up the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in 1979 and under the guidance of its chairman, Sir Frank Moore, tourism has been promoted to the point where it is a \$4 billion a year industry. This State Government perceived the job creation prospects of tourism and, through its positive policies, has encouraged the building of \$2 billion worth of international hotel and resort projects. These will require the services of more than 5 000 people. In other words, 5 000 new jobs will be created in the tourist industry over the next four years.

To assist young people to take advantage of these opportunities, a system of traineeships is to be introduced that will have some very real primary objectives. These will include—

- the generation of new opportunities for structured training in the labour market;
- the provision of young people with broad-based transferable skills to make them better able to cope with structural and technological change;
- the improvement of young people's access to further training for the primary labour market; and
- the provision for industry of a better-trained and more adaptable work-force.

Central features of the traineeships are that they will be available in non-trade areas and are not to be confused with apprenticeships. They will provide an integrated system of training combining broad-based vocational education and training with work in a related occupation.

There will be trainee rates of pay, and an underlying principle will be that trainees share in the costs of training along with employers and Government. A training agreement will be entered into by the employer, the trainer, the trainees and the parents as well as the State Training Authority. This agreement will outline the details of the traineeships and the responsibilities of the parties concerned. Such a concept can only be described as commendable when unemployment in the 15 to 19 age group is in excess of 20 per cent.

Other interesting initiatives relating to the Queensland economy include a \$300,000 feasibility study into a 12 000 ha palm oil industry in the Lockhart River mission. British agriculturists Harrison and Crossfield will undertake the study that promises the development of a new township and the provision of 1 200 new jobs.

As stated previously, exports are running at record levels. Queensland's economy is tied very much to exports, and this can have a destabilising effect through exposure to the forces and interplays of world markets—witness the sugar industry. To this end, the Government is leaving no stone unturned in an endeavour to constantly drum up new business and to attract new industry to Queensland.

“Enterprise Queensland” missions to Japan and China have been outstanding successes this year, with the possibility of new contracts totalling between \$120m and \$150m. These missions will continue, but it must be remembered that private enterprise has the major role in the provision of a vibrant and energetic economy.

While speaking of enterprise, I mention a new concept that has been operating at the Roma meatworks for about 12 months. The meatworks is owned by Kilcoy Holdings and reopened last year when most other meatworks throughout the nation were closing. Private investment contributed one and a quarter million dollars, the bulk of which came from local producers and businesses.

The company also initiated a scheme of employee investment whereby the employees, by agreement, contribute portion of their weekly pay packet—on average \$20—to an investment scheme. This money was returned to the employees by way of share scrip in the company, and thereby they became part-owners with a very real vested interest. As a result, industrial relations are most harmonious, and it is worthy of note that, only last month, 87 employees were presented with their first share certificates. So far the employee investment is estimated at \$60,000, made up of \$1 shares at \$1 premium. Most employees signed up for 1 000 shares or a \$2,000 investment, but they can purchase more if they wish. The scheme is ongoing and appears to be working. It could well be used as a model for other industries to follow.

Mr McElligott: That’s socialism, isn’t it?

Mr COOPER: Far from it; it is capitalism.

I shall dwell for a moment on primary industry and emphasise the absolutely vital importance of this industry to the Queensland and national economies. As I am a fourth generation primary producer, it goes without saying that I have a very deep commitment to, and understanding of, rural industry.

Quite obviously there is deep resentment among the rural community. For decades a totally false impression has been presented of the farmer being the rich and wealthy grazier. This was a myth conjured up by high wool prices back in the early ’50s. These prices did not last long and a Federal Government super tax took care of the rest. But the myth lingered on. It is well and truly exploded now, as was epitomised by the recent Canberra rally. Years of oppression, lack of understanding and rejection of well-documented submissions by producer organisations caused 40 000 farmers and small businessmen to rise up and march on Canberra. The uprising was spontaneous and was not whipped up by any particular organisation. It was co-ordinated by leaders of rural organisations, once they could see it was on. For my part, I openly and publicly supported the Canberra rally, just as I do the fighting fund. This fund will see money come from primary producers who have never contributed to an organisation before, as well as from those who are always contributing. It will be utilised to bring to the attention of the people of this nation the parlous position that rural industry is in. No-one should underestimate the power and effectiveness of the rural voice when mobilised to the degree that it now is.

At the heart of the problem are two factors. One is rising costs through taxes and charges, particularly fuel taxes and the effect of tariffs. The other is foreign Government support for farm products in other countries, mainly in the European Economic Community and the United States.

Another myth to be exploded is the apparent but mistaken belief that Australian farmers are heavily subsidised. Put simply, they are not. When the last sum is done, it is patently obvious and officially accepted that the effect of tariff protection is costing the average farm approximately \$7,000 to \$9,000 each year. This a net figure after all so-called subsidies have been deducted from Government-induced imposts.

As an investment the rural sector can only be described as pathetic. Return on investment is generally accepted at about 1½ per cent. Farmers would be far better off selling up and investing in fixed deposits or anything else. This is no answer to the

problem. It is difficult to comprehend Federal Government thinking when it provides assistance to the manufacturing sector at three times the rate it does to primary producers.

Primary production generates 44 per cent of Australia's export income. Its contribution to the domestic well-being of Australia is incalculable and it should be recognised that it will always be a most potent economic force. In Queensland the gross value of rural production in 1983-84 was over \$3 billion—a 31 per cent rise on the figure for the previous year. This production came from 34 000 holdings, which is a decline of 1 000 since 1980. As a contribution to the economy, this is most significant, yet the individual producer faces continued cost rises in 1985-86 and a fall in the value of production is forecast.

Farmers are not looking for massive hand-outs. They merely wish to compete in a fair market. They want the Government off their backs and out of their pockets.

The most efficient and effective form of production is that of the family farm. This Government in Queensland recognises that and encourages it.

Mr Elliott: These fellows over here would like a collective farm. That is the only type of farm they understand.

Mr COOPER: Yes, that is right.

Land tenures have been liberalised to provide as much capacity as possible for a family farm to operate. Most leases have been converted to perpetual lease with a provision for the living areas based on productivity, and not measured in hectares or square kilometres. From perpetual lease, these holdings can be freeholded on application. Many are already being freeholded and consideration is being given to extending the term of tenure of the large pastoral holding leases in western and north-western Queensland to provide added security.

The family farm is efficient because it does not, as a rule, pay itself wages. It does not work to rule. It is not governed by the clock. Average earnings indicate incomes are below the accepted poverty line, yet the Federal ALP Government is still hell-bent on bashing it still further into oblivion. There seems to be no rhyme or reason for this. Since the Hawke Government came to office there have been about 40 seriously adverse budgetary decisions against the rural sector. More will most certainly follow in the form of capital gains tax, death and gift duties, which are tipped for September, and of course six-monthly indexed fuel price rises—fuel being the very life-blood of the farming sector. Federal Government fuel tax amounts to 56 per cent. In 1983-84, Federal Government fuel tax realised \$6 billion; in 1984-85 it is estimated at \$8 billion. Coupled with sales taxes, consumption taxes, provisional tax, tariff costs and more and more hidden taxes and imposts, the rural sector more than pays its way, and these are the people whom Mr Keating referred to as tax cheats.

The National Party in Queensland has had and always will have a very close rapport with producer organisations. I myself have been a vice-president of the Maranoa Graziers Association. Like so many of my rural colleagues on this side of the House, I am still a member of the Queensland Graingrowers Association. Our relationship with its president, Mr Ron McLeod, is close and co-operative. Some of my best friends are closely involved with the Cattlemen's Union, and I mention particularly Mr Jock Douglas of Roma, who is dedicated to the cause of agro-politics. Mr Rod Henzell, president of the Maranoa Graziers Association, has been and always will be a close confidant of mine. I make these points deliberately, because I believe that there are elements both inside and outside this Chamber who would stand to gain from mischievous attempts to split the rural community away from the National Party. Such attempts will be doomed to failure.

Although there is a very real need for rural organisations to fight with all the means at their disposal to ensure a better deal for their members, the rural community in general would be the losers in any fragmentation of traditional National Party support. This support is not in any way taken for granted by the National Party. No-one could

ever forget the massive decision by this Queensland National Party Government to abolish death duties—a decision which forced the Commonwealth to follow suit. Under Hawke and the ALP, the Federal Government will almost certainly bring them back.

The National Party Government of Queensland has been to the fore in providing and fighting for assistance in times of depressed prices, market collapses, and drought and flood, and will continue to do so. The support given to this party and to the Government by the rural sector has been returned in kind. Our roots are deep—from our most humble beginnings in Roma in 1935 when the then president of the Maranoa Graziers Association, Mr Alan Campbell, called for the formation of a political party and the adoption of the constitution of the Country Party of New South Wales.

Later, in Toowoomba in 1936, the Queensland Country Party was officially formed. Since then, the names of Campbell, Corbett, Ewen and Tomkins have had a special significance in the Country Party/National Party 50-year history. From this solid base the National Party of Queensland has grown and expanded to be the most representative political party of any. All other parties are far too urbanised to be taken seriously in the vast regions west of the Great Divide.

At present, the great sugar industry is afflicted with major and serious problems. One has to be careful when using the word “rationalise”, as far too often it is used in a glib and off-hand manner to prescribe the easy solution. History has shown, however, that many other rural industries have suffered near calamitous times and, through a combination of Government assistance and rationalisation with dignity, have come back from the brink of total disaster.

Who could forget the agonies of the sheep and wool industries, the torment of wool promotion and the floor price scheme, and the cattle crash of 1974 to 1978, which split the industry asunder?

Rationalisation is still occurring, but the industry itself is the stronger for it. In the dairy industry, the wheat industry and the tobacco industry—the list is endless—no-one who was involved will forget the heartbreak of tough decisions and of being forced to rationalise. All attention, particularly Federal Government attention, must be turned now to the sugar industry and those involved in it, to help them adjust to economic reality. This industry has given, and continues to give, so much to this State and this nation, as have our other great primary industries already mentioned.

Finally, I wish to express an opinion held widely by the rural and mining industries in particular and by many other people in general. I refer to the emotional issue of land rights. I make it abundantly clear from the outset that I do not believe that anyone in this country need feel any sense of guilt at having dispossessed any group or another. It simply has not happened that way and, as far as I am concerned, the people of this nation stand as one, under one flag. I do not believe that any group of people deserve to be advantaged more than another—unless, of course, it is because of their own ability to advance themselves through work, effort and achievement.

It is also my opinion that Governments of all political persuasions, mainly Federal, have made enormous mistakes in dealing with the Aboriginal problem down through the years.

With the benefit of hindsight we can now see clearly the enormity of these mistakes. Some of these mistakes include throwing fistfuls of dollars in the direction of the problem, with the hope that the problem will go away. In other words, it is only appeasement of a guilt complex which only served to exacerbate and enlarge a situation that, as a result, has grown out of hand.

Huge tracts of land have been given away, particularly in the Northern Territory. Approximately 30 per cent has already gone, and a further 18 per cent is under claim. Inalienable freehold title, so called, has the effect of creating separate enclaves, States within States. It effectively prevents all other Australians from having access. It is, without question, apartheid in reverse.

Witness also the situation in Western Australia and South Australia—an intended land grab of intolerable proportions which, if included with the Northern Territory, would amount to nearly one-third of the Australian land mass under claim by a people representing just 1 percent of the population. The emotional debate over land rights must and will now become more of a rational debate over equal rights.

I believe that the Queensland method of giving autonomy to local Aboriginal and Islander communities by forming them into local authority areas similar to the 134 local authorities in Queensland is the rational and proper way to go.

By granting deeds of grant in trust for those areas, the land in question cannot be sold to outsiders but access will be possible to all people. The deeds of grant can only be altered by the Parliament of the day. Incredibly, implementation of the deeds of grant is being delayed by the intransigence of the Federal Government over the future of Commonwealth Government houses in the communities.

A Government Member: They want to overcharge them.

Mr COOPER: They do. They expect to be paid full replacement value for those houses. Each house could be worth up to \$80,000. Where in the name of fortune will they get that sort of money? The Queensland Government is prepared to make the houses available at their existing market value.

I believe that initiatives taken over the past two years in particular by this Government can be made to work, and demonstrate a continuity of commitment and a desire to bring Aboriginal and Islander people to a relatively equal status with the rest of the population. It is essential that we learn to live as one people.

Blame for divisions can be sheeted home in large part to militant, irresponsible, left-wing radicals and white do-gooders, many of whom have grown fat feeding off the Aboriginal cause. These white do-gooders, masquerading as advisers, have manipulated and confused an innocent and well-meaning race of people to such a degree that they have wrought deep and traumatic change to the character of the true Aboriginal people. They should be roundly condemned and exposed for what they are. We have spoken at length with the people of these communities who have implored us to bring in laws to stop these trouble-makers from entering their reserves. With the use of the council by-laws which they now have their own councils can go far in dealing with this problem.

Also of major concern, but doomed to failure as more and more people become aware of it, is the Federal Government's so-called Preferred National Land Rights Model. Major areas of concern are—

- (a) The legislation will be designed to override State legislation where it is not in accord with Federal legislation.
- (b) It will foreshadow the overruling of future State legislation.
- (c) It makes clear the Federal intention to enforce consistency with Commonwealth law across the land in spite of assurances to the contrary.
- (d) It ignores the right of private ownership.
- (e) It provides for an open-ended or a blank cheque on claims to Crown land denied to all other Australians.

Aborigines would be permitted to lay claim to this land bank which is normally held by State Governments for future public use.

In the area of the mining industry, more grave concerns are raised. Generally the model is over-complicated and inefficient. It sets up new tribunals unnecessarily and it intrudes upon traditional State Government responsibilities for regulating the mining industry. Endless delays caused in the Northern Territory have already led to a termination of exploration activities on Aboriginal land by many companies, some of which have withdrawn their interests totally from the Territory.

I believe, as do so many other Queenslanders and Australians, that the colonisation of this nation is a fact of history. Nothing will change that. We cannot and must not divide ourselves up into divisive separate enclaves that will create racism and hatred on such a scale that we have not witnessed in this country to date. The Queensland legislation is without doubt the way to go. It is based on discussion, pragmatism, common sense and reality. Above all, it is based on equal rights.

I will mention a couple of parochial issues. I believe that the State Government in general has been doing a great job concerning decentralisation. I ought to know; I live in a very rapidly growing region in western Queensland.

Mr Lee: The best in the west.

Mr COOPER: Undoubtedly the best in the west.

I commend the Government for paying particular attention to the Warrego Highway. The road from Roma west to Mitchell is especially a problem as it carries heavy traffic and the road is gradually deteriorating. This year money has already been allocated for that purpose. I acknowledge the actions of the Government in that regard.

The Springsure to Emerald railway line is in need of upgrading to a heavier standard of track because of the tremendous explosion in grain-growing in that region. That is something that the Minister for Transport has taken fully on board and to which he is giving his very serious consideration.

May I conclude by assuring His Excellency of the loyalty of the members of this Legislative Assembly. May I also assure him that this Government will continue to provide this State with balanced and decentralised development; that it will provide for balanced and decentralised political representation; that it will protect the rights of its citizens to receive essential services, and that it will protect the rights of its citizens to work. People have a right to these requirements.

Yesterday, we listened to an oft-repeated chant from outside this building which went something like this, "People united will never be defeated." All I can say is—how utterly true. On this side of the House, we represent the people, and we are united.

I wish His Excellency and Lady Campbell well during His Excellency's tenure as Governor of Queensland, for and on behalf of the members of this Assembly.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Electoral Districts Act 1985 in a certain particular; and for related matters."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (3.22 p.m.): I move—

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

The Electoral Districts Act 1985 was introduced into the House on 27 March 1985 and was debated at length on 10 April 1985. The Act received Royal assent on 19 April 1985.

Shortly after Royal assent was given, an error was located in the schedule to the Act. In Part 1 of the schedule to the Act dealing with the south-eastern zone, reference is made to—

“C

- (i) the part of Division 4 of the Area of the Shire of Rosalie that, at the commencement of this Act, is comprised in the electoral district of Somerset.”

This is incorrect. It should read—

“ . . in the electoral district of Lockyer.”

That is logical if the words before and after the quotation are read. The south-eastern zone boundary has not been changed. The area in question was in Somerset prior to the 1971 Act and remained there after the 1971 redistribution. It was changed in the 1977 redistribution.

The Bill is a very simple measure and provides for—

- (a) an amendment to the schedule to the principal Act in Part I by omitting the word “Somerset” and substituting the word “Lockyer”;
- (b) the amendment to have retrospective effect from 19 April 1985, the date on which the Electoral Districts Act received Royal assent;
- (c) preserving the effectiveness of any act which has been done and which may have been affected by the inaccuracy of Part I of the schedule; and
- (d) making provision for the lodgment of further suggestions insofar as the south-eastern zone and the country zone are concerned no later than one calendar month after the date that this amending Act receives Royal assent.

I now propose to deal with certain of the more outrageous comments that have been made by Opposition spokesmen in recent months in relation to this matter.

The Leader of the Opposition, for example, demanded that the distribution commissioners cease work forthwith and he then proposed to take out an injunction against the distribution. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition was intent only on deceiving the public, and no such injunction was sought or obtained.

The legal advice received by the Opposition on this matter was obviously the same as that which the Government sought when it first became aware of the matter.

The advice received by the Government was to the effect that there was no reason at all for the commissioners not to proceed with the distribution as provided by the 1985 Act, pending amendment of that Act.

The Leader of the Opposition also stated that people could not make submissions while the Act was wrong. Again he was wrong. Again his intention was to deceive the public. There was no impediment. The National Party and the Liberal Party, too, for that matter, had no problem in making their submissions.

However, as the Australian Labor Party obviously feels it could not prepare a correct submission—I can understand the great difficulty that its members have in understanding things—this Bill makes provision for the lodgement of further suggestions insofar as the south-eastern zone and the country zone are concerned. As I said earlier, one calendar month has been allowed after the date on which this amending Act receives Royal assent.

Mr Warburton: Why would you extend the period if you weren't wrong in the first place?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Because Opposition members said they had difficulty in understanding it and were hindered in the presentation of submissions.

I am amazed at the frequent reference by Opposition members and their friends in the media to the Electoral Districts Act being rushed through the Parliament in an all-night session.

The Bill was introduced on 27 March and allowed to lie on the table of the House for examination by all members. It was not debated until two weeks later on 10 April. The debate commenced at 2.15 p.m. and the Bill had its third reading at 12.30 a.m. the following morning. So much for an all-night session. No attempt was made by the Government to gag the debate, and the statements by Opposition spokesmen that the Act contains numerous errors because it was rushed through the House without sufficient time for consideration are obviously and clearly false.

On another matter—the member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill), who revels in the title of Australian Labor Party Redistribution Committee Secretary—a high-falutin title—has had a great deal to say about the Wujal Wujal Aboriginal Community in far-north Queensland and has claimed that he was responsible for discovering a second serious error in the Act. In a further attempt to deceive the public, he, too, called on the distribution commissioners to cease work.

The member had a whole two weeks from 27 March to study Part III of the schedule to the Act, and if he was doing the job he was paid for, he would have seen that Wujal Wujal had been specifically mentioned. It seems that, despite his academic achievements, the member for Ipswich is a slow thinker, like the former union officials who sit with him on the other side of the House. He made no reference to Wujal Wujal when he spoke on 10 April. He had not caught up with the fact at that time. In fact, it took him until 15 July, which, incidentally, was far outside the time for making submissions, to discover where Wujal Wujal was and to claim its inclusion in the western and far-northern zone was wrong.

The Electoral Districts Act clearly states in which zone this Aboriginal community is located, and the member for Ipswich is the one who is completely in error in his statements in relation to this matter. However, I forgive him.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Warburton, adjourned.

CANNED FRUITS MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Canned Fruits Marketing Act 1981 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.30 p.m.): I move—

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

The Canned Fruits Marketing Act was enacted in 1981 as part of complementary Commonwealth/State legislation aimed at overcoming serious marketing problems faced by canners of apricots, peaches and pears at that time. The legislation introduced stabilised marketing arrangements into the canned deciduous fruits industry and has been reasonably effective in improving the marketing outlook for that industry.

Queensland does not produce commercial quantities of canned deciduous fruits, but the market disruptions and severe price-discounting that occurred prior to the introduction of the canned fruits marketing legislation adversely affected the market for Queensland's important canned pineapple industry.

This Bill seeks to extend those marketing arrangements for a further three years to 31 December 1987. Complementary legislation has been passed through the Commonwealth Parliament, and other participating States are in the process of amending their legislation accordingly.

The Bill provides also for the improved functioning of the Australian Canned Fruits Corporation by requiring that body to develop a corporate plan and annual operational plans.

Amendments to the method of insuring canned fruits acquired by the corporation are also provided for, as are amendments to confirm the payment to canners of any sales premiums in excess of the minimum prices set by the corporation. The penalty provisions are also being updated.

The Bill has the full support of the Queensland fruit industry, and I am confident that the continued stabilisation of the canned deciduous fruits industry will avoid the severe disruptions to the canned pineapple market which previously occurred.

Queensland's involvement in the scheme is relatively minor and we will not become physically involved unless our deciduous canned fruit production exceeds the trigger point of 50 000 basic cartons per season. The extent of the Queensland industry is such that production is unlikely to reach that level in the foreseeable future. However, it is desirable that Queensland be seen to be involved.

It will not be necessary to proclaim the substantive sections of the legislation unless Queensland's production of canned deciduous fruits reaches the trigger point. Nevertheless, the continuation of the deciduous canned fruits marketing arrangements in the southern States will have a stabilising effect on the total canned fruits market and this will benefit our tropical fruit canning industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Tobacco Industry Protection Act 1965-1974 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.34 p.m.): I move—

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

Honourable members should know that the Tobacco Industry Protection Act of 1965 was introduced to improve the control of pests and diseases in tobacco. It was directed essentially at—

preventing the transfer of pests and diseases from one tobacco-growing district to another;

preventing infected seed or seedlings being supplied to tobacco growers;

breaking the continuity of tobacco-cropping in a district so that infected plants or residues from one crop do not transmit pests or diseases directly to the next crop; and

containing new pests or diseases of tobacco within quarantine areas to reduce overall economic damage and enable their eradication.

The Act has, in the past, achieved its objectives with a minimum of enforcement by inspectors, by providing a basis for self-imposed discipline within the tobacco industry. However, prosecutions and the imposition of penalties by the courts on persistent offenders have been necessary on occasions.

In this regard, the penalties have not been increased since 1965, and the maximum penalties of \$200 have been rendered almost insignificant by 20 years of inflation. Over the same period, tobacco prices have doubled and tobacco yields trebled, so that growers' incomes have increased sixfold. The amendments proposed will increase the penalties to \$1,000, which should act as a deterrent to offenders.

There is a particular and important reason for seeking these amendments at this time. In recent years, the serious disease blue mould has been very effectively controlled by a new fungicide marketed as Ridomil. Previously, the Act had provided an important mechanism for reducing the significance of blue mould. Now, with the virtual absence of blue mould, some growers do not see the tobacco-free periods as so important and a small proportion are deliberately negligent with their destruction of tobacco plants and residues in the free period. This negligence increases the likelihood that blue mould growing on out-of-season tobacco will develop new races resistant to Ridomil such as has already occurred in Latin America.

Education programs to convince growers of this danger have been only partly successful. Contrary to uninformed opinion, the need for enforcement of the provisions of the Act is even greater now that the industry has Ridomil than it was before.

Responsible north Queensland growers, through representative meetings and their industry leaders in the Tobacco Growers Co-operative Association and the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board, have urged my department to enforce the Act more rigorously and to seek increased penalties for infringements.

I am confident that, in putting this Bill before the House, there is complete support from all responsible members of the tobacco industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kruger, adjourned.

MINING (FOSSICKING) BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the declaration of areas in the State in which fossicking for gemstones and gold is to be permitted, to provide for the issue of fossickers' licences, to regulate fossicking activities within those areas and for other purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (3.38 p.m.): I move—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

It gives me much pleasure as Minister for Mines to introduce this Bill, the main provisions of which are to form the basis of a new concept in the promotion of tourism in the mining environment.

These days when one thinks of mining one usually thinks of the huge open-cut coal mines of central Queensland, the unique operations at Mount Isa or the new, large-scale gold-mining successes in northern Queensland. It was only during the last session of this Parliament that I introduced legislation to ratify an agreement entered into on behalf of the State with Mount Isa Mines Limited to consolidate its tenures and to allow the company to continue its operations.

Proud as we may be of these developments, we must not forget the original contributions made by individual prospectors and miners. Almost without exception, the successes of today can be traced back to their discoveries. With more and more leisure-time, people from all walks of life are following in the footsteps of the early pioneers, firm in the belief that there are still undiscovered secrets and untapped wealth waiting to be found on or below the earth's surface. The proposed legislation will provide a mechanism to allow limited areas of the State to be set aside for use by these tourists, holiday-makers and fossickers for the purpose of searching for and collecting gold and gemstones.

To appreciate the various provisions of this legislation, it is necessary to know a little of the background leading to its introduction and, in this regard, it must be remembered that, while the legislation is to have State-wide application, its origins are to be found on the gem-fields of central Queensland.

During 1955, these fields saw the commencement of what was to become a large annual influx of tourist miners. Although the sapphire industry experienced a state of depression from 1956 to 1959, with renewed activity in 1960 the week-end miner became more prominent. The influx of these week-end miners continued during the early '60s and, with the improved market continuing, the number of miners and tourists on the fields increased substantially. To cope with this tourist trade, amenities were erected at Sapphire and Rubyvale in the form of camping areas and caravan parks with toilet and shower facilities. It was during this period that machinery was first used on ground considered in the past to be too poor to work by hand-mining methods.

With the sapphire industry showing signs of a quickening pace as prices paid for sapphires escalated, there was a resultant upsurge in the use of heavy machinery and large areas being sought for lease. However, the use of this machinery to work shallow ground, particularly in the areas round Sapphire and Rubyvale, was causing concern, and fears were expressed that its use would destroy the tourist industry as the small miners and tourists would be forced further afield.

The tourist potential of the fields was brought to the fore in August 1968 when the late John Herbert, then Minister for Labour and Tourism, informed the Minister for Mines that, in his view, steps should be taken to protect the fields from the granting of leases, as the fields were indeed a great tourist attraction. In an attempt to prevent further applications for leases in sensitive areas of the sapphire-fields, areas were proclaimed around Sapphire, Rubyvale, Glen Alva and The Willows in which mining tenements were restricted.

The then Minister for Mines (Honourable R. E. Camm) in support of this proclamation stated—

“This is one area where I believe that our interests can best be served by setting aside a district where the average man can pursue what is rapidly becoming a widespread hobby and tourist activity.”

Nevertheless, the use of machinery increased considerably during the early '70s, resulting in protests from round Australia. The Queensland Chamber of Commerce requested the Department of Mines to set aside areas close to the existing townships for tourists to prospect on, whilst another proposal put forward the conservation of the whole of the gem-fields as a major tourist attraction.

In an attempt to slow the spread of mechanised mining, further restrictions were imposed and areas were established in which no machinery could be used other than that commensurate with hand mining. As a result of these restrictions, the machine miners began to run out of ground, and trading in the older tenures—alluvial mining claims—that were not subject to the restrictions became rife, as did illegal mining. To a large degree, this defeated the efforts to contain mechanised mining.

To many of the miners, the presence of machinery on the fields constituted a threat to their livelihood and a rift developed between machine miners and the traditional hand miners.

In the mid-1970s, the Department of Mines attempted to rectify inconsistencies in the Mining Act and Regulations that were preventing proper management of the gem-fields, and orders were issued to enforce strictly the laws pertaining to the fields, particularly in regard to illegal mining.

Late 1977 saw the start of a downturn in the industry on the fields. Prices were depressed and large stones could not be sold. Years of oversupply and the opening up of the Sri Lankan deposits to mechanised mining contributed to falling demand.

Today, mining activity on the fields is only a fraction of its peak in the mid-1970s and the Government believes that the potential prosperity that could flow to this region, as well as to similar regions of the State, from an active tourist industry is its real future. Accordingly, the decision was made to introduce this legislation to provide for such tourist activity in this mining environment.

The main thrust of the legislation is to provide for the declaration of limited areas in various regions of the State in which fossicking for gemstones and gold is to be permitted and in respect of which fossickers' licences are to be issued. Additionally, there are provisions to regulate these fossicking activities and to provide overall control of the areas.

The legislation can be broken into four broad areas—

- types of areas to be provided;
- licences to be made available;
- penalties; and
- powers of the warden.

There are to be two types of areas provided. The first of these are designated areas, which the Governor in Council by Order in Council may declare in respect of certain lands within a mining district. These designated areas can only comprise land which is—

- unoccupied Crown land;
- occupied Crown land (other than occupied pursuant to any Act relating to mining or the Miners' Homestead Leases Act) which the land-holder has agreed can become or be included in a designated area; or
- reserve land other than any State forest, timber reserve, national park or environmental park.

In respect of any designated area or part thereof, the Governor in Council can indicate, by proclamation, the method of prospecting or mining that may or may not be carried on, as well as the machinery and equipment that may or may not be used.

Honourable members will note that the legislation provides that any restriction imposed on the method of mining or the equipment to be used will relate to existing mining tenements within the boundaries of the designated area, or any part thereof, to which such proclamation relates. This is considered necessary to prevent a continuance of the existing situation in which certain titles issued under repealed legislation are not subject to restrictions, thus resulting in heavy machinery being operated in what are now recognised as hand-mining areas. As I outlined earlier, this was a major factor in the problems confronting the gem-fields of central Queensland in the '70s. However, the legislation does provide the warden with the authority to permit heavy machinery into areas where it is normally prohibited, to carry out certain works such as restoration, dam-building and roadworks.

The second category are the fossicking areas. These may be declared within designated areas by the Governor in Council by Order in Council. Mining tenements will not be able to be pegged or applied for in these areas. They will be for the sole purpose of fossicking and hand mining.

With regard to the licences to be made available, it will be seen that a new licence to be known as a fossicker's licence, which can be issued to either an individual or a family, is provided for use in both designated areas and fossicking areas. This licence is for the purposes of searching for and collecting gemstones and gold. The family licence is designed to reduce the cost for families who are interested in this activity, thus encouraging them to spend their holidays in the gold and gem areas of the State.

The term of a fossicker's licence is to be two months. This is considered an appropriate length of time for most tourists and holiday-makers. However, any person desirous of remaining for longer periods can apply for a further licence.

The legislation provides that an application for a fossicker's licence can be refused where it is believed the applicant or a member of the family, where the application is for a family fossicker's licence, has previously contravened or failed to comply with any relevant mining legislation. Thus, if the holder of a licence, or member of the family, has, in the past, refused to obey lawful instructions of the warden, has failed to make the ground worked safe, has failed to keep his campsite hygienic or has not complied with any other requirements applicable to the particular area, he can be refused a further licence. This should ensure a better environment for all. Additionally, by issue of a notice, a fossicker's licence can be cancelled if it is believed that the holder, or family member in the case of a family fossicker's licence, has contravened or failed to comply with the relevant legislation.

The holder of a fossicker's licence is required to make the land where he has been working safe. However, total restoration is not necessarily required. As people return to these areas year after year, they prefer to be able to define where work has previously taken place. Additionally, it must be borne in mind that, to many people, the worked ground adds to the character of the area. Nevertheless, it is necessary for such ground to be left in a safe condition.

Further, unless prohibited by Order in Council, the holder of a fossicker's licence is permitted to camp on unoccupied Crown land subject to his complying with any applicable laws relating to camping. Whilst camping, he must dispose of all refuse, including human waste, and rubbish in a safe and sanitary manner or as directed by the warden. He is also to ensure that he causes minimum inconvenience to other persons lawfully in the area and does not endanger their health or well-being.

The holder of the fossicker's licence is required to vacate the campsite before the expiration, cancellation or surrender of his licence and remove all structures. He must also ensure that the land is safe and that the site is in a sanitary condition. These

provisions of the legislation are designed with a view to preventing environmental pollution where there may be large numbers of campers.

All gemstones and gold found by the holder of a fossicker's licence in designated areas, which include all fossicking areas, are the property of the holder. However, royalty is payable to the Crown at the rate prescribed in the Mining Regulations 1979. Unlike the requirements applicable to miners generally, the holder of a fossicker's licence will not have to lodge a royalty return if no royalty is payable.

As I indicated earlier, a land-holder whose land is included in a designated area has agreed to the use of such land by fossickers, and therefore there is no provision for the payment of compensation by the holder of a fossicker's licence.

The other licence is the miner's right. The holder of a miner's right is given the additional privileges in line with those given to the holder of a fossicker's licence, such as camping, but is also bound by the additional responsibilities, such as making the land safe and ensuring the campsite is in a sanitary condition. There is, however, no provision for a "family" miner's right.

The third broad area covered by the legislation relates to penalties, and these can be broken into two distinct types. Substantial penalties have been prescribed when heavy machinery, which is prohibited by proclamation, is used in a designated area or a fossicking area without the prescribed authority. These penalties are—

- for a first offence—\$10,000;
- for a second offence—\$20,000; and
- for a third or subsequent offence—\$50,000.

Honourable members will note that these penalties are to be imposed by the Wardens Court rather than by way of indictment to the District Court or the Supreme Court. It is felt that, as these offences relate to activities in what have been determined as areas of mining significance, the Wardens Court is the appropriate court in the first instance. Should any party be aggrieved by the penalty imposed by that court, they naturally have the right of appeal to a higher court.

Again, as with the provision to impose current restrictions on existing titles, this is an endeavour to stamp out illegal mining, particularly in areas that have been recognised as being appropriate for hand miners and fossickers. Past experience on the gem-fields of central Queensland has shown that a fine is not by itself a sufficient deterrent. However, it is believed that the detention or confiscation of the machinery being illegally used would make such breaches of the law uneconomical and, additionally, would prevent the continued illegal use of the machinery to meet any monetary penalty imposed, as has been the case in the past.

Accordingly, the legislation provides for the Wardens Court that convicts a person for having or using prohibited machinery within a designated area or fossicking area, without the consent of the warden, to order the detention of such machinery for a specified period or, alternatively, its forfeiture to the Crown. Honourable members should note that the appeal provisions of the Mining Act do apply to any party aggrieved by such a determination of the Wardens Court.

The other type of penalty provided for in the legislation is on-the-spot fines. These will be issued where a person contravenes or fails to comply with the provisions of this legislation, other than where prohibited machinery is involved, and are similar to those applying under existing State legislation.

This type of fine system is considered appropriate to cover the numerous instances in which people on these somewhat isolated yet active fossicking and mining areas commit minor breaches that can affect the working and living conditions of other users of the particular area. A minor breach could be anything from pollution of the environment with rubbish or human waste to searching for and collecting minerals without the relevant authority.

The fourth major area of the legislation relates to the powers of the warden. Provision is made for a warden to require a person who is mining, fossicking or camping in a designated area to produce his authority to be there. Once again, this is in an endeavour to prevent illegal mining and camping.

Further, if the warden considers that an offence has been or is about to be committed, the legislation provides that he may enter any place to make inquiries or carry out a search in relation to the offence. In this regard, I point out that in the past it has been difficult to obtain prosecutions for alleged breaches because of restrictions placed on the collection of evidence to substantiate the Crown's case.

I point out to honourable members that these powers to enter and search any place used exclusively as a dwelling do not extend to any person other than a warden who, by virtue of his appointment, is also a Stipendiary Magistrate, unless that person obtains a warrant for that purpose from a justice.

The legislation also authorises the warden to seize and detain property found in a designated area which he suspects has been used in contravention of this legislation. He may also eject a person from a designated area as well as remove explosives, firearms and other weapons.

The warden is also provided with the power to deal with abandoned property, including structures and vehicles. Presently these areas of high fossicking activity are littered with unsightly abandoned equipment, vehicles and temporary dwellings of very little or no value which detract from the tourist potential of the area, and it is considered that for this reason, as well as that of hygiene and personal safety, such abandoned property should be removed.

These are the major components of the legislation, which I feel sure will greatly facilitate fossicking by tourists and holiday-makers, particularly on the gem-fields of central Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

COAL AND OIL SHALE MINE WORKERS (PENSIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act 1941-1983 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (3.58 p.m.): I move—

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

The Coal Mine Workers Pensions Fund provides benefits by way of lump-sum payments to qualified coal mine workers and their dependants.

The amendment Act of 1981 allowed contributors to have the option of retiring at the age of 58 years (previously 60 years) and, if qualified, receive lump-sum benefits, providing they had service in the industry of at least 30 years.

At that time, I advised that this was seen as the first step in attaining an eventual 55 years of age optional retirement for all contributors.

The Amendment Act of 1983 took a further step in this direction by reducing the qualifying service period from 30 years to 25 years while retaining the 58 years retirement age.

This amendment Bill provides a further move towards a 55 retirement age by reducing the retirement age to 57 years but retaining the 25 years service qualification.

The amendment was recommended by the Miners Pensions Tribunal with the agreement of the mining unions and the employers, and the fund's actuary has advised that the move is possible while still retaining the actuarial solvency of the fund.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

DISTRICT COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the District Courts Act 1967-1982 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.2 p.m.): I move—

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

The administration of the District Courts in Queensland has progressed to the stage where I am of the opinion that it is desirable to create positions of deputy chairmen of these courts. The sole object of this Bill is therefore to allow for such appointments to be made.

It is my intention initially to appoint a deputy chairman at Townsville and one at Brisbane. The Government recognises the importance of north Queensland to the State and we have an ongoing policy of giving due recognition to this fact. As part of this ongoing policy, I recently appointed a Deputy Director of Prosecutions in north Queensland. I also see the need for the appointment of a senior District Court judge in north Queensland.

The appointment of a deputy chairman of the court at Townsville will enhance the status of this court in north Queensland. I consider that there is also a need to have a judge designated to assist the Chairman of the District Courts in Brisbane.

This Bill will assist in improving the administration of our District Courts in Queensland. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

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

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act of 1867 as amended in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.4 p.m.): I move—

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

Today I introduce a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act of 1867. The proposed amendments relate to the already existing section 39A of the Supreme Court Amendment Act 1980 which makes provision for section 39A (1), existence; section 39A (3), qualifications for appointment; and section 39A (4), seniority of masters of the Supreme Court. Subsections (1), (3) and (4) of section 39A shall, by this amending Bill, be replaced by new subsections (1), (3) and (4). The effect of the new amendments will be to provide for the creation of an additional position of senior master, whilst retaining the existing positions of masters.

The qualifications required for appointment to the position of senior master or master will be defined.

The senior master may be appointed from among persons who are either masters or persons qualified for appointment as masters.

Finally, the last amendment, to section 39A (4), provides for the method of determining seniority between masters. The senior master shall have seniority over any other master.

The existing method of determining seniority between other masters is not altered, that is, seniority shall be determined from the date on which one's appointment as master takes effect.

These amendments shall serve to streamline more effectively the administrative functions of masters appointed to the Supreme Court.

There is already reference to a senior master in Order 86 Rule 11 of the Rules of the Supreme Court, which provides—

“The distribution of business between the Masters shall, subject to the direction of the Chief Justice, be by the direction of the Senior Master.”

These amendments shall now formally provide for the existence of such a position.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (4.6 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the position of member of the Council of the Griffith University be one to which section 7A(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act 1867-1978 shall not apply.”

This morning the member for Mackay (Mr Casey) drew the attention of the House to particular Acts. Of course, the member for Mackay was inaccurate in the way he used the facts. He is apparently so—

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr POWELL: If the honourable member listens, he will find out.

Section 8(1)(g) of the Griffith University Act states that six members shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, and it was under that authority that the recommendation was made to the Governor in Council that the member for Mount

Gravatt (Mr Henderson) be appointed to the Council of the Griffith University. Since then it has been pointed out to me that section 7A of the Legislative Assembly Act is in conflict with that action. However, section 7C of the Legislative Assembly Act empowers this Assembly, by resolution, to exclude one of those positions from the list of prescribed positions, and that is what the motion seeks to do.

Mr CAHILL (Aspley): I second the motion.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (4.9 p.m.): This morning the member for Mackay (Mr Casey) referred to an extraordinary situation. It is quite incorrect to imply that the Opposition was not aware of the full consequences of its action in this regard. Unquestionably we have once again seen bumbling activities on the part of the National Party Government.

Those of us who have been members of this House for a while can well remember that certain validating legislation has, on numerous occasions, been introduced to get Government members off the hook. I can well remember the position in respect of Sir Llewellyn Edwards, who had a major problem. Mr Booth, who is one of the gentlemen sitting in front of the problem child at the moment, got himself into all sorts of a pickle, and again legislation had to be introduced to get him off the hook. I can remember Mr Greenwood getting himself into the same position. I cannot remember how many others found themselves in a similar position.

It is clear that the Opposition did the Parliament a service this morning by bringing to the attention of the public just how slipshod are the activities of this Government when it comes down to the important aspects of parliamentary procedure.

There is no doubt about what the Act says. Opposition members are aware of the position. I am sure that my colleague the member for Mackay will have something to say about what is happening now. It is clear that the member for Mount Gravatt has not automatically become a member of—

Mr Powell: The Griffith University Council.

Mr WARBURTON: That is correct, the Griffith University Council.

Although we were hounded this morning about this matter, the position must be regarded as an office of profit under the Crown.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: That is very arguable because certain High Court decisions clearly show that one does not have to receive money to be holding an office of profit under the Crown.

I appreciate that lawyers are akin to economists. They earn their money by arguing with one another. The position is clear. I simply repeat that I believe the parliamentary Labor Party did the people of Queensland a service this morning by bringing this matter to their attention.

Mr Innes: Why didn't the parliamentary Labor Party bring to the attention of the House the 1979 legislation which said, in fact, that he did not take the position?

Mr WARBURTON: That interjection comes from a member of the group of people that has become known as the silent minority. Members of the group are always ready to be critical, but they are never prepared, or in a position, to take any action in their own right. I appreciate the role of the member for Sherwood in this matter, but the fact remains that, if the member for Mount Gravatt has automatically relinquished or been put off the Council of the Griffith University—I am not sure when he took that position, although I believe it was during the last session of Parliament—the Government has ample opportunity to correct the position. I merely repeat that this is another typical example of the way in which the Government carries on the business of government.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.12 p.m.): Once more the Government is introducing validating legislation to try to save the situation for one of its members, and to save one of its Ministers from embarrassment.

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order. For the benefit of the honourable member for Mackay, I point out that it is not validating legislation. The member for Mackay was not in the Chamber when the motion was moved. With your concurrence, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will repeat the motion for his benefit.

Mr CASEY: I have a copy of it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Mackay has a copy of the motion.

Mr CASEY: You are well aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, that any member of the House is entitled to make a point and develop it. I will develop this point to show that the Government is trying to validate the action—the stupidity—of the Minister for Education in January of this year when he appointed a member of the Legislative Assembly to a Crown office in this State without the necessary legal and legislative authority to do so. If the motion before us is not to validate the Minister's action, I will eat my hat and the Minister's hat too, because that is exactly what it is intended to do.

I will outline various points very clearly for the benefit of honourable members, including the Liberals who should know a lot about validating legislation. The records of this House contain the Raymund Smith validating legislation—another Liberal—and the Greenwood validating legislation—yet another Liberal. That legislation was necessary because they took jobs under the auspices of the Crown. The legislation was necessary to save them. I am not certain that, at one stage, the honourable member for Sherwood did not look like getting into trouble in exactly the same way.

If the action that I took in this Chamber this morning on behalf of the Opposition was not correct, why is it necessary for the Minister to move this motion? The very actions of the Minister are proof positive that the action that I took this morning was correct.

Sure, an alternative is available, and I was fully aware of that alternative. In fact, from 21 January this year I was aware of that alternative. That was the date on which I read in the Government Gazette of the appointment of the member for Mount Gravatt to the Council of the Griffith University. I know a fair bit about the Legislative Assembly Act that was amended in this Chamber in 1978, because I was the person who initiated in the House the action that caught the member for Warwick (Mr Booth) in a similar situation. He was very embarrassed about that. He is a fine chap and a good-looking fellow, and I am sorry for the personal embarrassment that he felt at that time. I am also sorry about the embarrassment that the member for Mount Gravatt must be feeling at this stage. It is not so much their embarrassment; it is the stupidity of the Ministers; it is the stupidity and callousness of the Government and its deliberate intent to completely disregard the rules and conventions of Parliament.

This morning, honourable members heard the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) talking about the people who demonstrated outside Parliament House yesterday. He said what terrible people they were and that they would not respect the rules of Parliament. Today, it can clearly be seen that this Government does not respect the rules of Parliament.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr CASEY: Here is another member of the Government talking about the demonstration yesterday. This morning, I asked across the Chamber, "What difference is there between those people yesterday and the people from the National Farmers Federation who, a month ago, outside the Commonwealth Parliament in Canberra, did

exactly the same act in front of television cameras?" They waved exactly the same sort of placards and chanted the same style of slogans for all their worth. Members of this Government were present outside Parliament House in Canberra. They did not see the Commonwealth Police rushing in, grabbing, bashing, kicking and shoving the people and throwing them into paddy-wagons because they were outside Parliament House. The Hawke Government respects the right of every individual in this community to clearly vent his feelings to the Commonwealth Parliament. But that is not so with the Queensland Government. It takes the sort of action that we saw yesterday and which we see here today. It has been caught with its fingers in the honey jar. It does not know its own rules; it does not know what has really been going on.

In January this year, the member for Mount Gravatt was appointed to the Council of the Griffith University.

Mr Davis: Illegally.

Mr CASEY: That is correct. The University of Queensland Act states quite clearly, in section 6, that the constitution of the Senate shall be 11 persons, two of whom shall be members of the Legislative Assembly. That Act was passed by this Assembly and gave legal authorisation to a member of this Parliament to take a seat on the Senate of that university. That is enshrined within the legislation. Therefore, section 7 of the Legislative Assembly Act does not apply in that case. That is not so in the case of the Griffith University.

Mr Powell: Mr Casey——

Mr CASEY: The Minister had his say and then slunk down. He thought that, because of the slow lifts in the Parliamentary Annexe, I would not get to the Chamber in time to speak and that his motion would go through quickly. I ask the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) to do something about those lifts because they are getting worse.

The Griffith University Act provides that six members shall be appointed by the Governor in Council.

Some of the eminent lawyers and legal personalities within this Chamber—I do not include the member for Sherwood among them—may be able to tell us that it is doubtful whether some of the actions taken by the Council of the Griffith University, of which the member for Mount Gravatt is a member, are legal.

When amending the Legislative Assembly Act, the Government foresaw its own stupidity, realised that it has as Cabinet Ministers a bunch of dills and frauds who sometimes are likely to put through silly legislation and do stupid things—as on this occasion—and covered its tracks in section 7A (2) by stating—

“If a member of the Assembly is appointed to an office, place or position to which subsection (1) applies his appointment to such office, place or position shall be null and void.”

That is correct. The member for Mount Gravatt has, since 17 January this year, been a bit null and a bit void. It could be said that his condition went back further than that.

It is true that he did not receive any payment, and because he is an honest and an honourable man, he stated that this morning in the House. However, it is not necessary to receive any payment under an office of profit under the Crown. The Minister knows that well, and that is why he has moved this motion this afternoon. Other honourable members know that that is completely and utterly so. That was a justification offered when the position of the honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth) was raised. It was considered that, because it was a ministerial or Government appointment, a position on the board of a grammar school was an office of profit under the Crown. The kudos that is gained by being on such a board is used to a great extent by National Party people in the community. Because profit can be derived from such a position, it has been considered in legal terms in previous years to be an office of profit.

I indicated deliberately this morning that I would take a step under a further section of the Act that gives the Legislative Assembly, if it so desires, the right or entitlement to take control of its own destiny and to resolve to declare the seat of a member to be vacant for a particular reason.

In summation—I point out that the points made this morning were correct. A number of alternatives were available to the Government, and, since January, I have given the Government the opportunity, through a full session of Parliament, to take action. The Minister for Education was not sick then; he became sick after Parliament rose. However, he had the opportunity to correct his own stupidity, but he did not do so.

Mr Goss: He's incompetent.

Mr CASEY: The comment by the honourable member for Salisbury that the Minister is incompetent is a very good point. However, I believe that more than incompetence is involved. The Government has been in contempt of the Parliament. The Premier has declared openly that he wishes that he did not have to worry about a political Opposition and Parliament. Some National Party members indicate clearly that that is the way they feel; it is also the way in which they act. They wish sincerely that they did not have to come down here and be placed under the scrutiny of the Opposition and the people of Queensland; they wish that issues such as this could not be brought to the attention of the people.

Mr Goss: The Minister still hasn't learned his lesson after all this time. Doesn't that indicate that he is a poor pupil indeed?

Mr CASEY: One might be justified in wondering what students will be doing in the year 2000, because the Minister is flat out working out what he is doing himself in 1985.

The action by the Minister this afternoon clearly shows that the Opposition took the right step this morning. He can try to step round that and make all the excuses he can think of. The Liberals can also try to step round that and make excuses as to why they, in their usual fashion, this morning chose not to support the proper procedures of this Parliament but preferred to allow the Government to continue to do stupid things in this Parliament to the State and to the people of Queensland.

It is the Opposition in this Parliament that will form the next Government in this State. This morning was the first example of what shall happen during this session. It will constantly show the people of Queensland quite clearly the incompetence and intolerance of this Government and its unacceptability to the people of Queensland.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.26 p.m.): This morning the member for Mackay, on behalf of the Opposition, moved that the seat of Mount Gravatt be declared vacant.

Mr Fouras: And you gutlessly sat there with the Government. You are gutless wonders.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: We were correct and the Government was correct. Those who were wrong this morning were the members of the ALP. Because they have discovered that there is a way in which this can be remedied, now they are changing their ground. The question is not the vacancy in this House but the validity of the appointment to the Griffith University.

If this morning the Opposition had moved a motion challenging the validity of the appointment to the Griffith University, it would have been right. The Opposition was quite wrong to challenge the member's sitting in the House. The Opposition did not even do its homework on the subject. The legislation on this matter refers to people who have been appointed by accident, inadvertence or even deliberately to offices of

profit under the Crown, but it does not automatically cause the seat in this House to be vacated. Because of the inconvenience that has been caused over a period by the position of members having to be validated, that legislation was passed by this Parliament, with the support of the Opposition, in 1978. That was to ensure that such embarrassment would never happen again.

I wish to quote the following commentary on this subject—

“This amending Act amends the Legislative Assembly Act to re-enact, with modification, the relationship which previously existed between Members of Parliament and the Crown. It provides that, unless an Act expressly authorizes a member to hold an office of profit under the Crown or an appointment to a body or position coming from the Crown in right of the State, an appointment of a member to that office or position shall be null and void.”

Ever since the honourable member for Mount Gravatt became a member of the Council of the Griffith University, that appointment has been null and void. That will be corrected this afternoon, but that will not fix up the problem still facing the member for Mount Gravatt in relation to that period from the time of his appointment until this moment—that is, if this motion is passed. Of course, the question then has to be asked: what meetings of the Council of the Griffith University did he attend; what decisions were made; were any decisions made in which his vote was critical; and are those decisions still valid by virtue of the fact that he was illegally appointed to the Griffith University?

Mr Powell: That is legal.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am sure the Minister has sought advice and no doubt he will give it to the House.

Those are the questions that should be asked. It is not a matter of whether or not he can sit in this House. By virtue of the legislation that was passed in 1978, he is quite entitled to sit in this House.

The honourable member for Mackay believed he was on the right track in trying to invalidate the position of the member for Mount Gravatt, but he was quite wrong. I do not care how much he argues this afternoon to try to recover his position, he was wrong this morning and he is wrong now.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Liberal Party looked at this matter when the appointment was made and looked at the legislation.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is why I wanted to speak this morning on this subject. Through press reports during the last few months we discovered that this matter might be raised, and the members of the Liberal Party were ready to speak on this subject this morning.

Having checked out the matter, we found that the position of the honourable member for Mount Gravatt in this Chamber was perfectly in order. There was no hesitation or qualification about his position in this Chamber. We realised that, if the Opposition pursued the line that it forecast it was going to pursue, it would be on the wrong track.

Because of the circumstances that have arisen, I hope that the Minister, in his reply, will give honourable members the legal advice that he has received about the decisions made by the Griffith University Council in the interregnum.

This morning, the honourable member for Mount Gravatt raised by way of interjection that, because he was not receiving any remuneration, he held no office of profit. Of course, that is not correct. Over a period in this Chamber it has been established

firmly that a person does not have to receive remuneration to occupy an office of profit under the Crown.

Mr Fouras: What is so special about his doing the job?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I think that he has more letters after his name than the honourable member has. I think that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt is well on the way to becoming an honorary doctor of laws, which the honourable member for South Brisbane will never become. One day, the honourable member for South Brisbane will undoubtedly receive the cap of honoris causa. Then he will receive some more letters after his name. Honourable members know that the honourable member for South Brisbane is the most educated person on the Opposition side of the Chamber. I suggest that he remain silent so that we are not disabused.

Obviously, there has been an oversight by the Minister with the appointment to the Griffith University Council. I am sure that the Minister has now discovered that he should have attended to this matter a little more promptly and so avoid his present embarrassment. I presume that he wishes the honourable member for Mount Gravatt to continue to be a member of the Council of the Griffith University. I hope that this is not the only occasion on which this happens. I hope that similar circumstances do not arise in this Chamber.

An Oppositor Member: Don't be surprised.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have heard some rumours to the effect that there may be more. I do not think that it is good enough for the Parliament to be treated in this way. If some casual arrangements are made without respect for the law and the authority of this Parliament, it is a dangerous situation not only for the Parliament but also for those institutions and bodies to which members of Parliament are appointed. I trust that in future this matter will be examined very closely, as it should have been in the past. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. This has happened before. Labor members have been involved and we have had to look after them, too. Because nobody is watching to see that these matters are attended to, errors can occur.

The amendment in 1978 was designed to overcome that human quality of making errors of this nature. As far as the Parliament is concerned, there is now no problem. The only problem that remains is the question of the appointment to the institution's council. As far as Liberal Party members are concerned.—

Mr Fouras: You want the wrong appointment to continue.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, I do not. Liberal Party members support the appointment of a member of Parliament to the Council of the Griffith University in the same way as we supported a member of Parliament being appointed to the Senate of the University of Queensland. If there is a technicality standing in the road of that appointment, that technicality ought to be removed. The only complaint that can be made is that the technicality ought to have been removed a little sooner.

Mr WHARTON: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr UNDERWOOD: Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): I call the Leader of the House.

Mr WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the question be now put.”

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West): I move—

“That the member for Ipswich West be heard.”

Question—That the question be now put (Mr Wharton's motion)—put; and the House divided—

In division—

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for South Brisbane under Standing Order No. 123A. If he continues, I will send him out.

AYES, 42		NOES, 36	
Ahern	Lane	Braddy	Price
Alison	Lester	Burns	Scott
Austin	Lingard	Campbell	Shaw
Bailey	Littleproud	Casey	Smith
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie	D'Arcy	Underwood
Booth	McPhie	De Lacy	Vaughan
Borbidge	Menzel	Eaton	Veivers
Cahill	Miller	Fouras	Warburton
Chapman	Muntz	Goss	Warner, A. M.
Cooper	Newton	Gygar	White
Elliott	Powell	Hamill	Wilson
FitzGerald	Randell	Innes	Yewdale
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson	Knox	
Glasson	Stephan	Kruger	
Goleby	Stoneman	Lee	
Gunn	Tenni	Lickiss	
Harper	Turner	Mackenroth	
Harvey	Wharton	McElligott	
Henderson		McLean	
Hinze	<i>Tellers:</i>	Milliner	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jennings	Kaus	Palaszczuk	Davis
Katter	Neal	Prest	Comben

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, before you put the question. I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 158, which clearly states—

“A Member shall not be entitled to vote either in the House or in a Committee upon any Question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any Member so interested shall be disallowed.”

I draw to your attention the fact that the motion can apply to the honourable member for Mount Gravatt only.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I do not propose to accept the point of order from the honourable member for Mackay.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a further point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, do you propose to examine the Standing Order, because you, sir, are custodian of the Standing Orders of the House?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I put the question that Mr Powell's motion be agreed to.

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

AYES, 48		NOES, 30	
Ahern	Lane	Braddy	Warner, A. M.
Alison	Lee	Burns	Wilson
Austin	Lester	Campbell	Yewdale
Bailey	Lickiss	Casey	
Bjelke-Petersen	Lingard	D'Arcy	
Booth	Littleproud	De Lacy	
Borbidge	McKechnie	Eaton	
Cahill	McPhie	Fouras	
Chapman	Menzel	Goss	
Cooper	Miller	Hamill	
Elliott	Muntz	Kruger	
FitzGerald	Newton	Mackenroth	
Gibbs, I. J.	Powell	McElligott	
Glasson	Randell	McLean	
Goleby	Simpson	Milliner	
Gunn	Stephan	Palaszczyk	
Gygar	Stoneman	Prest	
Harper	Tenni	Price	
Harvey	Turner	Scott	
Henderson	Wharton	Shaw	
Hinze	White	Smith	
Innes		Underwood	
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	Vaughan	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Kaus	Veivers	Davis
Knox	Neal	Warburton	Comben

Resolved in the affirmative.

ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARIES TERMINOLOGY BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 13 November 1984 (see p. 2324, vol. 296) on Mr Tenni's motion—

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

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (4.48 p.m.): The Opposition supports the Bill in terms of its stated purpose and will certainly not be seeking to move any amendments to it. It is, nevertheless, surprising that such legislation is not already in the statutes, because it certainly would appear that there has been a need for clarification for some considerable time.

I note from the Minister's second-reading speech that the Bill was drawn up following advice from the Solicitor-General. As the Division of Administration, Planning and Research certainly has a role to provide administrative services to client departments within the State Government, that is a perfectly reasonable response. Semi-government institutions and, indeed, other users of specialist services, including the Australian Government, use the services provided by the Division of Mapping.

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

Mr SMITH: I understand that the total clientele of the division numbers about 40 although, surprisingly, some of the semi-government authorities still appear to do their own work. I wonder why, when a competent authority is available, some semi-government departments still choose to do their own work. That certainly does not appear to be the most efficient way of their going about their business. Standardisation can be lost when some of them proceed on their own way. I should have thought that the standardisation of geographic descriptions would be highly desirable from the public point of view. In several instances over the years, lack of standardisation has caused problems.

Clause 8 of the Bill refers to compulsory notation to indicate the specific purpose of an administrative map. I acknowledge that the maps are for administrative purposes

and have nothing to do with property descriptions. That point should be made, because most of the concern about maps and the controversy that has raged in previous years has concerned property. Nevertheless, some safeguard is necessary relative to the purpose of administrative maps and their potential for misuse by certain people in the community. I bring to the Minister's attention how necessary it is to ensure that a notation be not just a single notation on a map that could be removed easily. The notation should be similar to the type used by the education authorities when they are preparing academic results. In other words, the notation should contain words such as, "For this map to be valid, it should have no erasures or alterations." It may be possible to have something similar to what is to be seen on academic certificates and Government cheques.

Another matter of concern relates to the potential use by one public authority of a map that has been defined for use by another authority. I hope that the Minister may respond to my concern with an assurance about safeguards that may be put into place. In my mind, each authority has a responsibility to ensure that it is keeping up to date.

I am sure that all honourable members are well aware that errors can be compounded, and that error upon error can lead to problems. I note that when one authority uses another authority's map it is not necessarily liable for damages unless a question of negligence is involved. However, tighter safeguards should be provided in this area.

I can only repeat my opening remarks, namely, that it is good to see such a Bill in place to clear up definitions and to provide the machinery for more accurate description of maps and the purposes for which they may be used.

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (4.54 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Townsville West for his comments.

I will certainly bring to the attention of my department the notation on the maps. If it is possible to do what the honourable member suggests to improve the situation, I see no problem there.

As to clause 8—a problem does arise. As the honourable member will appreciate, we do not know whether one local government department hands a map on to another one, and whether that department then makes an alteration. That is up to the particular body concerned. There is not much that we can do about that because we do not know what is going on. However, I will certainly bring the problem to the attention of my department and see whether there is any way around it.

Motion (Mr Tenni) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. M. J. Tenni (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation—

Mr RANDELL (4.56 p.m.): I seek a brief explanation from the Minister. I have had some discussions with him and his departmental officers. The explanation notes that I have been given state that where an administrative district is required to extend to the middle of a watercourse the appropriate line is the middle of the normal flow of water rather than the line mid-way between the banks, which could be to one side or the other of the actual water.

Local authorities can be situated on either side of a watercourse. I am afraid that if the line is to be taken down the middle of a watercourse and if the watercourse breaks through on a bend, a land-holder's property could be located in two local authority areas. I have had talks with the Minister's officers, but I would like his assurance that, if a watercourse breaks through, the line will shift. I think that the matter might be covered by clause 8, but I would like an assurance from the Minister.

Mr TENNI: Note has been taken of the points that the honourable member has made in previous discussions and in his speech today. If there is a gradual movement in the stream, the line will follow that course. If there is a sudden movement in the stream, the matter will be resolved. The circumstances to which the honourable member referred will not occur.

Of course, it is a matter for the local authority concerned to decide whether it takes the line in the middle of the watercourse in the original situation or another line. I think that if the particular local authority has any doubt when it is making the decision it will refer the matter to my department for its opinion.

Mr RANDELL: In other words, local authorities will have the option of saying what they will do?

Mr TENNI: Yes.

Mr RANDELL: It is not compulsory for them?

Mr TENNI: No.

Mr SIMPSON: Under common law, if it is a slow change, the boundary follows that change. If it is a rapid change, it is a different ball game altogether. When similar situations arise with the sea, a new line is drawn.

This is an administrative matter. For administrative purposes, obviously the matter would be sorted out in an amicable way to the benefit of all concerned.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

The House adjourned at 5.1 p.m.