Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 28 AUGUST 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 28 AUGUST 1985

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

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Accommodation, Andergrove State School

From Mr Casey (254 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will rectify the discriminatory treatment in relation to class-room, administration and library accommodation at Andergrove State School.

Electoral Districts Bill

From Mr White (871 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject or amend the Electoral Districts Bill so as not to increase the number of electorates from 82 to 89.

Advice on Fire Services

From Mr Smith (6 806 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that more qualified and professional advice is given in respect to fire services.

Problems in Sugar Industry, Mackay District

From Mr Hinze (2 740 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take immediate steps to alleviate the problems in cane-growing and milling in the Mackay district.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Architects Act 1985

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985

Orders in Council under—

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1979 and the Local Bodies Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1984

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Valuation of Land Act 1944-1985

Valuation of Land (Annual Adjustment) Act 1984-1985

Regulations under—

Architects Act 1985

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985

Fire Safety Act 1974-1985

Valuation of Land Act 1944-1985

By-laws under the Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985

Details of firms which received payment from the Department of Mapping and Surveying for surveying and mapping contracts and consultancies in 1984-85.

Proposal—

(A) Proposals by the Governor in Council and the Administrator of the Government to revoke the setting apart and declaration as national park, environmental park and fauna reserve under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984, the Land Act 1962-1985 and the Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1984 respectively, of:—

(a) all that piece or part of National Park 1391, parish of Trinity described as Area "A" as shown on plan NPW 173, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of about 3.424 hectares;

(b) all that piece or part of National Park 60, parish of Ossa described as Areas "A", "B", "C" and "D" as shown on plan NPW 182, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of about 3.2305 hectares;

(c) all that piece or part of National Park 573, parishes of Crediton, Eungella, Gamma, Lacy, Mia Mia and Pelion described as Area "E" as shown on plan NPW 119, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of about 0.667 hectares;

(d) all that piece or part of National Park 135, parish of Curlewis described as Areas "A", "B", "C", "D", "E" and "F" as shown on plan NPW 141, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of 0.6245 hectares;

(e) all that piece or part of National Park 641, parish of Hewittville described as Area "A" as shown on plan NPW 177, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of about 3.05 hectares;

(f) all that piece or part of National Park 727, parish of Marathon described as Areas "A" and "B" as shown on plan NPW 187, prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife and containing an area of about 9.38 hectares;

(g) all that piece or part of Environmental Park 800, parish of Coonambelah described as "Brazier Park" as shown on plan EP 1446, deposited in the Office of the Surveyor-General and containing an area of about 3.589 hectares; and

(h) all of Fauna Reserve 1093, parish of Como.

(B) A brief explanation of the Proposals.

Reports—

Government Motor Garage for the year ended 30 June 1985

State Stores Board for the year ended 30 June 1985

Valuers Registration Board of Queensland for the year ended 31 December 1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Funding for Schools; Allegations of Member for Mackay

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.6 a.m.), by leave: Last night in this House the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) spoke about spending on education establishments and made claims that the Government was failing to cater for growth areas in its school building program and was not treating children fairly in different areas of the State. He cited a number of areas, including his own electorate, in which he said this was happening.

For the interest of honourable members and as a reminder to the honourable member for Mackay, I point out that, in his own electorate, right now, the Government is spending more than $7m on the construction of two new schools—the new $6.6m State high school at Pioneer and the new special school at North Mackay, which will cost close to $762,000. The honourable member for Mackay could also be aware of the new State primary school being built at Mount Pleasant in Mackay. That shows clearly that the State Government is catering for growth in the Mackay region.

I point out also that, State-wide, the Government is involved in a record capital works program, a program that has been boosted thanks to the State Government's initiative through the Special Major Capital Works Program. Under that Special Major Capital Works Program, $100m has been allocated for major school building projects over a two and a half year period. That is the program which the Labor Opposition Leader decries so often, yet it has enabled the Government to undertake a school development program of record proportions and, during the 1984-85 financial year, approval was given for the construction of a total of 22 new and replacement State primary, special and secondary schools under this special program and through the Works Department's regular capital works program.

As the honourable member for Mackay is well aware, the two new schools in his own electorate—as I said, worth more than $7m—are being constructed under this scheme, so let honourable members hear no more from the honourable member for Mackay about fair treatment from the Government.

The honourable member for Mackay mentioned also the Gladstone area. Over recent years, the Gladstone area has been the prime area of school development, with literally millions of dollars being spent there by the Government on the development of new schools, all the way through from pre-school to tertiary level. No other electorate in the State has had anywhere near the program of development that has been seen in that electorate during recent years.

The honourable member for Mackay mentioned Townsville. We are building a new primary school at Kelso, and tenders are being called for the construction of a new State high school at Condon, which will be a multimillion-dollar development.

In our overall scope of development throughout the State and in the spread of these projects, we are both catering for growth and doing so fairly in the areas where that growth is occurring.

The honourable member for Mackay complained about the facilities provided for new schools. I wonder whether he will do the same when the new schools in his own area are opened. It is correct and logical that in building new schools—and I remind

him that this is being done to cater for growth areas—a full range of up-to-date facilities will be provided. It seems to me that he is suggesting that we should lower our standards for new schools. Let me make it plain that it would cost the Government more if we were to do otherwise—if we were to build a school and then try to update it at a later date. It is more economical to provide these facilities during the initial stages of development than to attempt to provide them at a later date.

The honourable member for Mackay made statements about the Andergrove State School. I provided information on the draft building program for that school to him five months ago. I informed him of the Government's plans to provide additional teaching spaces at the school and to provide for the upgrading of administration and library facilities at the school. I also informed him that the Education Department's priority for new tuckshop and covered games area facilities was insufficient to gain it inclusion on the Works Department's draft program for the current financial year. As I said, that was five months ago. Now, in the lead-up to the Budget session, the honourable member is involved in a suggestion that the children of Andergrove State School should be withdrawn from their school over this matter. Let me make it clear that such a move will do nothing for the school but it will disrupt the schooling of the children.

Last night's statements in the House by the member for Mackay were, once again, a typically irresponsible outburst by the Opposition, which has no clear knowledge of the programming and husbanding of resources to cater for the overall needs of a growing State within the funds available.

Australian Manufacturers and Distributors Directory

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology) (11.12 a.m.), by leave: Honourable members will recall my ministerial statement of 22 August 1985, in which I exposed a confidence trickster who had been attempting to elicit financial contributions to a non-existent manufacturers directory. I make no apology for my action. If the public had not been warned, the sting could have rewarded the confidence man $200,000 for his $1,000 investment. Police investigations into that matter are continuing.

However, deceptions of that nature often have wider repercussions, and so it is in this instance. Apart from those directly involved—that is, those manufacturers who paid contributions to the bogus directory—the deception has caused harm and embarrassment elsewhere. It has been brought to my notice that the publicity generated by the attempts to expose the bogus directory has caught a legitimate enterprise, "The Australian Manufacturers and Distributors Directory", in the cross-fire.

The attempts of the publisher, a Mr Richard Weeks of Australian Trade Press, a legitimate Brisbane company, to establish a directory, have been quite seriously affected by the adverse publicity surrounding the bogus directory. His representatives have been treated with suspicion and given a hostile reception when approaching manufacturers for contributions to what is in fact a genuine effort by an enterprising local company.

Investigations carried out by officers of my department indicate that Australian Trade Press is a bona fide company, with a proven track record in publishing, and that there is no doubt that Mr Weeks is sincere in his plans to produce a directory.

Health-funding

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: During the past few days, we have again witnessed the spectacle of members of the Queensland ALP desperately trying to justify the disgraceful victimisation of this State by the Hawke Labor Government in relation to health-funding. Ever since the Hawke Government was first elected in March 1983, members of the Queensland ALP have supported that Government's policies on health-funding, which have penalised and robbed Queensland to the advantage of the southern States. If one recalls 1981, the utter hypocrisy of the ALP on Commonwealth health-funding to Queensland becomes clearly evident.

It was in 1981 that the then Liberal Federal Health Minister (Mr Mackellar) announced a new system of funding for State hospitals which virtually meant the end of special funding for Queensland's free hospital system. Mr Mackellar announced that Commonwealth funds to Queensland for its hospitals would be included in general revenue on the same basis as for other States.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: It is interesting to hear the bleatings of the ALP. The truth hurts.

I was about to say that that is a key point, because the present Federal Government inherited and maintained these Fraser/Mackellar funding arrangements and added Medicare to that system. This totally refutes the present claims of the Australian Labor Party at a federal and a State level that special provision is made in the tax-sharing arrangements for Queensland's free public hospital system. There is no special compensation for Queensland's free hospital system.

Mr McELLIGOTT: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister is deliberately misleading the House. As he well knows, under the tax-sharing arrangements, Queensland receives $417m more than New South Wales. The Minister should tell the truth.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have pointed out to honourable members before that I will not allow a ministerial statement to be turned into a debate; yet a ministerial statement is being turned into a debate.

Mr AUSTIN: For the benefit of the honourable member for Townsville, I repeat that there is no special compensation for Queensland's free hospital system, either by way of direct grants or through tax-sharing arrangements.

During the lead-up to the March 1983 Federal election the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) and the Federal Minister for Health (Dr Blewett) paid special attention to what they claimed was the dreadful neglect of Queensland's hospital system by the Fraser Government. Mr Hawke told a Queensland Press Club luncheon on 18 February 1983 that Queensland had suffered severely from Federal Government cut-backs in hospital funding and a Labor Government would "nurse our hospitals back to health"

As all honourable members would be aware, the extra money was to come from the new one per cent Medicare tax which provided Mr Hawke and Dr Blewett with the means to increase hospital grants to the States and prove what great fellows they were. There was never any pretence then that Queensland was being compensated out of general tax-sharing grants for its free hospital system. In fact, the attacks on the Fraser Government by Hawke, Hayden and Blewett indicated their belief that there was no such compensation. No, Queensland would have to be compensated in some other way.

Let us now look at the record of the first two full financial years of the Hawke/Blewett administration and for the coming financial year to see how they have set about treating Queensland and Queenslanders. These figures are available for all to see in the Federal Budget Paper No. 7, released last week.

Health funding for the States in 1983-84, the first Hawke Budget, consisted of the normal Identified Health Grant plus the first instalment of the Medicare allocation to cover the first five months of Medicare from February to June, 1984. Per head of population, the highest amount of $127 went to Western Australia, followed by New South Wales with $108, Victoria with $98, Tasmania with $95, South Australia with $71 and last by a long way, Queensland with $50. That included a so-called special grant of $15 milion to Queensland, which was announced belatedly after the public outcry over the original funding arrangements. Nothing in this funding allocation could possibly

compensate Queensland for the alleged sins of the past in Commonwealth payments for our public hospital system.

The following year, 1984-85, things did not improve for Queensland; in fact, they worsened considerably compared with other States. Taking first prize for the highest per capita health funding grant in that year was Tasmania with $228, followed closely by the State which had been second-last the previous year, South Australia. That State, which just happens to be the home State of Federal Health Minister, Neal Blewett, PhD, increased from $71 per head to an incredible $212 per head of population in one year. I repeat that, Mr Speaker: from $71 per head to $212 per head of population in one year.

Western Australia was next with $179; then New South Wales with $157; then Victoria with $144; and have a guess which State was last again—Queensland, with a paltry $73 per head. That is about one-third of the per capita grant allocated to South Australia, despite the fact that the Queensland figure includes the remainder of the so-called special grant. What an absolute and utter disgrace, particularly for a Federal Government that has pledged some benefits for Queensland's public hospital system.

Now I turn my attention to this financial year. Incredibly, the only State that has suffered a drop in Commonwealth funding is Queensland.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: Queensland was the only State, yet Opposition members do not want to hear about that.

Tasmania is still out in front with $243 per head; South Australia is getting $220, Western Australia $190, New South Wales $168, Victoria $154, and Queensland, last by a long, long way, gets just $72 per head.

The average for the other five States is $172 per head, which is a staggering $100 per head more than Queensland receives. To achieve the average level of funding for the other States, Queensland would need an extra $253m in health funding this year.

In one of the more pathetic attempts to try to save face for Canberra, this morning the honourable member for Townsville claimed on a radio program that my figures had not included a special $10m grant for this financial year. That would lift our allocation to a mammoth $77 per head. What the honourable member did not say on the radio program is that if special revenue assistance grants are to be included in the figure, we have to add another $34m for South Australia and another $43m for Tasmania.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Lytton that I will not take any direction from that side of the House whilst a ministerial statement is being made. In future, I will take appropriate action.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. I raise with you, Mr Speaker, the question of the time allocated for ministerial statements and the debate of the Standing Orders Committee, when you requested us to restrict our times so that members of this Parliament could debate the issues of the day. The Minister for Health is wasting the time of the House in taking up time in this way.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister.

Mr AUSTIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If I did not have so many interjections from the other side of the House I would be able to finish quickly.

If the figures of the honourable member for Townsville were included, our relativity would deteriorate, not improve.

So that there can be no misunderstanding by honourable members about the basis on which the calculations were made, I seek leave to incorporate, in *Hansard,* Table 9 and Table 23 from Federal Budget Paper No. 7.

Leave granted.

Table 9: General Revenue Grants 1981-82 to 1985-86 ($ thousands)

	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	Western Australia	South Australia	Tasmania	Six State total
			FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS (a)				
1981-82 (b)	2 034 575	1 502 472	1 259 687	809 909	716 027	322 031	6 689 700
1982-83	2 361 766	1 743 372	1 527 398	913 086	864 097	362 778	7 772 498
1983-84	2 576 810	1 926 238	1 684 834	999 277	953 830	397 042	8 538 032
1984-85	2 693 115	2 019 927	1 885 612	1 042 348	1 000 280	417 147	9 058 429
1985-86 (estimate)	3 000 100	2 242 900	1 971 900	1 119 500	1 039 700	386 400	9 760 500
			IDENTIFIED HEALTH GRANTS				
1981-82	477 736	325 936	165 155	155 039	8 606	4 747	1 137 219
1982-83	469 005	300 549	92 970	140 083	9 467	5 221	1 017 295
1983-84	489 116	323 248	99 992	150 663	78 609	27 236	1 168 864
1984-85	521 442	344 218	104 684	161 985	182 326	58 970	1 373 626
1985-86 (estimate)	560 800	370 200	113 400	175 800	196 400	63 500	1 480 100
			SPECIAL REVENUE ASSISTANCE				
1982-83	..	19 500	..	..	10 500	..	30 000
1983-84	47 100	62 800	31 000	18 200	17 200	7 200	183 500
1984-85	..	31 000	..	20 300	..	..	51 300
1985-86 (estimate)	..	..	10 000 (c)	..	34 300 (d)	43 100 (e)	87 400
			SPECIAL GRANTS				
1981-82	..	..	58 500	..	..	..	58 500
1982-83	..	..	−19 650	..	..	..	−19 650
			TOTAL GENERAL REVENUE GRANTS				
1981-82 (b)	2 512 311	1 828 408	1 483 342	964 948	769 633	326 778	7 885 419
1982-83	2 830 771	2 063 421	1 600 718	1 053 169	884 064	367 999	8 800 143
1983-84	3 113 026	2 312 287	1 815 825	1 168 140	1 049 639	431 478	9 890 395
1984-85	3 214 557	2 395 145	1 990 296	1 224 633	1 182 606	476 117	10 483 355
1985-86 (estimate)	3 560 900	2 613 100	2 095 300	1 295 300	1 270 400	493 000	11 328 000

(a) For years prior to 1985-86, these grants were known as tax sharing grants.
(b) Includes additional assistance provided by the Commonwealth in 1981-82 of $24.5 million to New Wales, $15 million to Victoria and $29.5 million to Queensland.
(c) Grant of special assistance in recognition of the Grants Commission's conclusion that financial relativities were disturbed upon the introduction of Medicare.
(d) Represents two-thirds of the health grants advantage South Australia would have received in 1985-86.
(e) Comprises $11.9 million representing two-thirds of the health grants advantage Tasmania would have received in 1985-86 and $31.2 million for further special budgetary assistance.

Table 23: Recurrent Grants for Medicare, 1983-84 to 1985-86 ($ thousands)

	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	Western Australia	South Australia	Tasmania	Six State total
1983-84	104 096	80 045	29 075	27 277	21 227	10 675	272 395
1984-85	345 485	247 374	85 459	897 858	114 775	31 945	912 896
1985-86 (estimate)	365 094	260 069	73 407	89 801	111 596	33 274	933 241

Mr AUSTIN: The Hawke Government is showing utter contempt for the people of Queensland. It has not only failed to honour its commitment to restore a fair level of health funding to this State, but also used health funding as a weapon to bludgeon the people of Queensland in the same way as it has with other payments to this State.

Honourable members opposite stand condemned for their part in this savage vicitimisation of their home State. Their position cannot be excused and it cannot be justified, and the people of Queensland will not tolerate it.

7

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

A question submitted on notice was answered as follows—

Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

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

(1) Which Totalisator Administration Board agencies and subagencies have been established with board approval during the chairmanship of (a) Sir Edward Lyons and (b) Mr Ian Callinan?

(2) For each of the above periods separately, who were the successful applicants in respect of each agency and subagency?

(3) For each of the above periods separately, which of the board-approved applications did not receive ministerial approval as required under section 189 (3) (a) of the Racing and Betting Act prior to the agency or subagency commencing operations?

Answer—

(1 to 3) To answer the honourable member's question adequately, it is necessary to table statements setting out the information requested. I table these documents, and seek leave to incorporate them in "Hansard"

Leave granted.

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

TAB AGENCIES ESTABLISHED SINCE 1-7-81—NO MINISTERIAL APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR SITING

Agency	Address	Agent(s) Appointed	Address
Samford	Newsagency, 42 Main Street, Samford	Mr G. R. and Mrs J. S. Steele	Newsagency, 42 Main Street, Samford
Canungra	Canungra Produce and Saddlery, Christie Street, Canungra	Mrs J. L. Corcoran	Little Flying Fox Road, Pine Creek, Canungra
Half Tide	Shop 1, Coalport Centre, Valray Street, Half Tide	Mr P. J. and Mrs K. E. Thrupp	McCarthy Street, Half Tide, Via Mackay
Coolum Beach	Coolum Beach Newsagency, The Esplanade, Coolum Beach	Bellmead Pty. Ltd. (Mr and Mrs B. Turner)	Care of Hawthorne, Cuppaidge and Badgery, 5th Floor, Reserve Bank Building, Brisbane
Brassall	Brassall News, Hunter Street, Brassall	Mr A. G. and Mrs K. M. Russell	61 Chermside Road, Eastern Heights, Ipswich
Browns Plains	Brownsleigh Hardware, Westpac House, Beaudesert Road, Browns Plains	Mr C. A Nelson	23 Felios Street, Shailer Park
Middlemount	Middlemount Newsagency, Shopping Plaza, Middlemount	Mr J. and Mrs J. Ross	Care of Post Office, Middlemount
Kallangur	Newsagency, 1406 Anzac Avenue, Kallangur	Mr G. W. and Mrs P. J. Eaton	Lot 1, Old North Road, Bray Park
Redland Bay	Shop 1, 159/163 Broadwater Terrace and Stradbroke Street, Redland Bay	Mr J. A. Falconer and Mr K. J. O'Shea	Care of MacFie, Curlears and Spiro, 147 Old Cleveland Road, Capalaba
Yarraman	8 Margaret Street, Yarraman	Mrs P. C. Bishop	Lot 54, Rosalie Drive, Yarraman
Kawana Waters	Shop 36, Kawana Shopping Town, Nicklin Way, Buddina	Mrs G. Caristino and Mr E. Little	Perwillowen Road, Nambour and 5 Farlau Street, Currimundi (Little)
Maleny	Shop 2, 10 Maple Street, Maleny	Mr J. T. Orr	Lot 8, Centenary Drive, Maleny
Ravenshoe	Ravenshoe Gas and Electrics, 54 Grigg Street, Ravenshoe	Mr J. L and Mrs C. M. Franklin	48 Eacham Road, Yungaburra
Pinkenba	Pinkenba Hotel, Eagle Farm Road, Pinkenba	Magco Pty Ltd	28th Level, Lennons Plaza, 68 Queen Street, Brisbane
Main Beach	Shop 3, 20 Tedder Avenue, Main Beach	Main Beach Realty	19 Tedder Avenue, Main Beach
Tieri	Newsagency Shop 3, Tieri Shopping Centre, Tieri	Mr R. M. and Mrs M. F. Johnstone	Caravan Park, Tieri

TAB AGENCIES ESTABLISHED SINCE 1-7-81—NO MINISTERIAL APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR SITING—*continued*

Agency	Address	Agent(s) Appointed	Address
Urangan	Newsagency Pier Street, Urangan	Mrs J. R. Beckett	Pier Street, Urangan
Helensvale	Newsagency Shopping Centre, Lindfield Road, Helensvale	Mr K. G. and Mrs H. G. Trembath	5 Calder Crescent, Helensvale
Wellington Point	Wellington Point Hotel, Wellington Point	Mr C. W. and G. W. Hogan	Wellington Point Hotel, Main Road, Wellington Point
Deception Bay	Shop 14, Shopping Centre, Corner Redliffe Connection Road and Bay Avenue, Deception Bay	Marged Investments Pty Ltd	Turbot House, 63-65 Turbot Street, Brisbane
Mission Beach	Newsagency, Beachtown Shopping Village, Mission Beach	Mr K. C. and Mrs K. M. Mott	Pacific Street, Mission Beach
Duaringa	Esso Truck Stop, Duaringa	Mr B. F. and Mrs J. A. Flynn	Capricorn Highway, Duaringa
Herberton	Perkins Street, Herberton	Mrs B. M. Gaylard	Perkins Street, Herberton
Mount Pleasant	Shop 12, Mount Pleasant Plaza, Mount Pleasant	Mr R. W. Watt	1 The Esplanade, Slade Point
Gracemere	Newsagency, 11 Laurie Street, Gracemere	Mr J. P. and Mrs S. J. Robertson	Fisher Street, Gracemere
Currimundi	Currimundi Chemist, 87/89 Nicklin Way, Currimundi	Mr D. Hodgkinson	"Bundarra", Hardwood Road, Landsborough
Trinity Beach	Corner Trinity and Rabaul Streets, Trinity Beach	Mr R. and Mrs R. Eustace	170 Trinity Street, Trinity Beach
Esk	Golden Fleece Service Station, 95 Ipswich Street, Esk	Mrs E. E. Hartigan	95 Ipswich Street, Esk
Hamilton Island	Jetty Store, Hamilton Island	Tropic Isle Retail Shoes Pty Ltd	P.M.B. Airlie Beach P.O.
Brandon	Newsagency, 56 Drysdale Street, Brandon	Mr R. and Mrs I. Paneccasio	56 Drysdale Street, Brandon
Glenden	Shop 10, Glenden Town Centre, Glenden	Mr R. W. Oakes	Caravan Park, Glenden
Calliope	46 Stirratt Street, Calliope	Mr D. M. Cleary and Mrs M. L. Badken	46 Stirratt Street, Calliope
Calamvale	Calamvale Hotel/Motel, Compton Road, Calamvale	Cal-Mac Pty Ltd	Calamvale Hotel, Compton Road, Calamvale
Allingham	Forest Beach News, Leichhardt Street, Allingham	Mr V. L. and Mrs C. L. Burton	84 Cartwright Street, Ingham
Rasmussen	Ross Hotel, 1200 Ross River Road, Rasmussen	Fabelle Pty Ltd	1200 Ross River Road, Rasmussen
Oonoonba	Oonoonba Motor Hotel, 78 Abbot Street, Oonoonba	Mr M. Carmody	64 Alligator Creek Road, Alligator Creek, Townsville
Carindale	Carindale Street, Carindale	Carindale Tavern Pty Ltd	Carindale Street, Carindale
Burrum Heads	Post Office Store, Burrum Heads	Mr A. H. and Mrs S. Robertson	Post Office Store, Burrum Heads
Queens Beach	Newagency, 43 Golf Links Road, Queens Beach	Mr J. B. and Mrs M. H. Naira	80 Poole Street, Bowen
Burpengary	Newsagency Shop 8, Tower Shopping Centre, Burpengary	Mr A. and Mrs K. Strande	Lot 30, Robbs Road, Morayfield
Benowa	Benowa Tavern, Ashmore Road, Benowa	Barboo No. 5 Pty Ltd	Benowa Tavern, Ashmore Road, Benowa
Miriam Vale	Star Roadhouse, North Street, Miriam Vale	Mr M. Bailey	Star Roadhouse, North Street, Miriam Vale
Dayboro	Foodland Supermarket, 1 McKenzie Street, Dayboro	Mr R. and Mrs B. Haugh	15 McKenzie Street, Dayboro
Slade Point	Newsagency Shop 5, Finch Street, Slade Point	Mr G. J. and Mrs G. T. Breckell	9 Quail Street, Slade Point
Biggenden	26 Edward Street, Biggenden	Mr G. Henningsen	26 Edward Street, Biggenden
Tiaro	General Store, Mayne Street, Tiaro	Mr B. and Mrs B. Wheatley	General Store, Main Street, Tiaro
Anne Street, City	Ann Street, Brisbane	TAB Branch conducted by Branch Staff	
Chermside	Chermside Newsagency Chermside Drive-In	This Office opened and then closed approximately 6 months after	
Esk	Ipswich Street, Esk	This Office was resited to a Sub-Agency	

TAB AGENCIES ESTABLISHED SINCE 1-7-81—NO MINISTERIAL APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR SITING—*continued*

Agency	Address	Agent(s) Appointed	Address

LIST OF AGENCIES SINCE 1-7-81 WITH MINISTERIAL APPROVAL—NO CHANGE OF AGENT

Agency	Resited from	Resited to
Ingham	Lannercost Street	Herbert Street
Mooloolaba	Esplanade	David Low Highway
Mooloolaba	David Low Highway	Esplanade
Hughenden	Grady Street	Grady Street
Everton Park	Gordon Road and South Pine Road	South Pine Road
Stratford	Kanerunga Road Stratford	235 Kamerunga Road, Freshwater
Kingaroy	Alford Street	175 Haly Street
Buderim	Main Street	36 Burnett Street
Centre Point	Bell Street	Centre Point Shopping Centre
Toowoomba		
Richmond	Goldring Street	Goldring Street
Albany Creek	Agency in Albany Shopping Village, Albany Creek Road	Hookers Real Estate, Albany Creek Road
Eight Mile Plains		Strathlands Shopping Centre, Underwood Road, Rochedale South

T.A.B. AGENCIES RESITED SINCE 1-7-81

NO MINISTERIAL APPROVAL SOUGHT

Albion:	Resited	—	From 331 Sandgate Road to Wyllies Building, Corner Lever Street/Sandgate Road
Beaudesert:	Resited	—	From Brisbane Street to Brisbane Street
Browns Plains:	Resited	—	From Beaudesert Road to Johnstone Road
Coopers Plains (Boundary Road):			Changed to Subagency (same premises)
Gatton:	Resited	—	From Railway Street to 52 Crescent Street
Labrador:	Resited	—	From 300 Marine Parade to Marine Parade
Surfers Paradise:	Resited	—	From Hub Arcade to 3180 Gold Coast Highway
Goodna:	Resited	—	From Ipswich Road to Saint Ives Shopping Centre
Keperra:	Resited	—	From Tully Street to Dallas Parade
Kingston:	Resited	—	From Amoco Service Station to Woodridge Plaza, Wembley Road
Lowood:	Resited	—	Resited from 3 Walters Street to 83 Mains Street
Woongarra Street (Bundaberg):	Resited	—	Resited from Woongarra Street to 49 Woongarra Street
Childers:	Resited	—	Resited from 104 Churchill Street to 100 Churchill Street
Adelaide Street (Maryborough):	Resited	—	Resited from Ellena Street, Maryborough
Allenstown (Rockhampton):	Resited	—	From Corner Canning and Allen Streets to 42 Gladstone Road
Yeppoon:	Resited	—	From Normanby Street to 3 Normanby Street
Killarney:	Resited	—	From Willow Street to Willow Street
Saint George:	Resited	—	Victoria Street to Henry Street
Beerwah:	Resited	—	Simpson Street to Beerwah Travel, Simpson Street
Strathpine:	Resited	—	From Gympie Road to Gympie Road
Nanango:	Resited	—	From 58 Drayton Street to Hinkley Arcade
Toogoolawah:	Resited	—	From Cressbrook Street to Cressbrook Street
Freshwater:	Resited	—	From Kamerunga Road, Stratford to Kamerunga Road, Freshwater
Cloncurry:	Resited	—	From Ramsey Street to 11 Ramsey Street
South Johnstone:	Resited	—	From Bombett Road to Hynes Street

LIST OF AGENCIES APPROVED SINCE 1-7-81 WITH MINISTERIAL APPROVAL

Agency	Address	Agent(s) Appointed	Address
Ashmore	All Sports Shopping Centre, Nerang Street and Currunburra Road, Ashmore	Mr and Mrs McEwan	J. 3 Peter Parade, Miami
Loganholme	Shop 9, Loganholme Shopping Village, Bryants Road, Loganholme	Mr and Mrs Lawrence	C. 6 Warnambul Road, Shailer Park
Rocklea	Rocklea Trotting Track		
Capalaba	Capalaba Greyhound Track		

Answer (continued)—

Furthermore, I would like to add the following comments—

(a) The Racing and Betting Act makes no provision for the Totalisator Administration Board to establish subagencies. All outlets established by the board are, in fact, agencies. The terms of the agreement entered into between the board and a licensee differentiate between what are referred to as agencies and subagencies.

(b) No agencies have been established during the term of office of the present chairman of the board.

(c) Following the statement in the House yesterday by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General relating to this matter, I understand that the board is taking action to submit to me, for approval, all applications for agencies approved by the board that have not been approved by me pursuant to the Racing and Betting Act.

Mr Warburton: Some were approved by you?

Mr HINZE: There has been an interjection from the Leader of the Opposition, and I wish to answer it. The documents that I have tabled contain a list of agencies approved by the Minister. I think that there are either two or three.

Mr Warburton: That is during Sir Edward Lyons's reign?

Mr HINZE: I am not sure. I will have to think about what I am saying; I do not want to make a mistake here.

Mr Warburton: You have approved some?

Mr HINZE: I think two.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

Mr WARBURTON: The Minister has responded, to some extent, to the question raised. Naturally, I have not had an opportunity to look at the documents that have been tabled. Mr Speaker, I am sorry; this is a question without notice to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Mr WARBURTON: This morning, the Minister seemed to admit that, during the period of either Sir Edward Lyons or Mr Ian Callinan—I suggest that it was during the period of Sir Edward Lyons's reign as chairman—he did in fact approve some of the agencies that were recommended by the board of the Totalisator Administration Board. That being the case, is it not fair for me to suggest to the Minister that he was very knowledgeable about his responsibilities under the Racing and Betting Act because he

had in fact approved some of the agencies? Does not that put the lie to a statement that he has been reported as making, that in fact he was not aware——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to put his quesiton without notice to the Minister.

Mr WARBURTON: Does that not in fact put the lie to a statement that the Minister was reported as making that, when the Junefair application was made, he had no knowledge of the fact that he had to give final approval to the establishment of the agency? Could I just repeat it? By admitting that he was aware of the provision of the Act, does not that make his later statement somewhat ridiculous?

Mr HINZE: So as to avoid any misunderstandings that I may make in answer to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, I ask that the question be put on notice so that I can deal with it adequately tomorrow.

Mr WARBURTON: I do so accordingly.

Ministerial Conduct Rules

Mr NEAL: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is there any truth in claims by the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox), as reported in today's *Courier-Mail,* that the Premier has quietly put aside conduct rules in respect of his Ministers?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am happy to reply to this question because I was surprised that the leader of the Liberal Party made that statement. He was part and parcel of a former Government and he knows that the rules exist and that they are adhered to very rigidly.

If a Minister has an interest, he declares that interest. That has been traditional practice right down the years. The minute that I heard that a question had been raised about racing, I asked that it be held up and I said that it would go to Cabinet. That is well known, and honourable members can ask the chairman of the TAB if they want that confirmed. Cabinet abides by those rules, and a Minister does not take part in the decision in those circumstances, which arise only rarely.

Mr Goss: Why didn't you adhere to the rule yourself?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If I start talking about the honourable member for Salisbury, I will not finish. He should leave the subject alone.

I think that it is a bit of a joke for the Liberals to talk about collective Cabinet responsibility and guide-lines. On 4 August 1983, when the Liberals were in coalition, they broke that principle when one of their colleagues broke Cabinet solidarity and the rule of Cabinet speaking with one voice. He voted against a Cabinet decision in this House and sought to change that decision. After that, the Liberals elected that honourable member as their leader; yet they come here and hypocritically talk about the Government's responsibilities and guide-lines. The Liberals were the first ones to break the rules, and that is why they sit where they do in this Chamber. I am surprised that the leader of the Liberal Party would even dare to mention this, let alone criticise. If he wishes me to do so, I will go on television, as he did, and highlight some very interesting facts.

Aboriginal Land Rights

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to a report in today's *Australian* concerning Aboriginal land rights and ask: What are his views on the Commonwealth Government's attitude to Aboriginal land rights?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The present Labor Government in Canberra is exactly the same as the previous Labor Government. It has embarked on a program to give special privileges or rights to particular people. We in the Queensland Government want equal rights, not land rights. It is about time that Canberra stopped pushing its land rights policy.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You look very unwell this morning, very pale.

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

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The article in the paper today is spot-on about what the Australian people are thinking. It is about time that the scandal that is spreading across the nation—giving special rights to one section of the community, creating two nations instead of one nation and tearing Australia apart—was stopped. When the next election comes, this will be a very big issue. We in the Queensland Government will make sure that it is a big issue. We will give Ayers Rock back to the nation. We will stop land rights immediately. We will make sure that the vast tracts of land that are neutralised, of no value and not used will be put in production. I guarantee that it will become a very big issue.

Mr Scott: What about the deeds of grant in trust?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member does not believe in equal rights for every member of the community. I am only restating what I have said for the last 10 years. I have compaigned on this issue for 10 years and everybody else is now beginning to wake up and is saying the same thing. At some time in the future the Government will put honourable members opposite on the spot.

Totalisator Administration Board Agency, Oxenford Area

Mr BURNS: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing: At any time during his term as Minister for Racing, did he personally tell or attempt to influence the chairman of the Totalisator Administration Board, the general manager or any member of the board not to proceed with a TAB agency in the Oxenford area?

Mr HINZE: Is the honourable member asking should I have interfered?

Mr BURNS: Did the Minister personally tell or attempt to influence the chairman of the TAB, the general manager or any member of the board not to proceed with a TAB agency in the Oxenford area?

Mr HINZE: I ask the honourable member to place that question on notice.

Mr BURNS: I do so accordingly.

Totalisator Administration Board Agency, Oxenford Area

Mr BURNS: I have a second question for the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, which I will place on notice. So that the Minister will know right now what I am leading to, I ask: If the answer to my first question is that the Minister did not, will he tell the House whether he has ever tried to influence any other member of the staff, or has he used a member of his staff, or any other member of the board, or in any other way attempted to influence that chairman? In other words, if the Minister did not do it himself, did he get someone else to do it?

Mr HINZE: I cannot understand why the honourable member is getting cranky.

Mr Burns: I am getting cranky because you are dodging your responsibility as a Minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton has asked his question.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member has been here long enough to understand that he has asked the question and he must now wait for the answer.

Mr Burns: You have been gelded, all right.

Mr HINZE: No, I have not.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton is interjecting persistently. I do not consider that one of the interjections that he just made is appropriate in the House. I still do not know whether the honourable member has asked the question without notice or has put it on notice. Will he please inform me?

Mr BURNS: I will ask it again without notice.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Was it put on notice?

Mr BURNS: I ask the question without notice.

Mr HINZE: I believe I know the tenor of the honourable member's question and I also believe that I know the reason behind it. That is why I ask him to put it on notice, so that he can receive a full and complete answer.

Mr BURNS: I do so accordingly.

Local Authority Road-funding

Mr RANDELL: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing: In view of the cut in funding by the Federal Government to local authorities for main roads in Queensland, with the consequent loss of jobs throughout rural areas causing distress to many families and having an adverse impact on country businesses, will he give consideration to implementing road and bridgeworks over and above normal projects in the pipeline, particularly in depressed sugar areas, with a view to alleviating hardship for rural families and businesses?

Mr HINZE: A week or two ago the Federal Minister for Transport (Peter Morris) came to Queensland and travelled with me into north Queensland. That trip could be described only as a great waste of time. The Minister gave this State absolutely nothing. Irrespective of the comments that flow from the Federal Minister for Transport from time to time, the facts of the matter are simply that this year money for roads in Queensland has been reduced by approximately $60m. In making this request, the honourable member is asking that those engaged in the sugar industry in the Mackay area be granted some relief by being given the opportunity to undertake roadworks in that area.

I commend the honourable member for his question. He is concerned about the great sugar industry and its collapse because we cannot get our Federal colleagues to honour their responsibilities.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr HINZE: I thought that the honourable member was asleep. He should go back to sleep and leave the Chamber in peace.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HINZE: If the honourable member keeps it up, he will be going for a six.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Continually, I have to remind the honourable member for Lytton that the Minister's answer will be listened to in silence. On several occasions I have asked the honourable member to remain silent, and I will not ask him again.

Mr HINZE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection.

Being as brief as I possibly can, I inform the honourable member that I have approached the Treasurer to see whether it is possible to increase the allocation to the

Department of Main Roads from $17m to $32m so that those funds can be allocated to the various local authorities in the State to provide the employment to which the honourable member referred, particularly in the rural areas of Queensland.

Mr CASEY: I have a question for the Minister for Primary Industries. I ask the Premier and Treasurer whether the Minister is still ill.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Yes.

Mr CASEY: It is an important question about the sugar industry and the Queensland Government's actions, so I will place the question on notice for tomorrow.

Q-Net

Mr CASEY: In directing a question to the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, I refer to the proposed Q-Net being established by the Department of Industry Development. Recognising the need for pilot programs to be undertaken to assess the cost and social values of providing Government communication for remote regions of the State, I ask: When the State Government network is fully established, will the cost of the new communication system be met on a user-pays basis by the various departments and Government instrumentalities involved? Under circumstances in which departments or Government instrumentalities can indicate that the cost benefit to them of using their current communications system represents a saving on the use of Q-Net, will they be allowed to continue to use their existing system, as in the long run it is the tax-payer who foots the bill?

Mr AHERN: What has to be understood about the Q-Net proposal is that it is a pilot program. A number of areas have been selected in which there appears to be a good prospect of substantial savings on telecommunication costs being made. As well, there seem to be good opportunities for an expansion of Government services being possible by virtue of the Aussat satellite program.

It must be understood at this stage that what is happening is that the Queensland Government is funding a pilot program. Everything will be evaluated. Consultants will be called in to evaluate the experience at the end of the pilot program. Following that, a decision will be made on the services that will be implemented on a permanent basis and those that will not, and on how the services will be funded. Which departments will carry the funding out of their budget and which ones will have a separate allocation will be something for the Government to ascertain at the time that the pilot project is concluded.

Mr Casey: How long will that be?

Mr AHERN: It is expected that the pilot program will be completed at the end of the calendar year.

Mr Casey: That is the 1986 calendar year?

Mr AHERN: No, this calendar year.

The project will be commenced in October. I understand that pilot programs will be well under way and completed by the end of the calendar year. If there is any difference, I will let the honourable member know. It is expected that by early next year decisions will have to be made in relation to long-term use. Cabinet will need to discuss the matter with Treasury officers. However, there appear to be good prospects for savings to be made.

I remind the honourable member that satellites are utilised round the world. It is expected that by 1995 there will be one satellite every two degrees round the equator. In other words, there will be 180 satellites round the world's axis. The world is not doing that for fun; it is doing it because substantial cost savings can be made and because of a possibility of expansion of Government services, services to private industry

and so on. Australia is trailing its feet in regard to what the rest of the world is doing. Queensland is simply conducting a pilot program. The Government will have the evaluations in place as quickly as possible. Bearing in mind that the first generation of Aussat satellites has an anticipated lifespan of only seven years, quick decisions must be made.

Payment of Fine Imposed on Member for Wolston

Mr ALISON: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs: Is he aware of press reports that an anonymous person paid the fine for the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs), which led to his release from gaol? If so, will the Minister advise honourable members of the circumstances relating to the payment of the fine and the release of the honourable member for Wolston?

Mr MUNTZ: In answer to the honourable member for Maryborough—I believe that all honourable members should remember that the honourable member for Wolston did break the law. He refused to pay the fine and elected to go to gaol. My department did not place him there. It was his own decision to go to gaol. Even at his hearing, the honourable member for Wolston had the opportunity to apply for a community service order under the fines option program. He did not take advantage of that opportunity.

Honourable members ought to know exactly why the honourable member for Wolston went to gaol. He went of his own free will. In my opinion, it was political grandstanding. All honourable members know that Councillor Paul Tully of Ipswich City Council is seeking his endorsement at the next election. Basically, in addition to the strike action in which the honourable member for Wolston participated, to ensure his own endorsement he was just grandstanding in an effort to lift his own image within his party. However, all honourable members know that the honourable member for Wolston's endorsement is under threat by Councillor Paul Tully in the forthcoming election.

The honourable member for Wolston's fine was paid recently by a person who cannot be positively identified. However, my officers reported that the fine was paid by a tall, thin chap with a scruffy, longish beard. I do not know whether it was a member of Parliament, but it was certainly a member of the socialist Left of the Labor Party who paid the fine. The man paid the fine and left before the honourable member for Wolston saw him. However, my information is that it was quite obvious that the person who paid that fine knew the honourable member for Wolston very well.

On that same day, an article appeared on page 5 of "The Courier-Mail" concerning comments made by a spokesman for the International Socialists, Mr Ian Rintoul, who was in Brisbane at that time. Mr Rintoul perfectly fits the description of the man who paid the fine. One of the statements made by Mr Rintoul was—

> "Militant action such as strikes and demonstrations was the only way to make the Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, listen to union demands."

That is the type of action that he took. I believe that if it was not Mr Rintoul, it was his younger brother who paid that fine. It was most certainly a friend of the honourable member for Wolston.

As I have said before, if the honourable member for Wolston wants to prove that he is not grandstanding and if he is genuine in his attempts to demonstrate against the actions of the Government, I will this afternoon provide accommodation so that he can return to Wacol prison. I will have the honourable member for Wolston escorted to the prison this afternoon. I will take every necessary action to ensure that that fine that has been paid by a friend of the honourable member for Wolston is refunded. The honourable member for Wolston should not grandstand. He simply has to say that he wants to go back to gaol, and I will immediately make the accommodation available. The honourable member for Wolston will be welcome there. Many of his colleagues within the unions, both State and federal, are already there, so he will be among friends.

I do not know why the honourable member for Wolston promotes the cause of those people inside the prison. The honourable member for Wolston has many militant unionist colleagues in prison whom he wants to get out early. Perhaps the reason is that he is looking for prospective endorsements at the next State election. Perhaps he wants to nominate them for pre-selection. The Labor Party is running short of candidates. That might be the reason.

Union Financial Assistance for Former SEQEB Employees

Mr ALISON: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Will the Minister give an estimate of how much per week is subscribed by the various unions towards assistance for the SEQEB workers who sacked themselves and are allegedly still out of work? How much is allegedly paid out of that fund each week for financial assistance for these self-sacked SEQEB workers? Would the Minister have any idea what is happening to the balance of the funds?

Mr LESTER: About 8 200 mine-workers, who are union members, are paying a $10 a week levy. That does not include the members of other unions who are also paying a levy. It could well be that the TLC is collecting $100,000 a week. On at least one occasion, Mr Dempsey has indicated that that may not be sufficient and that the levy may have to be increased. Is it any wonder that a number of unions are asking, "Where is the money being spent?"

It has been said that the levy is being collected simply to supply food parcels and to help in instances of special hardship. I ask: Is the TLC to inflict further draconian industrial action on Queensland? Will it try to inflict further power black-outs? I emphasise that the TLC has a mandate of 5 per cent. Last Thursday it endeavoured to call a strike. When it was unsuccessful in doing that, stop-work meetings were held. Fewer than 5 per cent of the total membership attended.

It must be remembered that the industrial disputation began when the union movement defied the State Industrial Commission and broke agreement after agreement. It must not be forgotten that the Australian Council of Trade Unions, which is the head of the "coalition" now in Canberra as seen by the 27 members at the tax summit, is opposed to the spirit of the Constitution, which clearly provides for free trade between the States. The union movement attempted to coerce the High Court into making a decision before it was ready to do so. It is our right to appeal if State rights are being impinged upon.

I remind honourable members that, in polls taken by newspapers, television and radio, 65 per cent of Queenslanders have supported the Government's action to provide a continuity of power supply. Almost every major editorial in the country has backed the Queensland Government. Therefore, I suggest that the unions are pursuing a lost cause. They should give it up. The ALP should advise them to do so as well. Unfortunately for that party, its stocks are going down. The polls show that it is losing ground every day. Perhaps it is good for the National Party, but it is not good for the people of Queensland. It is very bad for the ALP.

Oxenford Totalisator Administration Board Subagency Licence

Mr D'ARCY: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to allegations of political interference in granting a TAB subagency licence at Oxenford and a statement made by him in an interview on Monday to the effect that he had questioned the general manager about reference to political interference and had been told that there was a poor and inaccurate description of what had occurred. I ask the Minister to advise the House: What would be an accurate description of what occurred relative to the failure of Mr and Mrs Frith to receive the subagency in 1982?

Mr HINZE: I ask the honourable member to put the question on notice.

Mr D'ARCY: I ask the Minister to answer the question immediately. I will not put it on notice.

Deeds of Grant in Trust

Mr McPHIE: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs: Has there been further delay in the implementation of the deed of grant in trust legislation as a result of the unacceptable attitude of the Federal socialist Government and its Minister, Mr Holding?

Mr KATTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. We were informed by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Holding) that we would have no trouble in processing the deeds of grant; that the Federal Government agreed with all of our intentions. After 11 of the deeds were drawn up, approved by Cabinet and sent to Canberra, we were belatedly informed in a telex from one of the Minister's Federal colleagues that we would not be allowed to part with the houses.

For the benefit of those who are ignorant of or do not know very much about the communities in the Torres Strait islands area, I point out that the islands are very tiny and that the houses cover almost the whole of the islands. If the Queensland Government were to hand over to the people the deeds of grant without the houses, quite frankly, it would be handing over nothing at all because, if the aerodrome and the area occupied by the houses were to be taken out of the transaction, the remaining area of land that could be handed over would be zilch.

The Queensland Government is faced with a complete refusal on the part of the Federal Government, and that prevents this Government from taking any action. Certain legal aspects are being sorted out at present so that some progress can be made, but the blame for the hold-up must be placed entirely and completely at the feet of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has received telexes from the chairman of the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Council and the chairman of the Island Co-ordinating Council requesting the Federal Government to act with a sense of reasonableness. The "reasonableness" that is coming from the Federal Government is that it wants $100,000 in replacement costs for a house in the Torres Strait area; in other words, the Federal Government wants the people in that community to pay $100,000 to take over each house.

I point out that people who live in other areas of Australia are required to pay the market price of the house only, and the market price for a house in the Torres Strait region would be, I suppose, approximately $5,000, $10,000 or $15,000 at the very outside. Such a demand by the Federal Government amounts to an imposition upon the people in that area that is not imposed upon other people living anywhere else in Australia. I find that situation quite extraordinary.

However, in the light of the remarks made by the Premier and Treasurer earlier and in the light of the comments that have appeared in newspapers over the past two or three days, I do not really find extraordinary anything that the Federal Government would do in the field of Aboriginal affairs. Suffice it to say, though, that 76 per cent of the Australian population is totally opposed to what the Federal Government is endeavouring to do in the field of Aboriginal affairs. Concomitantly, the same percentage is in favour of the Queensland Government's approach in relation to whites and blacks in its attempts to introduce and implement effective measures in the affairs of Aboriginal communities in Queensland. Seventy-six per cent of the Australian population is riding on the side of the Queensland Government.

Allegiance to Her Majesty by Member for Mackay

Mr McPHIE: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs: Is it true that, at a packed opening of the community hall at the Mackay State High School at which the Minister officiated recently, and in front of hundreds of high school students

and guests, the honourable member for Mackay refused to stand for the playing of *God save The Queen* when called upon to do so by the president of the p. and c. association?

Mr MUNTZ: It should be recorded for the benefit of the people of Mackay in particular and for the benefit of the people elsewhere in Queensland that last Saturday the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey), in front of a packed audience of hundreds of schoolchildren between the ages of 12 and 18 years who had previously performed a concert supported by the Mackay High School band, sat down in complete contempt for the monarchy. The honourable member was completely disrespectful and he was a disgrace to the people he represents.

I believe that the honourable member was completely discourteous. I point out that Her Majesty the Queen is Queen of Australia, and I particularly remind the honourable member of that. I also believe that he should be stripped of his Australian citizenship.

The people of Mackay are beginning to wake up because of a number of things that have happened. It is obvious that the people have little or no representation. Where the honourable member stands, judging by the way in which he behaved, would have been quite obvious to the people of Mackay—and no doubt obvious to everyone present in the House today.

The people I feel most sorry for are the young people who performed in the concert. Despite its being a tremendous performance, the honourable member sat down in complete contempt of Her Majesty the Queen and of the people who had attended the opening day. I believe that the people of Mackay will record a vote of no confidence in the honourable member when he next stands for election.

There is no way in the world that the honourable member should be allowed to behave in the way that he did, especially as the organising committee and the teachers who assisted in organising the occasion had announced that the national anthem would be played. The honourable member stands condemned by his own actions.

LEAVE TO MAKE PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. I seek the leave of the House to make a personal explanation.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr CASEY: I seek the leave of the House to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Time has expired.

Mr CASEY: It does not matter. Under Standing Orders, honourable members can seek leave at any time to make a personal explanation on a matter.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that I am on my feet.

Mr CASEY: In accordance with Standing Orders, on any occasion when a matter arises a member may seek leave to make a personal explanation. I seek that leave of the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Opposition Members: Aye.

Government Members: No.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The "Noes" have it.

Mr Casey: Divide!

Mr SPEAKER: I think the "Noes" have it.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

Opposition Members: Aye.

Government Members: No.

Mr SPEAKER: The "Noes" have it.

Mr CASEY: Mr Speaker, the circumstances, as mentioned in the House——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The "Noes" have it.

Mr CASEY: The "Noes" have it?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr CASEY: Divide!

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 37	
Braddy	Milliner
Campbell	Palaszczuk
Casey	Price
Comben	Scott
D'Arcy	Shaw
De Lacy	Smith
Eaton	Underwood
Fouras	Vaughan
Gibbs, R. J.	Veivers
Goss	Warburton
Gygar	Warner, A. M.
Hamill	White
Innes	Wilson
Knox	Yewdale
Kruger	
Lee	
Lickiss	
Mackenroth	
McElligott	*Tellers:*—
McLean	Davis
Miller	Prest

NOES, 40	
Ahern	Lane
Alison	Lester
Austin	Lingard
Bailey	Littleproud
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Booth	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Powell
FitzGerald	Randell
Gibbs, I. J.	Row
Glasson	Simpson
Goleby	Stephan
Gunn	Stoneman
Harper	Tenni
Harvey	Wharton
Henderson	
Hinze	*Tellers:*—
Jennings	Kaus
Katter	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (12.7 p.m.): Mr Speaker, in view of what has occurred, I have no alternative but to move—

"That this Government has lost the confidence of this House because of its failure to allow the member for Mackay to make a personal explanation, an automatic right that has always existed in this Parliament.

This action by the Government now withdraws one of the very limited opportunities available to Opposition members and highlights the unsuitability and incompetence of the present Speaker."

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, on a point of order——

Mr WARBURTON: And I have moved that motion.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, on a point of order—the honourable member is clutching at straws. There are plenty of other opportunities. He is speaking in terms of——

Mr WARBURTON: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I have moved——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I recognise that.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am on a point of order. You do not mean to say, after what you have said, that I cannot speak on a point of order?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Today is a day for General Business—Matters of Public Interest. The Leader of the Opposition must seek leave of the House to move a motion of this kind.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to move the motion that I have outlined.

Mr SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

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

Honourable Members: Divide!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Ring the bells.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 30	
Braddy	Warner, A. M.
Campbell	Wilson
Casey	Yewdale
Comben	
D'Arcy	
De Lacy	
Eaton	
Fouras	
Gibbs, R. J.	
Goss	
Hamill	
Kruger	
Mackenroth	
McElligott	
McLean	
Milliner	
Palaszczuk	
Price	
Scott	
Shaw	
Smith	
Underwood	
Vaughan	*Tellers*
Veivers	Davis
Warburton	Prest

Noes, 47	
Ahern	Lee
Alison	Lester
Austin	Lickiss
Bailey	Lingard
Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud
Booth	McKechnie
Borbidge	McPhie
Chapman	Menzel
Cooper	Miller
Elliott	Muntz
FitzGerald	Newton
Gibbs, I. J.	Powell
Glasson	Randell
Goleby	Row
Gunn	Simpson
Gygar	Stephan
Harper	Stoneman
Harvey	Tenni
Henderson	Wharton
Hinze	White
Innes	
Jennings	
Katter	*Tellers*
Knox	Kaus
Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. In view of the attitude and the statements contained in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, I must make clear the real purpose and reason for the Government's attitude. This matter commenced when the former Leader of the Opposition——

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will ascertain whether there is a point of order.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Following on what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition, I insist that I have this opportunity to make my point of order.

Just recently in Mackay, in front of a number of schoolchildren, the member for Mackay (Mr Casey) adopted a certain attitude—he deliberately sat down in front of the children, and he has done that previously——

Mr WARBURTON: With respect, Mr Speaker, that is not a point of order and it should not be allowed. Even if he is the Premier of this State, he has no right to proceed in this fashion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, on previous occasions I have informed the House that I will listen to a point of order, and the Leader of the Opposition has brought this to my attention. First and foremost, I will listen to a point of order and then I will make my decision. I am listening to the Premier, and that is what I intend to do.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is a very, very serious situation when a member of this Parliament——

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is a point of order. As the Leader of the Opposition said, we have the right.

I have to clarify the situation that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Mackay. In days gone by, the honourable member for Mackay always called himself the "Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition". That is in *Hansard* everywhere. With a Bible in one hand, this is what the former Leader of the Opposition swore—

> "I .. do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, as lawful Sovereign of Australia and her other Realms and Territories, and to Her Heirs and Successors, according to Law. So Help Me God."

That is what the honourable member for Mackay said.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I again point out to honourable members that, for a start, when I am on my feet they will resume their seats. When a point of order is being taken, I will not listen to another point of order until the first point of order is finished. That is my ruling, and that is what I will follow through.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you just ruled, when the Leader of the Opposition raised a point of order with you, that you would listen to the Premier and then rule on his point of order. I ask you to rule on his point of order and tell us whether, in fact, he made one. You have not made a ruling on his point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If I rule that there is no point of order, there is no point of order.

Mr MACKENROTH: But you haven't ruled that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have not ruled on it, because it is out of order. There is no point of order. That is my ruling on that one.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Sugar Industry

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (12.21 p.m.): Today I draw to the attention of this House and to the people of the State and nation as a whole some of the lesser-known concerns and spin-offs of the depression within the sugar industry.

At the same time, I draw the attention of the House to the presence of a young man who is sitting in the gallery with his mother and who has travelled to Brisbane to meet the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) following an event of some significance in the Burdekin area of north Queensland—an area that produces about 20 per cent of Australia's sugar and an area that is, in some ways, blessed by ideal sugar-producing conditions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is too much audible conversation and movement in the Chamber. Those members who intend to leave the Chamber should do so silently, and the members who wish to remain will resume their seats.

Mr STONEMAN: In the Burdekin area there are approximately 3 000 schoolchildren, most of whom never see or are likely to see the Parliament of this State, because of a separation of almost 1 000 miles. The young man to whom I refer is Rory Burke. His mother is Mrs Nola Burke. Nola's husband, Pat, is back on the family farm just outside Brandon, which is about 50 miles south of Townsville and the centre of the Pioneer mill established by the Drysdale family 100 years ago.

Rory Burke sits in the gallery today because he responded to a suggestion by the Burdekin Save the Sugar Towns Committee that primary schoolchildren write a letter to the Premier and Treasurer and secondary students write to the Prime Minister. The prize for the winning entry in the case of primary pupils was a trip to Brisbane to meet the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and for secondary students a trip to Canberra to meet the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke). In Rory's case, he will meet the Premier at 12.30 p.m. today.

Rory Burke is nine years old and is a Year 4 student at St Francis Primary School in Ayr. I note that he has chosen to wear his school uniform today, and I commend him for that as he does that school great credit.

Perhaps it would be appropriate for me to read to the House the contents of Rory's letter. It states—

"Dear Mr Premier,

My name is Rory Burke and I am nine years old. I am writing this letter on behalf of my eldest brother, Shaun. Since Shaun was a little boy, he has always dreamed of working on my father's cane farm in the Burdekin district.

After Shaun left school he went to the Burdekin Rural Education Centre to learn about farming. This year he came home to make his dream come true to start on dad's farm.

As you know the price paid for cane is very low so he is finding it hard to make a good business out of his dream.

I wonder too what the district will be like when I leave school. This will be about 1993. Unless things improve, many of my friends will have to leave. My family have been in this district for nearly a hundred years. I wonder how much longer we will be able to stay.

Please help my family, neighbours and friends to save our town.

Yours faithfully,
Rory Burke
P.O. Box 76, Brandon"

Winner of the secondary section was Dale Edgar of Home Hill. His father runs a shop in the town. Dale expressed similar if somewhat more sophisticated concerns, as did the winner of the section for Year 11 and 12 students, Maria Christofides, who comes from a farming family.

Perhaps I should read from a section of Maria's letter, which must surely express the concerns of many thousands of similar aged students along the coastline of Queensland. It states—

> " . . almost every farmer who owns a cane farm will be forced into bad debt by the end of the year if something drastic isn't done soon.
>
> The kind of help we need can only be supplied by you, Mr Hawke. What about the future of all the school leavers? Employers in this town are too scared to employ young people because the money coming back into the economy is so little they can't afford to pay more wages. What will this do to the country's unemployment figure. My father's property used to provide a living for nineteen people, but as time has progressed and conditions worsened, the same farm only provides for four people.
>
> Many farmers who work their farms will no longer be able to uphold their two and three generation tradition and many thousands of people will lose their livelihood. Please help us!!! Yours faithfully, Maria Christofides."

As I pointed out at the beginning of my speech, I will draw the attention of the House to some of the lesser known concerns relating to the dramatic situation facing the sugar industry. However, at the same time I believe that those concerns are graphically contained in the letters of these three young people of varying ages, as well as others who responded to the call.

The people of this nation should be aware that the Rory Burkes, the Dale Edgars and the Maria Christofides are the nation of tomorrow, and they are crying out for help from a nation that has benefited from the labours of their parents, grandparents and, no doubt, great-grandparents. If this country is to continue to benefit from the labours of such dedicated and responsible people, in turn it, as a whole, has to respond and assure Rory's brother Shaun that the farm will be worth struggling for; it has to ensure that Dale Edgar's father, Darcy, is able to maintain his shop in Home Hill and provide a support base for young Dale, and assure Maria that the 13 hours a day for six and seven days a week that her father is giving to a farm that is going backwards will be worth while in the long run.

These young people are not asking for hand-outs; they are not asking for 36¼-hour weeks and nine-day fortnights; they are not asking for the right to strike, and they do not want something for themselves in the direct sense. They are asking that they be given a chance to have a future.

In his letter to the Prime Minister, Dale Edgar asked that his earnest request for assistance for cane-growing communities be considered in earnest also. Dale concluded that letter by saying—

> "Thank you for taking the time to read my letter which has been written on behalf of many people in the Burdekin district. I hope it at least provokes a decision on the subject."

I am sure that many thousands of people of all ages along the sugar belt of Australia would utter a fervent "Amen" to that plea and, along with all honourable members, thank these young people for reminding us that, above all, there must be a future for Dale, Maria and Rory and their families.

It is all very well if the people of this nation believe that they can do without a few farmers, that many must go, that times are tough and that if you are in trouble it is your own fault, that mills must close down, that towns have been built up during

boom times and therefore must tighten up when times are bad, but who pays? Is it the farmer and his family who walk off the family farm alone? Is it the mill-worker who supports his family at a redundant mill alone? Is it the businessman, his staff and their families alone? Is it the primary producers of this nation who must always get bigger or get out, who must always become more efficient, who must reduce production and therefore capacity to continue, who must always absorb costs because there is no-one to whom they can pass on the bill? Is it always the primary producer who is looked upon with scorn because he has more than a quarter acre of land? No. The nation as a whole—the people of the cities, the workers, the businessmen—must also pay or the day will surely come when there will be no Edgars, no Christofides and no Burkes out there to pass the bill on to. If that fact is not appreciated and appreciated quickly, God help us all.

If we are not prepared to show our young people that there is hope, that there is a tomorrow and that we as a nation do consider that they are worthy of recognition and support, I suggest that everyone is living in a fool's paradise, protected by a flimsy bubble that is about to burst and expose us to harsh realities which appear to have faded from memory and will only be reawakened by a stampede from rural Australia.

Shortcomings of Fire Service

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (12.30 p.m.): This low-service, irresponsible Government daily gambles with the lives of the innocent by its neglect of the State's emergency services. Today, though, I want to talk mainly about the fire service.

Drastic reorganisation of the fire services has led to top-heavy administration and staff reductions at the cutting edge—that is, a depletion of the number of professional fire-fighters. On this occasion, though, the Government is deprived of using its usual carping cry of some Federal responsibility for a cut in a Queensland Government service. By and large, the community is funding the fire service by levies, and, of course, the new levy imposed under stage one was presented to the people of Queensland by the Government as an ultimate answer to funding the fire services of Queensland.

In most organisations, when staff cuts occur, it is usually claimed that improvements in efficiency or the application of new technology have made those cuts or changes possible and the level of service is able to be maintained. The Government of Queensland, however—and I say that deliberately, because I do not single out the Minister, who has held the reins of office for less than two years—is not able to make that claim, because not only have the numbers of full-time professional fire-fighters been cut drastically, but the morale of the men and women of that vital emergency service has also been severely undermined by the loss of confidence in the direction received from this low-service Government.

To emphasise that fact, I point out that this morning, on behalf of about 6 000 professional fire-fighters, I have presented a petition to the Parliament which highlights the concern that is held with respect to the decline in standards and efficiency of professional fire brigades, owing to the reductions in the number of full-time personnel, and the greater risk to life and property exposed to the threat of the ravage of uncontrolled fire.

Today, though, I do not intend to talk primarily about staffing levels but rather about the state of equipment within the service. In the last couple of weeks, more alarming revelations have followed those that have come to light over the past year. It is surely reasonable to expect that Government and semi-government authorities would ensure that their road vehicles are properly maintained to a standard required by Queensland law and a standard that, if not maintained by the private sector, attracts prescribed penalties.

An even more justifiable expectation would be that emergency-service vehicles that share the roads with normal traffic but operate outside the restrictions of the Traffic Code, which is very important, are maintained not to some minimal standard but to a

high standard appropriate for the stress to which those vehicles are subjected. The low priority the Bjelke-Petersen Government has for such community expectations was fully revealed only a few days ago when the officers and men of the Roma Street Fire Station, as a measure of their concern for their own and public safety, refused to man vehicle No. 66 because it was riddled with rust and observably structurally unsound. Vehicle 66 is not a secondary support vehicle; it is, in fact, a first-line appliance—that is to say, it is a high-pressure pump unit absolutely essential and central to any fire-fighting action.

Frequently, reference is made in this place to tightening inspection standards of vehicles and the observance of the law in many areas; but that vehicle was inspected in May by this Government's own Transport Inspection Branch and issued with the appropriate certificate to continue operating. I do not suggest, nor do I imply, that officers of the Transport Inspection Branch would willingly pass such a vehicle, be it private or Government-owned. I can then only conclude that there was a clear political intrusion that prevented that vehicle from being immediately ordered from the road in May.

I intend to show that the deplorable condition of this appliance and others has been well known to the Government since 1983. In a memorandum to the secretary of the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board, dated 22 December 1983, Mr C. J. Law, the engineer responsible for workshops and services stated—

> "It is considered that over the next three years at least 14 appliances will require replacement on the basis of age, mileage and the condition of cab and body.
>
> These appliances are . . ."

And a number of them are listed. I will not go through them. Further down, the memorandum says—

> "Of the pumpers, the units most urgently in need of replacement are 41, 61, 66, . ."

and three others.

That was a very clear statement that something should be done. However, following the refusal by the Government to agree to the replacement of faulty and worn-out equipment, the same engineer again wrote to the secretary on 29 June 1984, stating as follows—

> ". . . it is imperative that we bring to the attention of the Minister the poor condition of a considerable number of our appliances."

The letter also mentions that—

> "The extent of the rust is quite alarming."

The engineer also said—

> "I am reluctant to keep the cab on site for any extended period as the fewer people who see it at this stage the better."

In other words, that gentleman was made party to a cover-up.

On 4 July, the chief officer, Mr Belcher, also wrote to the secretary and included in his remarks the following words—

> "My concern is that if appliances are not replaced and cannot because of their age be properly maintained in good condition, then the safety of the crews attending fires is placed in jeopardy and breakdowns may result in undue delay in reaching a fire scene with possibly serious results.
>
> I recommend that the Minister be requested to re-consider his decision to defer our application and allow the programme to proceed as previously requested."

I have previously shown this material to Mr Speaker, and I now seek leave to have the whole of those documents incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

The Secretary,
Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board,
BRISBANE

Sir,

Re: Replacement of Fire Appliances

I refer to the letter from the Minister for Fire Services in which he advises that the request for loan moneys to purchase new fire appliances in 1984/85 year has been deferred.

It may be that the Minister is not aware that the proposed purchase of appliances is solely for the replacement of existing equipment which, because of age and general condition must be replaced if we are to maintain the service.

The Engineer—Workshop & Services is preparing a detailed list of the precise condition of each vehicle to support the submission that the previously outlined replacement programme must be allowed to continue.

My concern is that if appliances are not replaced and cannot because of their age be properly maintained in good condition, then the safety of the crews attending fires is placed in jeopardy and breakdowns may result in undue delay in reaching a fire scene with possibly serious results.

I recommend that the Minister be requested to re-consider his decision to defer our application and allow the programme to proceed as previously requested.

Yours faithfully,
(signed) W. Belcher
Chief Officer

Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board

From: Engineer—Workshop and Services To: Secretary Date: 29/6/84

Subject: Report of Condition of Appliances

I refer to the Staff Order regarding the advice that applications for loan funds for appliance replacements in 1984/85 have been deferred.

This has far-reaching implications and I feel it is imperative that we bring to the attention of the Minister the poor condition of a considerable number of our appliances and emphasise that rather than a deferment or a reduction in the allocation for appliances we really need an increase.

To do justice to the situation a comprehensive report is necessary and it is not possible to have this ready for the Board Meeting on 9/7/84. However I will have an interim report ready outlining the situation in general terms. I have spoken to the Chief Officer who agrees with this approach. He will also be submitting a general report on the implications from the operational side.

To add weight to my report, I would suggest that some members of the Works and General Purposes Committee visit the workshop next week if possible to see at first hand the extent of the rust in the cabin of Car 74—the unit we are rebuilding. The extent of the rust is quite alarming and it is highly probable that a number of other appliances of this vintage 1973-1975 are as badly affected also. I am reluctant to keep the cab on site for any extended period as the fewer people who see it at this stage the better.

(Signed) C. J. Law,
Engineer—Workshop and Services

Mr SMITH: I hope the seriousness of the chief officer's remarks is not lost on this Government. He said that the Government's refusal to provide the loan funds that would allow the overdue replacement of appliances was placing not only the lives of the fire-fighters in jeopardy, but was also imperilling the ability of the fire service to respond to an emergency that involved the safety of the public and property. I believe the community at large will find it unacceptable that this Government, by its inaction, has placed the lives and properties of its citizens at risk. Clearly, the attitude of this low-service Government is to try to continue to con the public, maintain its outrageous rhetoric, and do nothing unless a dam-burst of public opinion forces its hand.

For months, if not years, fire-fighting unions have been trying to have the Government take seriously the unpreparedness of the Queensland fire service to meet major emergencies. It is interesting that these unions, prior to 1984, had a long record of a

low level of disputation. They were only forced into the arena of public comment after all internal approaches had been exhausted and they were concerned not only about being totally ignored with respect to any reconsideration by the Government but, in addition, about being publicly berated.

It was only when one Brisbane television station decided to take up the issue that there was any movement at all. In fact, it would also be accurate to say that the Government has now pressed the panic button. Despite that, the Government has not decided that the funds should now flow for replacement vehicles and equipment; rather, it has decided to bring down the shutters so that the deficiencies in this vital service cannot be exposed to the public gaze.

Since the television portrayal, many fire-fighting vehicles have been inspected by the Transport Inspection Branch. As a result, vehicle 69—a 1 000 gpm pumper—was immediately ordered off the road. Apparently it was even worse than vehicle 66, which has also been taken off the road. At least three other major units have had not one or two but eight tyres replaced. An unknown number have had one or more tyres replaced. It does not take an inspector from the Transport Inspection Branch or even a mechanic to check the state of a vehicle's tyres. The public are held responsible for the condition and state of wear of the tyres of private vehicles, and it is no different in the case of a heavy vehicle. The money simply was not available to the responsible officers to authorise such routine maintenance.

It would indeed be interesting to know whether the Government had contingency plans to blame the unions had a fire vehicle caused death or injury to the public as a result of an accident that occurred when a vehicle was operating under emergency conditions, either because it was structurally unsound or because a worn tyre had failed. The mind boggles at what could result if a heavily laden fire vehicle went out of control while travelling at high speed in an emergency.

The Government must stand condemned for failing in its fire services administration and for failing the people of Queensland.

Trade Union Movement

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (12.40 p.m.): I wish to raise the matter of trade-unionism. I believe that the end has come for certain trade unions in this country, and I wish to outline the reasons for my belief that, unless corrective action is taken, those unions will be heading towards oblivion. I believe that 1985 will be seen as the watershed year in the power of unions.

History has recorded the growth of the union movement in this country, the struggle that took place for the unions to represent workers, the work that was done and the establishment of the Labor Party within the union movement. However, in some instances, unions have outlived their usefulness.

If they do not change direction, they face oblivion. They have not realised the change in public opinion on major disputes. In the Electrical Trades Union dispute with the SEQEB, the unions believed, when they turned off power to industry and homes, that the Government would have to cave in.

In the past, for the first three days of a strike, members of Parliament got a great deal of support and encouragement from the people who were suffering hardships in the belief that the Government had the right to govern and the unions had a right to negotiate. However, opinion changed after about five days and questions were asked about why the Government had not solved the problem. From then on, the Government was in a position in which it was very difficult to negotiate.

These days, if the unions do not accept the umpire's decision, or the findings of the commission, public support will be totally with the Government. On the last occasion, Dinny Madden and his crew absolutely blew their chances. They did not realise that public opinion on irrational demands by unions has changed in Australia, as it has

changed throughout the world. When a union is in the wrong, the public will no longer support it. That is what happened on this occasion. People do not simply say, "That is an industrial problem and therefore the Government is at fault because it has not been able to solve it." If the union organisers do not realise that, their union life will be very short.

Last year, a strike of immense importance to all Australians started at Mudginberri, an abattoir in the Northern Territory about 250 km east of Darwin. All of the 25 to 28 workers at the abattoir—the number depends on which newspaper is read—agreed to go on contract killing.

The Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union decided that that was not acceptable to the union and declared the abattoir black. It picketed the abattoir and banned Federal meat inspectors from entering the abattoir to carry out inspections of the buffalo meat for export.

The proprietor of the abattoir, Mr Jay Pendarvis, believed that the workers would be better off, that the company would be better off, and that, in the long run, the ramifications would extend throughout the Northern Territory. At this stage I will not canvass the different killing costs at some of the Northern Territory meatworks, but they vary from $50 to $150 a beast. That is the huge difference in killing costs under the tally system that was operating at the time.

The AMIEU was fined by the Australian Industrial Commission and told to remove the pickets. When the union was fined for failing to do so, it refused to pay the fine. Later, an order was issued to confiscate the assets of the union. The fines mounted up. Since 10 May, the strike at Mudginberri has put the proprietor in a very difficult position. The company cannot export its meat and the union is holding out completely against the will of the workers, who have the wish and the right to earn a good living for themselves.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions was called into the dispute. What did it do? Because the AMIEU is affiliated with the ACTU, it called a national strike. The union to which the meat inspectors belong is also affiliated with the ACTU. Of course, the waterside workers went out on strike.

Mr Borbidge: That is not new.

Mr FITZGERALD: As the member for Surfers Paradise says, that is not new. Some of the workers in the airline industry were called out on strike. The workers servicing the aeroplanes at airports in Australia went on strike for four hours in support of an illegal strike. According to the courts, it was an illegal strike.

What did the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Willis) do? He tried to get the parties together. Of course, nothing happened. Now he is seeking to use the connection between the ACTU and the Federal Government. Of course, we know that while debate was taking place in the Chamber of the House of Representatives during the recent tax summit, the Prime Minister and other Ministers were getting their advice from Bill Kelty, Simon Crean and others in another part of the building. There is a close association between the ACTU and the Federal Government.

What attitude is the Federal Government adopting in this matter? Will it back the industrial courts? Will the unions recognise the changing public attitude to union lawlessness? Will the fines that have been imposed be paid, or will the consequences be faced? This morning we heard an example of that. If fines are imposed, people have the right not to pay the fines and to face the consequences.

The members of the public are sick and tired of union bosses who are power-brokers and use workers' powers for their own personal benefit. The community will not accept unions making hit lists.

The unions have decided to make a hit list of all the companies that are connected with this dispute and will not support them.

There are many similarities between the Mudginberri dispute and the dispute in the electricity industry in Queensland. The two unions involved are the AMIEU and the ETU.

What powers do the unions have in these matters? What right do unionists have to work? What right do those men who were members of the ETU, and who are probably still members of the union, have to work if they want to work? What right do meatworkers have to work if they want to work?

The public is disgusted at the actions that the unions are taking. In both disputes, threats of action against the companies involved have been made. The ETU went interstate and tried to blockade Queensland. It has announced that it is selectively going to knock off Queensland companies that are seen to be supporting the Queensland Government. That is exactly the same thing as the ACTU has been trying to do.

Mr Borbidge: Political persecution.

Mr FITZGERALD: That is correct. That is the tactic that the unions are starting to adopt in both disputes. Both unions have defied the industrial courts.

Of course, there is a difference. The Queensland Government has won the fight in the electricity industry and the strike is finished. What is the Federal Government doing in the Mudginberri dispute? Nothing. It stands condemned. Its association with the ACTU has left it in a position in which it can do absolutely nothing.

The ACTU is supporting an illegal strike. It wants to take more industrial action. It claims that it will bring Australia to its knees. The ACTU recognises that this is a major power struggle for the unions. Those unions that have not recognised that public opinion has changed are doomed to failure. They will disappear into the history books. The only unions that will survive are those that are able to change. Unions in the United Kingdom will enter into a no-strike contract with companies that want to set themselves up in that country.

Application by Junefair Pty Ltd for Totalisator Administration Board Subagency

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (12.50 p.m.): In this House last Thursday, I raised serious allegations of political interference and conflict of interest in relation to the Minister for Racing (Mr Hinze) and the granting of the Oxenford TAB licence. The Minister responded yesterday, and I found his response totally inadequate. I am sure that everybody found it very telling that the Minister was not prepared to table the whole TAB file, but, instead, chose to table only a self-serving selection of documents. It was also very telling that the Minister carefully and specifically avoided denying political interference on his part. He is not prepared to make that denial. As far as the Opposition is concerned, the failure by the Minister on these two aspects is further evidence of guilt.

Let me be quite clear: the Opposition says that the documents tabled in the House last Thursday and yesterday show a whole course of conduct, the most probable and logical result of which was to deny the Oxenford TAB licence to Mr and Mrs Frith and to make Junefair Pty Ltd the successful applicant. That was the actual result. Mr Hinze did not put the position correctly when he said that he withdrew his application. In fact, he had already been granted the licence, and the licence was taken from him.

The evidence that the Opposition has presented is overwhelming, and in any other State and in any other Western democracy, it would be enough to bring down the relevant Minister and, possibly, the Government of the day. However, it is a sad commentary on the quality of this Government and politics in Queensland that it is often said that proving an overwhelming case, as the Opposition has done, is not enough in Queensland—you have to catch them red-handed. That makes the job of the Opposition so much harder; but so be it.

What I needed in relation to this particular case was that one final document—the straw to break the camel's back. It was not enough that the Opposition could put together

an overwhelming score. It had to be able to call "bull's-eye". What I needed in this case was that one last document that would conclusively prove the allegations; that is, the crucial memorandum of 18 April 1984, prepared by the general manager of the TAB.

I now have that document. I knew about it last week and I challenged the Minister to deny it. He did not deny the existence of that document or the general thrust of the document's contents as outlined by me. I now have the one document that the Minister for Racing was afraid of; the one document he knew could force him out of office; the one document that could bring the Opposition final victory, and split this Government wide open.

I now table a photocopy of an original memorandum dated 18 April 1984 from the general manager of the TAB (Mr C. Harriott) to the then chairman (Sir Edward Lyons).

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

What does the memorandum say? Perhaps I am going too fast, so I will recap briefly on question-time this morning. All that the Minister for Racing had to say was one word—"No" When he was asked if he personally told the general manager, the chairman or anyone else on the board not to give the licence to the Friths, all he had to say was, "No", but he would not say it. When he was asked if he used an intermediary, an agent or a member of his staff in this matter, all he had to say was one word—"No"—but he would not say that word. Honourable members now know why.

Now that I have tabled this crucial document let the record show—let the public know—that this Government is run not for the benefit of the public but for a select group of rich and powerful men with National Party membership or connections. Let the record show—let the public know—how National Party members stand up for their constituents.

The Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Ivan Gibbs), who is present in the Chamber, wrote to Mr Hinze supporting Mr and Mrs Frith, who are decent, average members of the community and small-business persons. After some months, not having received a response from Mr Hinze, Mr Gibbs went round his fellow Minister, and, on 30 November 1983, he wrote to Sir Edward Lyons, as I showed yesterday when I tabled the relevant document. To take that unusual step, Mr Gibbs must have known that the Frith application was being blocked by the Minister for Racing. But still nothing happened, and Mr Gibbs was faced with the decision of standing up for his constituents by confronting a fellow Cabinet Minister. Mr and Mrs Frith have a high regard for Mr Gibbs; when I spoke with Mrs Frith, she spoke highly of him. What did Mr Gibbs do when he was confronted with the choice of standing up for his constituents or supporting his colleague? He chose not to stand up for his constituents.

Let the record show—let the public know—that each and every one on the National Party back bench shares the same view. They will not stand up for their constituents—the average members of the community—if there is a conflict of interest with a Minister; that is, if the Minister tells the honourable member to sit down.

Let the record show and let the public know that the Premier and Treasurer has turned his back on Mr and Mrs Frith and all the Mr and Mrs Friths in Queensland in favour or in fear of Mr Hinze. Will the Premier now act or is he afraid of Mr Hinze? Has Mr Hinze got too much on all of them?

What does the memorandum of 18 April 1984 say? The two key paragraphs in the memorandum from the general manager, Mr Harriott, read—

> "It was about this time (early 1981) that Mr and Mrs Frith went to see the Minister regarding their being able to become TAB Agents at Oxenford. It was after this visit that Mr Wade told me that the Minister did not want us to proceed with any plans to commence operations in the Oxenford area at this time.
>
> I believe that between this time and February 1982, I had one or two telephone calls from Mrs Frith . . ."

And what did the general manager do? The memorandum continues—

> ". . and I evaded giving them any definite answer, as I was aware that the Minister had indicated that he did not wish to proceed."

That memorandum states that Mr Wade told the general manager that the Minister did not want the TAB to proceed.

Elsewhere in the memorandum the general manager refers to the recommendation in May 1982 by Mr Swinson for the establishment of a facility in Mr and Mrs Frith's premises. Elsewhere in the memorandum he refers to a note written on 13 July 1982 to the effect of "the GM says not to go ahead" That is the political interference memorandum. He questions Sir Edward Lyons as to who gave instructions for this application not to go ahead. I do not know whether Sir Edward Lyons replied to this memorandum. Let the general manager (Mr Harriott), Sir Edward Lyons or Mr Hinze tell us.

Who is the Mr Wade referred to in the memorandum? Who is the Mr Wade who gave the direction for Mr Hinze? Surely his identity is vital. I will tell the House who Mr Ian Wade is—he is the former private secretary to the Minister for Racing (Mr Russell Hinze). Honourable members can simply look in the telephone book and they will find Mr Wade's name listed. He is the Chief Executive Officer of the Racing Branch of the Minister's department. In that position, part of his duties is to look after the personal business and racing interests of the Minister.

The significance of the document that I have tabled today is that it is no longer just members of the Opposition who are charging political interference; it is the general manager of the Minister's own Totalisator Administration Board, who charges in an internal memorandum, tabled today, that the Minister, through his hatchet man, Ian Wade, blocked the Friths. Acting on those instructions, the general manager then "evaded giving them any definite answer, as I was aware that the Minister had indicated that he did not wish to proceed."

Mr Hinze denies conflict of interest. The record now shows that Mr and Mrs Frith came to him, and that it was after this visit from them that Mr Wade carried out the Minister's instructions not to go ahead with the Frith application. This is where and when Mr Hinze got the gleam in his eye concerning the TAB licence for himself and his family and, as a result, sent his boy down to the general manager of the TAB to give him his riding instructions, and he followed those riding instructions through to the letter until last Thursday week when the board gave the licence to the Hinze family company.

Mr Hinze denies conflict of interest. Mr Hinze may well seek to deny political interference, but now the defences are down, the truth is out, and the Opposition says that there is only one thing left for the Minister to do to close this whole sordid chapter—resign, resign, resign!

Mr Hinze claims a high regard for the truth. The statements that he has made over the last few days, and his ministerial statement made in the House yesterday, show his high regard for the truth. He regards it so highly that he reserves its use for only special occasions. He has spent a great deal of public money touting himself round the State as the friend of the average punter. The State now knows how he regards them.

He sees them as mug punters to be taken advantage of. There is one thing left for Mr Hinze to do. He has been exposed. In any Government, in any jurisdiction—even in this shonky Queensland Government—there is only one thing for him to do—resign, resign, resign!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 36A, the time allotted for the debate on matters of public interest has now expired.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Sugar Industry

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): I wish to report that I have received the following brief written statement from the honourable member for Nundah pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order No. 137—

"Parliament House
Wednesday 28th August, 1985

The Speaker,
Legislative Assembly,
Parliament House,
Brisbane 4000

Dear Mr. Speaker,

In accordance with S.O.137 I desire to propose today that the following definite matter of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion—namely the plight of the Australian Sugar Industry and the thirty-four (34) recommendations of the Sugar Industry Working Party Report submitted to Federal and State Governments for the following reasons:—

1. The economic and social importance of that industry to provincial and rural development.
2. The need for restructure of the industry.
3. The level of Federal and State assistance.
4. The uncertain market outlook and;
5. The economic uncertainty facing growers, millers and service industries.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) W. Knox

Hon. Sir William Knox
Member for Nundah"

I assume that the honourable member has the necessary support for this proposal.

Not fewer than five members having risen in their places to indicate approval—

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (2.17 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker——

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

"That the House do pass to the next business."

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have the call. It cannot be gagged.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Order No. 137, the Leader of the House has moved, "That the House do pass to the next business." Under the provisions of that Standing Order, I am obliged to put the question.

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

AYES, 39	
Ahern	Lane
Alison	Lester
Austin	Lingard
Bailey	Littleproud
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Booth	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Powell
FitzGerald	Randell
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
Glasson	Stephan
Goleby	Stoneman
Gunn	Tenni
Harper	Wharton
Harvey	
Henderson	
Hinze	*Tellers:*
Jennings	Kaus
Katter	Neal

NOES, 34	
Braddy	Prest
Burns	Scott
Campbell	Shaw
Casey	Smith
Comben	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Veivers
De Lacy	Warburton
Eaton	Warner, A. M.
Fouras	White
Goss	Wilson
Gygar	Yewdale
Hamill	
Knox	
Kruger	
Lee	
Lickiss	
Mackenroth	
McElligott	
McLean	*Tellers:*
Milliner	Davis
Palaszczuk	Innes

Resolved in the affirmative.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 51) on Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen's motion—

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

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (2.24 p.m.): As the Premier and Treasurer has indicated, the Bill seeks to omit the word "Somerset" occurring in paragraph (c) (i) of the Act and substitute the word "Lockyer".

My first reaction, and the first reaction of the Opposition, to that particular amendment is to oppose it completely on the ground of the Labor Party's vehement opposition to the National Party-sponsored electoral system that has been forced upon the people of Queensland. I initially raised this matter as an anomaly and we see it as such.

Mr FitzGerald: In the House?

Mr WARBURTON: It is difficult to raise matters in the House when the Parliament is not sitting.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: One of the fools in this exercise, if I might say so, has to be the member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald), who fully supported the Bill and had previous knowledge of what was contained in it but was not aware of the errors in respect of his own electorate. So much for our friend the member for Lockyer.

A number of things have occurred in the period between the enactment of the earlier legislation and the amending Bill. I refer in particular to what occurred at the Australian Constitutional Convention, which gave bipartisan support to the principle of one vote, one value. The Queensland delegation comprised members of the National Party, the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. The only delegates from Queensland to support the convention decision were those from the Labor Party. The Liberal representative, Sir William Knox, and the National Party delegates voted against the proposal.

A number of points ought to be reiterated about the Electoral Districts Act. I refer first to the zonal system. It bears repeating that, in our opinion, it represents everything

that is unpalatable in an electoral system, which ought to be equitable and fair. Section 23 refers to the report by the commissioners. I emphasise that—

> "The Commissioners shall (not later than a date to be appointed by proclamation) make and forward to the Premier a report upon the distribution or, as the case may be, the complete or partial redistribution made by them . . ."

It is not to the Government, not to the Cabinet and certainly not to the Parliament, but to the Premier. I have yet to see a piece of legislation on the Queensland statute-book that contains such a provision, that is, one calling upon a commissioner or anybody else to report such an important matter to the Premier as a person. That clearly indicates the type of legislation for which the Government is responsible and that it foists upon the people of Queensland.

The Opposition regards the Electoral Districts Act 1985 as an outrageous attack on the democratic rights of Queensland citizens. The Act was introduced into the Parliament for one reason and one reason only—to attempt to entrench the National Party in Queensland firmly in Government. The National Party is attempting to destroy democracy in Queensland.

If ever there was an example of what this mess of a Government is prepared to do to Queensland's parliamentary system, it occurred just prior to the luncheon recess when the Premier, who believes that he is the King Kong of the Parliament, used his influence in an unprecedented manner to stop a member of the Opposition speaking by intruding into the right of free speech of parliamentarians in this place. There can be no other excuse for the National Party's attempt to destroy democracy in Queensland. This legislation is vintage National Party legislation that is designed to rort the system.

A Labor Government in this State—and I can give this assurance to Queenslanders—will, as a matter of urgency, abolish this blot on democracy and restore a fair and equitable set of electoral boundaries.

The Premier and Treasurer referred in his second-reading speech to an "error" in the schedule to the Act. Let us get things into proper perspective. I put it to all honourable members that this mistake was no error but a first-class bungle, and that this bungle has proved to be very embarrassing in many quarters. This bungle is a classic example of administrative incompetence by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and the real architects of the redistribution in Queensland—the faceless men of the National Party who sit in the bunker at Bjelke-Petersen House in Spring Hill and who are known to be dictating to the Premier and Treasurer and his Cabinet about what they have to do and when they will do it.

Electoral legislation is universally regarded as the political life-blood of the National Party. It is astonishing that any mistake could be made in the content of such strategically important legislation.

This major blunder is not a simple error. It is, of course, very embarrassing to the Premier and Treasurer because it is his legislation.

It is the Premier and Treasurer who is the Minister responsible and, as such, he has to be the one to take the responsibility. The buck stops with the Premier and Treasurer. It cannot be passed down the line. It is his mistake; it is his error; it is his bungle; it is his embarrassment.

I understand that Premier's Department officials, who in theory are charged with the administration of this Act, have also been embarrassed. Of course, that is perfectly understandable. It is not my intention to cast aspersions upon those departmental officials, because the real story behind this bungle lies elsewhere and it must be exposed.

The limited involvement that officials in the Premier's Department had with this legislation was to receive written instructions from National Party headquarters and to act as a post office, so to speak, and pass on the information to the Parliamentary Counsel for the preparation of the original Bill.

Is this the sort of public administration that Queenslanders want? I say, "Certainly not!"

Let me make what I regard as a very serious accusation. This legislation represents external intervention into the affairs of Government in this State by persons who are not elected to this Parliament. If an Australian Labor Party organisation or body was trying to tell a State Labor Government what to legislate and how to legislate, charges of faceless men dictating to the elected Government would be heard from each and every member of the National Party in opposition. Well, these circumstances present a situation in which the boot is on the other foot.

This electoral legislation was conceived, developed, and honed into its final form by the faceless men at Bjelke-Petersen House under the direction of the National Party's hatchet man, Sir Robert Sparkes. That is where it all occurred. This intervention by the National Party organisation is not a case in isolation. In other policy areas the National Party organisation is developing proposed legislation and offering it to Ministers to present to their department, to the Cabinet, and to the Parliament as a fait accompli.

To the forefront in this regard—apart from Sir Robert Sparkes—is a person named David Russell. With due respect to the Governor in this State, I point out that that gentleman happens to be the son-in-law of Sir Walter Campbell. Clearly, the National Party likes to keep things in the family.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The provisions of Standing Orders refer specifically to the Crown. I think that the Leader of the Opposition should withdraw that implication. I do not think it is proper to imply that the Crown is involved.

Mr WARBURTON: I will withdraw it. I meant no disrespect to the Governor in what I said. I hope that you understand that, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I realise that, but the honourable member went close to the mark.

Mr WARBURTON: Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask the people of Queensland: Do they in fact want faceless men running this Government? I also ask: Do they want non-elected back-room busy boys at the National Party telling the puppets——

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order to correct a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that I stopped the honourable member for Mackay from speaking. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, were not in the chair; Mr Speaker was in the chair and he, of course, was in charge of the House. Mr Speaker, not I, as the honourable member indicated, was in charge. It is well known in this House that it is a sort of cardinal rule, insisted upon by members opposite, that the one hour set aside for the debate on matters of public interest should not be broken into.

Mr Warburton interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I insist on my right. I am taking a point of order on a very important issue, and I intend to take it.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, if you can call to order these honourable members, as I will call them, I will take my point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I feel that the Premier has conveyed the point that he wishes to raise. I take it that the Leader of the Opposition will accept the Premier's explanation that he did not in fact prevent the member for Mackay from making a personal explanation, which he can make at any time during the sitting of this Assembly.

Mr WARBURTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise again to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is forthright in protecting his rights by way of a point of order, and so am I. I intend to do exactly the same. The honourable member for Mackay can make his point any time he likes to do so. We indicated that before lunch-time.

Mr Burns: You voted against it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: All I am saying is that I am not stopping him, and I have not stopped him. He can make it at any time he wishes to do so. The Leader of the Opposition was wrong in making the statement that he did.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the Leader of the Opposition accepts the Premier's explanation on the matter. I take it that he accepts the explanation relative to the matter concerning the member for Mackay.

Mr WARBURTON: What did he say, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will repeat it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns interjected.

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

Mr WARBURTON: What did the Premier say of any consequence?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: On a point of order, I should say that, in case the Leader of the Opposition does not understand, did not hear, or was thinking of something else, I will reiterate that a few moments ago he said that I had prevented the member for Mackay from speaking. That is not true. It is not correct. Mr Speaker was in charge of the House. Secondly in this area, this episode took place during an allotted time that members of the Opposition insist should not be broken into. The member for Mackay is at liberty to take his point of order at any time he likes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the matter has been clarified. Does the Leader of the Opposition accept the point of order raised by the Premier? So far as I am concerned, the matter has been clarified. Would the Leader of the Opposition proceed?

Mr WARBURTON: In my day I have seen some balls passed in Rugby League, but I have never seen the ball passed from the Premier to poor Mr Speaker; it was all his fault; it had nothing to do with the National Party. I will now carry on.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member continue his speech?

Mr WARBURTON: I will do so.

I was asking whether the people of the State want non-elected back-room busy boys at the National Party telling the puppets in the Cabinet what to do, how they should do it and when they should do it.

The National Party, through a rigged electoral system, is saying that 35 per cent of the people give it the authority to govern and deliver more of this faceless-men type of legislation. This external intervention in the affairs of government in Queensland must be stopped immediately. It is unhealthy, it is undesirable and it is undemocratic.

Intervention by men, such as Sparkes and his faceless men, frankly knows no bounds. If honourable members cast their minds back, they will recall that Sparkes even called up the Minister for Justice (Mr Harper) during the recent abortion clinic debacle and suggested that charges should be dropped. I think that all honourable members will

recall that. Many people, including legal people, believe that, as a result of that telephone call, Sir Robert Sparkes should be charged with conspiring to pervert the course of justice. But, of course, any such consideration would not get past first base with this Government, which regards itself as a law unto itself and its president, Sir Robert Sparkes, as being above the law.

It would be very remiss of me, in speaking to this legislation, if I did not refer to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), who is in the Chamber at the moment. This legislation amends the schedule by omitting the electorate of "Somerset" and substituting the electorate of "Lockyer" It is quite extraordinary, when the original schedule was presented to Cabinet, that the member for Somerset and Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer did not have one clue about the boundaries of his own electorate. I have already referred to the honourable member for Lockyer. All I can suggest is that the Minister must obviously be out of touch with his own electorate.

People will easily understand that, if a man who is elected to Parliament does not know the boundaries of his own electorate, he could never be trusted to manage the financial affairs of this State part-time. The Minister and his colleagues have attempted to play down the significance of this amendment but, unfortunately for them, the amendment today once again brings to the forefront the mediocrity of the Minister and the Cabinet as a whole.

As I have acknowledged, the Opposition will not oppose the granting of an extra month for submissions. It believes that the three electoral commissioners should in no way be connected with a political party, and not only be impartial but also be seen to be impartial.

During my recent visit to north Queensland, and on previous occasions, concern was expressed to me that one of the electoral commissioners was a fund-raiser for the Bjelke-Petersen fund. That very serious allegation was made to me. In my view, it is imperative that the persons who are electoral commissioners must in no way be tainted with partisan politics.

Mr Andrews, the chairman of the commissioners, has privately acknowledged that he was asked as far back as early 1984 to be the chairman. Most of us would be aware that Mr Pearson, as the Under Secretary of the Justice Department, is the Chief Electoral Officer under the Elections Act, so it is understandable that he be an appointee.

Then, finally, there is Sir Thomas Covacevich. I have not met Sir Thomas, but I understand that he is a well-respected gentleman in the Cairns area. If this information is correct—and I believe it to be so—Sir Thomas has had an association which makes him unsuitable to be an electoral commissioner.

During 1979, the well-known and infamous Bjelke-Petersen Foundation was extracting donations from Queenslanders through various persuasive means. As part of that money-seeking exercise, people in different parts of the State actively sought funds for and on behalf of the National Party. In the Cairns region it has been claimed by a number of prominent people that Sir Thomas Covacevich canvassed for funds for the National Party.

It was, and is, the prerogative of Sir Thomas to seek funds for the National Party if he so desires, and I will not take that right away from him. If he wants to be a member of the National Party—and I have no idea whether or not he is—that is his prerogative. Certainly he is entitled to collect funds for the National Party. Sir Robert Sparkes, who is acknowledged to be the chief bagman for the Nationals, clearly would have known of the canvassing by Sir Thomas.

For this reason alone, it was inexcusable for Sir Robert Sparkes, the architect of this gerrymander, to enlist the services of a Bjelke-Petersen Foundation fund-raiser as an electoral commissioner. Similarly, it is inexcusable for Sir Thomas Covacevich to accept an invitation to be an electoral commissioner.

For the reasons that I have already mentioned, I make the point that, from the information that was given to me, under no circumstances is Sir Thomas a fit and appropriate person to be carrying out a redistribution in this State.

There are no restrictions that prevent the redistribution chairman (Mr Andrews) from releasing all submissions that have been received. In other States and in the Commonwealth, this sort of information is released for public consumption. It helps to make the process of redistribution appear to be fair and above-board.

When one considers the external intervention by Sir Robert Sparkes and other members of the National Party, and the claims that Bjelke-Petersen Foundation fund-raisers are commissioners—I am not the only one making those claims; they are widespread in the north—it becomes very evident why the submissions are not made public.

In 1985, there can be no worse form of corruption with which a Government in Australia may be involved than the introduction of clandestine procedures to develop a new electoral system. This can only lead to the reputation of electoral commissioners being held in doubt. I ask the Premier and Treasurer, or the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), if he is the Minister who will reply, to give an absolute assurance if he can—I do not believe that he can —that Sir Thomas Covacevich did not entice, encourage or ask people for funds for the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (2.47 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to stand in support of this amending legislation.

At the outset, I will deal with three points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, he criticised Government members by asserting that non-elected members tell the Government of Queensland what to do. What utter nonsense! The ultimate example of this principle at work can be found among the puppets in Canberra who dance to the tune played by the union movement. It is not an elected Government at all. Its members are nothing more than little marionettes, dancing round to a tune played by the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

The next point that I wish to touch on was made by the Leader of the Opposition very early in his speech when he said that the events in this Chamber at noon today were the worst example of the anti-democratic attitude of the State Government. That is utter nonsense as well. The Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that a Sessional Order governs the conduct of business in this House. He also knows, as does the honourable member for Mackay, that, from time immemorial, or at least since that Sessional Order came into effect, every member of this House has valued and treasured in various ways the opportunity to speak in the debate on matters of public interest. The exercise by the honourable member for Mackay was nothing more than cynicism in the extreme. It was time for the Matters of Public Interest debate, and Mr Casey attempted to take the order of Government business out of the Government's hands and assume control of the House. He has plenty of opportunity at other times to make a personal explanation.

The third point that the honourable Leader of the Opposition made related to Sir Thomas Covacevich. Tribunals that could independently determine these matters exist, and it is about time that members of Parliament had the courage to stand out on the streets of Brisbane and proclaim these to the sky and let an independent tribunal—not a kangaroo court—decide the issue.

In my speech, I will raise the two most common arguments put forward by Opposition members and sections of the media in relation to electoral redistribution in this State.

The first argument is: How is it that a Government that, in an election, receives about 39 per cent of the vote can have a majority of seats and therefore can govern, whereas a party that receives about 45 per cent to 48 per cent of the vote can win 31 seats and can be in Opposition? It is frequently asserted that this is undemocratic, that

it is wrong, that it is a rort and indicates that electoral boundaries are rigged, and so on. Those arguments are patent nonsense and are patently absurd in the extreme. They represent a degree of naive thinking in electoral matters that I want to set straight this afternoon.

I ask honourable members to imagine an almost perfect electoral system. I know that some would say that this exists only in the dream-time. I recognise that members of the Opposition would be expert in that, so they will probably understand the model. I ask honourable members to consider a system in which each electorate returns a single member. So my first principle is that the parliamentary system is built round a single member constituency. The next principle is that the system consists of 21 electorates, each with 101 voters. Therefore, 2 121 votes would be cast in a general election.

I now ask honourable members to consider the minimum requirement under such a system with single member constituencies, 21 electorates and 101 voters in each electorate. For a party to win an election, point No. 1 is that a party needs to contest only 11 electorates and needs to win only 51 votes in each electorate. In short, the total support for such a Government would amount to 11 times 51 votes, which is 561 votes out of a possible 2 121. Under that electoral system a Government could win office with 26.45 per cent of the vote. That is important. It also means that the Opposition would win 10 seats with 73.55 per cent of the vote.

What would be the automatic response to a result such as that? It would be as follows: This is undemocratic; this is unfair; how can a party that receives 26.45 per cent of the vote possibly govern when another party receives 73.55 per cent of the vote and is in Opposition? The answer is that the system about which I am speaking depends not upon the average performance of the Government but upon its performance in several key constituencies which it is necessary to win in order to win Government. Honourable members have to remember that to win 51 votes in 11 electorates is all that is required to win Government.

I now ask honourable members to consider what happens if the Government is formed by a coalition of two parties, which I shall call party A and party B. In each of the 11 electorates won by the coalition Government, party A receives 26 votes and party B receives 25 votes, to give a total combined vote in each electorate of 51 votes. If a strict preference interchange were to occur and all of the votes for party B went to party A, in terms of primary votes party A receives 11 times 26 votes, which is 286 votes, or 13.48 per cent of the vote, yet it still wins. Is that democratic? There are people who would say that that is a manifestly undemocratic system, that it is wrong and that it is blatantly rigged.

I now ask the question: What are the principles that determine a democratic system? It does not matter what one's overall performance may be, it is one's performance in individual electorates that is important. That system would be infinitely worse if a first-past-the-post system operated. This House has to consider the principles upon which a democratic electoral system is based.

Members of the Opposition in this Chamber consistently argue that there are two principles. The first principle is equality of electorate numbers. Honourable members hear that ad infinitum and ad nauseam from the Opposition side of the Chamber. The second principle on which the Opposition argues is that each of the constituencies is a single member constituency.

Mr Hamill: Not necessarily so.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member for Ipswich knows that that is the system in Queensland. They are single-member constituencies.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member should not get excited.

One cannot have it both ways. Either the results are undemocratic and those two principles do not apply or the results are democratic and those two principles do apply. If the principles hold, the result will be unusual; there will be a Government in power with 26.45 per cent of the vote or, if it is a coalition, 13.48 per cent of the primary vote, and there would be Opposition parties with substantial numbers of votes in Opposition.

Honourable members must ask themselves: What is wrong with this system? It is simply the fact that democratic systems do not depend upon the equality of electorate numbers or single member constituencies. The model is theoretical, but the principles apply everywhere. All members in this Chamber know that the model is theoretical, but the principles are true.

In real life, these are the variations that could occur in the model. The first variation is that the number of people in electorates could be varied so that, instead of having all electorates with 101 voters, some electorates would have 50 voters and some electorates would have 150 voters. That does not matter; it is still possible from the model to determine mathematically a minimum vote to win. The mathematical exercise is not difficult. The second variation is that the voting pattern could be varied. The Government could agree with the honourable member for Ipswich and say, "Perhaps we should not have single member constituencies; perhaps we should have multiple member constituencies." The Japanese Parliament has multiple member constituencies, as the honourable member would well know. Tasmania also has multiple member constituencies. That has never been seriously argued in this Chamber.

We still come back to the fact that the only significant variation in the model that is really entertained is the variation in the number of people in an electorate. The principle still applies. The argument that one needs 50 per cent of the vote to have a totally democratic parliamentary system is absurd. One does not need 50 per cent of the vote to win. The argument that the Government obtains 39 per cent of the vote and, therefore, it follows as a matter of logical course that the system is undemocratic and so on is patent nonsense.

Time and time again I have read statements such as, "In order to win Government in Queensland the Australian Labor Party needs to win 54 per cent of the vote." That is nonsense. No-one who has ever asserted that claim has ever stood in this Chamber and shown honourable members the mathematics that support that argument. I know that that claim is absolute nonsense. Where are the figures to support that claim? The answer is simple. The figures to support the claim are in the mythical kingdom of daydream-time that I mentioned at the beginning of my speech.

Let us examine the second argument that is advanced time and time again in this Chamber. That argument is that one vote equals one value; in other words, a democratic parliamentary system is based on the principle of one vote, one value. It is interesting that in this country that principle and that term is confused with numerically equal constituencies.

The key to this debate is what is meant by "value". What is meant by one vote, one value? The Opposition and sections of the media would have us believe that the term "value", when used in political terms, is a numerical concept, a one-dimensional concept which simply consists of numbers and that, therefore, 19 000 electors in Brisbane are equal to 19 000 electors in, say, Toowoomba.

As far as I am aware, nowhere in the world is value assessed on a single dimension. In fact, it is an extremely complex concept. For example, suppose someone simply said, "Here is a packet of five diamonds. There is a packet of five diamonds. They are worth the same amount of money." That argument would be nonsense. I use that very simple example to illustrate my point.

In order to define "value", honourable members must consider what is hoped to be achieved. What do Governments hope to achieve? They hope to achieve a representative democracy in which there are two principles at work.

Firstly, effectiveness of representation needs to be considered. In other words, do all people in the particular system, nation or State have equal opportunities to meet and discuss electoral problems with their elected representatives? That is equality. Secondly, do the members of Parliament themselves have equal opportunities to visit their constituents? Those are the two key questions. They are the questions that determine the concept of "value" that is used in electoral terms.

I am mindful of the fact that when many people who talk about one vote, one value are reminded that equal opportunities do not exist in country electorates, they inevitably come up with suggestions such as, "Why not install 008 STD telephones and allow the people to ring their local member at the cost of a local call?" The answer to that is simple: people want to see their local member, and talk to him or her. Members of p. and c. associations and football clubs do not want to ring up their local member on the telephone; they want to see their local member and talk to him.

Multiple electorate offices is another suggestion. People say, for example, that the member for Gregory could have one electorate office in Longreach, another at Boulia and another at Richmond, with a secretary in each. That takes me back to the simple point that people do not want to visit secretaries in electorate offices; they want to visit their member.

Yet another suggestion is that the problem could be overcome if higher travel allowances were paid to members of Parliament to enable them to travel round their electorates. I can find a problem with that. In my electorate and in the electorate of the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben), anybody can jump in a car and drive down to see his or her member in 20 minutes. In one day the honourable member for Windsor could drive round his entire electorate.

Mr Comben: One day! Give me 30 minutes.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member for Windsor could walk round his electorate in a day.

The tyranny of distance is not overcome by giving members of Parliament higher allowances. For example, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson), in moving round his electorate of Gregory, could not possibly travel round it in the same time as the honourable member for Windsor can move round his.

Another matter that has not been considered is the time that it takes constituents to visit their members of Parliament. A constituent of Windsor or Mount Gravatt need travel only a very short distance, taking but a few minutes, to visit our offices. If my electorate office was in Longreach, however, and somebody from Boulia wanted to come to my office—I do not know how far Boulia is from Longreach—it would entail a difficult journey, particularly after rain.

The fifth matter to be considered is the cost of travel. What does it cost a constituent to see his member of Parliament? Surely he wishes to talk to his member of Parliament, not to a secretary or officer. He does not want to talk on the telephone; he wants to see the member in the flesh.

I repeat that members of Parliament do not represent trees, sheep or cattleyards. This is a favourite theme of members of the Opposition. Members of Parliament represent people, and people must have an equal opportunity to see their members of Parliament and to visit their members of Parliament in order that they may be better represented in their Parliament. That is how equality is measured when the equality of votes is evaluated. It does not depend upon numbers. Members of Parliament are effective representatives when they are in touch with their electorate so that they know exactly the aspirations, ideals, fears and concerns of their electorate. That can happen only when members visit their constituents or when the constituents visit them.

One vote, one value, along the lines proposed by the ALP, is simply equality of electoral numbers. Ultimately, such a system establishes a tyranny under which the

inhabitants of one city could dominate an entire State. Under that system, people in country areas do not achieve effective and equal representation in the Parliament.

I summarise my argument once more. Two key arguments need to be demolished this afternoon. The first is that 39 per cent of the people can elect the Government. I realise that honourable members opposite will say that the model I have put up is simplistic. It is no different from the models set up in economics, sociology or psychology. Such criticism is just not valid. By my model I have established that that criticism in itself is not valid. One has to look at the totality of the electoral system. When that is done, as I have pointed out, it can be seen that it is possible to win Government with considerably less than 50 per cent of the vote and still have a totally democratic electoral system.

My second point is that we have been told a lie. A smokescreen has been placed over the whole State by Opposition members and their cohorts attempting to convince the people that one vote, one value is a fair and equitable electoral system. It is not. Ultimately it will result in a form of tyranny or, as Sir Robert Sparkes once reminded us, a "metromander".

I support the Bill. I congratulate the Government on bringing it forward. I recognise that it remedies a very minor mistake. The Opposition is trying to make a mountain out of a molehill. Its motive for doing so is no different from that which caused it to make statements about the seeds in the Premier's bag or about me as a member of the council of the Griffith University. It is exactly the same approach, and it will come to exactly the same end—nothing. I support the Bill fully.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (3.9 p.m.): The legislation is something of an embarrassment to the Government. The speech of the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) is embarrassment on top of embarrassment. We have had a most interesting dissertation on the electoral system from someone who could be described only as a poor man's Malcolm Mackerras. The member for Mount Gravatt probably still believes that fairies live at the bottom of his garden if he believes half of the claptrap that he 41esented this afternoon, dressed up in an extraordinary mathematical formula.

The member for Mount Gravatt spent considerable time talking about how an electoral system ought to be fair. He tried to justify how the Government sits upon the Treasury benches of this State with less than 39 per cent of the popular vote at the last election. What he failed to remind the Chamber and the members of the public who are in the gallery is that the Government did not receive a popular mandate from the people of Queensland. It managed to occupy the Treasury benches only by dangling ministerial portfolios at two Liberal members—the member for Wavell (Mr Austin) and the member for Merthyr (Mr Lane). Those gentlemen deserted their earlier political allegiances to seek the riches that holding a ministerial portfolio might bring to them. That is how the Government occupies the Treasury benches, and it has nothing to do with the gross mathematical formulas that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt was endeavouring to speak about this afternoon.

Mr Innes: More importantly, they deserted the people who voted for them.

Mr HAMILL: I thank the honourable member for Sherwood, because that is exactly the point that should be made. In the case of the honourable member for Merthyr (Mr Lane), the people in the electorate of Merthyr had the opportunity to vote for a National Party candidate; yet they chose not to do so. In the case of the people in the electorate of Wavell, the National Party did not field a candidate. The honourable member for Wavell (Mr Austin) contested the election as a Liberal Party candidate, but decided to rat on those in his electorate who voted for the Liberal Party—and he did that only a number of days after the election.

As I said previously, the legislation that has been brought before Parliament this afternoon is an embarrassment to the Queensland Government. Although it is an embarrassment to the Government, it is a feather in the cap of the Opposition, because

had it not been for the Opposition's vigilance in relation to the Electoral Districts Act that was passed through Parliament earlier this year, this debate would not be occurring this afternoon.

The Bill is an interesting one. As I say, in an attempt to cover up embarrassment, it provides for retrospective legislation that will set the Electoral Districts Act to right and put it into the form that the National Party Government thought it had been put into in April this year. It also affirms the effectiveness of the redistribution procedures that have been undertaken since the time that the original Act received Royal assent.

The Bill also extends the time allowed for submissions and calls for fresh submissions for the south-eastern zone, specifying a period of one month. Again, that is a face-saving device for a Government that has been publicly humiliated because of its own sheer incompetence and its inability to detail the National Party's gerrymander within the framework of the legislative provisions originally contained in the Electoral Districts Act.

I now turn to the specific issues that are at stake. In the provisions of the principal Act, the Rosalie shire would appear to be divided into two zones with one part of the Rosalie shire lying in the south-eastern zone and another part lying in the country zone—at least, that is what the Government thought that it was doing. Of course, when the principal Act is examined, it can be seen that no part of the Rosalie shire is to be found in the electorate of Somerset. Presumably, that portion of the Act was rendered ineffective because it could be construed only as specifying—I believe also that the electoral commissioners could only have construed it this way—that the Rosalie shire formed part of the country zone. However, that was not the case. Apparently the Government had made a hash of it.

Mr Campbell: That did not fit in with the Government's boundaries.

Mr HAMILL: As the honourable member for Bundaberg said, that did not fit in with the Government's boundaries; so the Government has now brought forward amending legislation.

The purpose of the Bill is to make sure that Division 4 of the Rosalie shire is placed not only in two different electorates but also in two different electoral zones that comprise two different electoral quotas and will, therefore, be represented by two separate members of Parliament. It is extraordinary that that should be so. After all, the Rosalie shire is but a small part of the State; yet under the Act one tiny division would have formed part of two different electoral zones. On the one hand, the town of Cooyar would have been placed in the country zone and on the other hand the town of Yarraman would have been placed in the south-eastern zone.

Mr Gunn: It always has been. I had that for six years, and you do not know what you are talking about.

Mr HAMILL: I hear the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer coming to the assistance of this legislation. It is a shame that the organ-grinder is not in the Chamber this afternoon and that honourable members have to put up with the monkey trying to put forward his own contribution on this embarrassing piece of legislation.

Mr FitzGerald: Your Labor Party said that Cooyar was in Division 4.

Mr HAMILL: And there is the organ-grinder's other monkey—the man who did not realise that he represented the area of the Rosalie shire. The honourable member for Lockyer chimed in, and his face is about as red as the hair which tops it, because he is embarrassed by the realisation that the people of Division 4 in the Rosalie shire, especially those near the town of Yarraman, were his constituents. They have been his constituents for some eight years now, but he has been neglecting them for all of that time.

The principal Act provides a range of criteria for the determination of electoral boundaries. It is very instructive to consider them again this afternoon. Section 12 outlines that the commissioners will take into consideration community and diversity of interest, means of communication, physical features, boundaries of local government areas and their divisions, distance from the seat of government—that is a spurious one, if ever there was one—density of population—given some of the contributions of a few of the members for the area I understand why density should be inserted—and demographic trends. It also calls on the commissioners to favour boundaries that will be conterminous with those of the local government areas and their divisions.

Let us assess the amendment in terms of the Government's criteria, not in terms of the criteria of the fairies at the bottom of the garden that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt was spouting about. Let us consider the criteria that the Government gave to the commissioners in the legislation that it put through this Chamber earlier this year. I deal first with Division 4 of Rosalie shire. Obviously the people of Cooyar are very different from the people of Yarraman. That is why the people of Cooyar will have a vote that is one and a half times the value of that of the people of Yarraman. Based on physical features, it is all part of the same small division of the local government area. There is no major impediment, in terms of physical features in the area, dividing Cooyar from Yarraman. The commissioners must consider boundaries of local government areas. After all, Cooyar and Yarraman are both in the Rosalie shire. Despite the two honourable members who represent the area not being able to determine which one of them represents the people of Yarraman, those two towns are in the same local government division and have the same councillors.

On the criterion of distance from the seat of Government—one is not much further from Brisbane than the other.

On the matter of density of population—both are in rural areas and the population density is scarcely different from one area to the other.

With reference to demographic trends—similarly the area is all part of the same tiny division of the local government area.

Despite all of that, the Government, in its infinite wisdom, has decided to truncate Division 4 of the Rosalie shire; to put all the rest of the Rosalie shire into the country zone and take out that tiny portion of Division 4 of the Rosalie shire and drop it into the south-eastern zone. That is a classic example of the hypocrisy in the Government's thinking in giving electoral representation in this State.

That is not the only example. Despite the Government's claim that local government areas and the divisions of local government should be important and treated as entities in their own right, the Government went ahead and truncated not only the Rosalie shire but also, all told, the areas of 12 local governments, which are being chopped up arbitrarily and indiscriminately by the zonal arrangements that characterise the National Party's approach to electoral representation.

I will read the names of all the shires so that honourable members may know them.

Mr Newton: There is nothing sinister about that.

Mr HAMILL: There is nothing sinister about that? A line has to be drawn in terms of boundaries, but why does the Government accord people in one area of the State a voting value that is different from that of people in other areas of the State? The honourable member for Caboolture would not have a clue when it comes to the fine details of giving proper, fair and equitable electoral representation to the people of Queensland.

I will now read the local government areas that have been truncated.

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Caboolture is not in his usual place, so he should not interject.

Mr HAMILL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The honourable member for Caboolture has been caught out again.

These are the names of the local government areas that have been chopped up indiscriminately. I have spoken already of the Rosalie shire, which is the subject of this embarrassing legislation. The Widgee shire is another one. Division 4 of the Widgee shire happens to be in the south-eastern zone. The votes of the people in that area are not worth as much as the votes of other people in the Widgee shire. The other parts of the Widgee shire are represented by the member for Cooroora, who is not in the Parliament this afternoon. Some of the other shires are Woongarra, Mulgrave, Calliope, Fitzroy, Pioneer and Thuringowah, which is to be the city of Thuringowah. The Government will not even recognise the boundaries of its newly created cities. It will chop them up and put parts of them in different electoral zones. That is typical of the absolute hypocrisy of the mob opposite. The other shires are Dalrymple, Belyando, Waggamba and Mareeba. In all, 12 local government areas have been chopped up by the manipulations of the National Party in drawing the electoral maps for this State.

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member does not like it, but it is the truth. If the organ-grinder were here we would not have to deal with monkeys such as the honourable member. We might then get a modicum of sense, which I do not expect from the Deputy Premier and Treasurer.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr HAMILL: It is no wonder that the voluble but empty-headed Minister and his friend from Lockyer are so voluble in their interjections. They are acutely embarrassed because they do not know whom they have represented for the past eight years. What an indictment of those members.

In his speech when introducing this embarrassing piece of legislation, the Premier and Treasurer said that I had sought to deceive the public over the Wujal Wujal Aboriginal Community and its inclusion in the western and far northern zone. I did no such thing. It is he, the Premier and Treasurer of this State, who is endeavouring to deceive when he rejects claims that his Electoral Districts Act is a gerrymander. It is the blueprint of a gerrymander by which the National Party thinks that it can retain its tenuous grasp of the Treasury benches.

Yesterday, I likened the performance of the Premier and Treasurer and the Government, particularly in economic matters, to that old tale about the emperor's new clothes. I accuse Government members of being like the gleeful mob who cheered that emperor. They clapped and cheered him. They did not have the intestinal fortitude to tell him that his policies were as transparent as the so-called clothes that he was wearing.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr HAMILL: We can see through the honourable member in terms of what he and the Government are trying to achieve in this hypocritical piece of legislation. The motley crew opposite are trying to justify the most extraordinary manipulation of the electoral boundaries of this State. We can see through the Premier and Treasurer and his voodoo economics. We can see through him for the political charlatan and hypocrite that he is in relation to this sort of legislation.

Earlier this year, when the Premier and Treasurer introduced the original legislation into this Chamber, he spoke—I am sure it was tongue in cheek—of balanced representation and balanced development. I call it for what it is. It has nothing to do with balanced representation; it has a lot to do with political advantage and electoral

manipulation. The statements that he made in his speech when introducing the original legislation prove beyond doubt the accuracy of my assertion that this National Party legislation has nothing to do with fair representation but a lot to do with electoral manipulation and with distorting the electoral system of this State.

At the time that I released the statement about Wujal Wujal, which obviously upset the Premier and Treasurer, I was prepared to be a little bit charitable. I stated that it was either an inexcusable mistake or a blatant attempt at gerrymandering the zone to protect the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services and member for Barron River (Mr Tenni), who has just entered the Chamber.

Mr Tenni: Don't be a fool.

Mr HAMILL: I shall deal with the question of foolery in a minute.

The Premier and Treasurer said that there was no mistake. I thank him for his frankness. It is a shame that some other members in this Chamber are not as frank. It is a shame that this morning the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) was not as forthcoming in relation to the scandal in the TAB administration.

Honourable members can see from the statement of the Premier and Treasurer that the inclusion of Wujal Wujal in the western and far northern zone is nothing but a blatant attempt at gerrymandering to protect the political hide of the National Party incumbent, the honourable member for Barron River and Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services.

The gerrymander in this State has been a bit like that mythical creature the bunyip. People have talked about the bunyip, but it has always been very difficult to prove its existence. We have it here for all the world to see; we have proved the physical existence of the Queensland gerrymander.

Although the House was treated to a very interesting, but not very enlightening, address by the member for Mount Gravatt in terms of electoral figurings, let me inform the House of the characteristics of this extraordinary creature the gerrymander.

"Gerrymander" is the term that describes the attempt to draw electoral boundaries in such a way as to bottle up one's opponents' support in very safe constituencies so that one's own party can win a larger number of electorates but with much narrower margins. The Wujal Wujal situation fits the bill exactly.

Honourable members were treated to extraordinary claims by the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services. He spoke about foolery. Let him consider some of his own statements in this matter. He made extraordinary claims when the Government was exposed over its electoral manipulation in far north Queensland.

Mr Tenni claimed in a press interview that was heard on radio and reported in newspapers that he was "absolute king there. They vote for me 99 per cent of the time." Mr Tenni must have been referring to compulsory voting, which this State has, and the fact that the people of Wujal Wujal must vote on election day. He certainly cannot say that he has 99 per cent of the support of the community in Wujal Wujal. At the last State election, you got about 33 per cent of the vote in Wujal Wujal. Mr Tenni, you are very lucky.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind the honourable member for Ipswich that correct titles should be used in this Chamber.

Mr HAMILL: The Minister is very, very lucky. If he thinks that he is absolute king, he ought to be thankful that, in Queensland, we do not vote for absolute kings because, on 33 per cent of the vote, he would be lucky to be made court jester.

Mr Newton: The Minister will get 100 per cent next time, now that the road has gone through.

Mr HAMILL: The luminary from Caboolture raises his head again. Puffing Billy from Caboolture says that the Minister will get 100 per cent of the vote in Wujal Wujal next time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have reminded the honourable member for Ipswich that he should use correct parliamentary titles, and he has defied my ruling immediately. I ask him once more to refer to a member by his correct title.

Mr HAMILL: I referred to the honourable member as the member for Caboolture.

Mr Burns: He went up to the Tablelands and told them that the prison at Wujal Wujal was a tourist attraction.

Mr HAMILL: That does not surprise me. It is almost as ludicrous as the claim yesterday by the member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud) that this State will have a recovery led by public servants.

The fact is that, with only 33 per cent of the vote, the Minister (Mr Tenni) would not receive enough votes to be made court jester. From his extraordinary interjection, it is obvious that the member for Caboolture is totally ignorant of the purpose of this debate, which is to confirm the National Party's gerrymander. He obviously does not realise that Wujal Wujal will not be in Mr Tenni's electorate at the next election, thanks to the legislation that he has had a hand in putting through the Parliament. I ask the honourable member to close his mouth before he embarrasses himself even more.

Mr Davis: Fair go; take pity on him.

Mr HAMILL: I have given Government members enough pity and consideration. It is time that they took account of their wrongdoings.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr HAMILL: They are your words, Mr Gibbs, not mine.

It is quite clear as a result of the Rosalie shire bungle that no-one took the trouble to check the legislation. It is obvious in the case of the Wujal Wujal rort that no-one took the trouble to look at a map. That is extraordinary, because the Government tried to frame its legislation from the maps that had already been drawn up in the Spring Hill headquarters of the National Party.

I will be charitable to Government members. Let it not be said that I do not give this mob a fair go. The community at Wujal Wujal is now a land-locked island totally surrounded by the Douglas shire. The Government is displaying new principles in the fine art of electoral manipulation—or a new low in the distortion of the electoral map of Queensland. After all, the 148 voters in Wujal Wujal are physically separated from the rest of the western and far-northern zone with which they are supposed to be locked. Under the current legislation, a similar thing happened in the provincial cities zone with little enclaves created along the coast. The boundaries of the existing electorates of Mount Isa and Mackay are fixed in the legislation and cannot be varied except by amendment by Parliament, even though the population in those districts may rise or fall substantially from election to election.

One of the new heights or depths—whichever way one looks at it—of the National Party's manipulation of Queensland's electoral system is the provision that the western and far-northern zone may have a quota but that enrolments in the eight seats in that zone may vary by more than 20 per cent above or below the quota.

I wonder whether the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, the member for Somerset, who does not know where Division 4 of the Rosalie shire really is, can tell the House whether it is the thinking of the National Party that Wujal Wujal should be a separate electorate with 148 voters and that the rest of the far-northern zone should be divided. At least the rest of the areas are connected physically and one can

walk from area to area and still be in the same electoral zone. It may be that the rest of that zone will be divided into the seven other electorates of the western and far northern zone. If that does not happen, the National Party's gerrymander will be seen for the nasty piece of electoral malpractice that it is.

As I said, Wujal Wujal is a land-locked island which is totally surrounded by the Douglas shire. Until the assent to the legislation introduced by the honourable member for Flinders (Mr Katter) last year, that community was administered as part of the Douglas shire. I have a map here that fully illustrates the point I am making. The area of Wujal Wujal is shaded for all the world to see, and I table the document.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

I will go back and consider those criteria that the Government set for the determination of electoral boundaries, the criteria that refer to such things as community of interest and diversity of interest. I will apply them to this interesting case of the Wujal Wujal Aboriginal Community. In one of his more interesting comments in relation to this matter, the honourable member for Barron River (Mr Tenni) said that the question of community and diversity of interest was very relevant. He did not really fully explain his arguments, but let me try to put some meaning behind the Minister's words. Presumably he saw some community of interest with Wujal Wujal being in the western and far northern zone because many Aborigines live in that zone and the people of Wujal Wujal happen to be black. Or is it that the community of interest is really that the people of Wujal Wujal had the good sense to vote in large numbers for the Australian Labor Party? They vote for the Australian Labor Party in numbers similar to the number of electors in the Cook electorate who vote for the ALP. Of course, the Cook electorate happens to be that other part of the western and far northern zone that is the closest part of that zone to Wujal Wujal.

Mr Tenni: Have you had a look at the last National Party vote at Wujal Wujal?

Mr HAMILL: I did indeed. I am referring to the vote in the electorate of Barron River. He received 33 per cent of the vote. Two-thirds of the community rejected Mr Tenni as the member for Barron River. That is why he wants to get rid of Wujal Wujal from his electorate. He does not want the embarrassment of the total rejection that he received from the people of Wujal Wujal.

He does not want them, because his electorate is a marginal one and he knows that his performance as the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, particularly in relation to the fire levy, has brought total discredit upon his administration of that department. He knows that his electorate is waiting for the opportunity to throw him out, and he does not want to let the people of Wujal Wujal be a part of that joyous day at the next election when he gets booted out of this Chamber.

If it is a question of racial discrimination—the people of Wujal Wujal are black, as many of the electors of Cook are black—why did not the National Party go the whole hog and do the same with Woorabinda, Cherbourg and Yarrabah and put all of them in the western and far northern zone? If it did that, it could be seen for what it is—a party that accords black Australians and black Queenslanders a lesser role in the affairs of state of this State. That would be the logical conclusion and that is what people have come to expect from people such as the Minister—illogical conclusions.

As justification for this enormous piece of political chicanery, the Minister also claimed that Wujal Wujal had social and economic links with the township of Ayton on the northern bank of the Bloomfield River. I say to the Minister that that statement is another piece of the deceitful hypocrisy that we have come to expect from him and his Government.

The Government has already stated that Cooyar and Yarraman, both of which are located in Division 4 of the Rosalie shire and are administered by the same local authority, have a diversity of interest that requires that they be split. Yet the Minister states that the people of Wujal Wujal should be linked up with people in a totally

different local authority, a local authority that is physically separated from the Wujal Wujal community by another local authority, the Douglas shire. After all, until last year the people of Wujal Wujal had been administered until last year by the Douglas Shire Council, so surely they have a greater affinity with the social, economic and political climate that surrounds that community, not the political climate and associations that are further to the north and in a shire totally different from the one in which they live.

Mr Tenni: How long ago were you in Wujal Wujal?

Mr HAMILL: The Minister has to face the fact that he has been caught out. Like the Premier, he has been exposed as a charlatan and a fraud, and the people of Wujal Wujal know that he has rejected them. The people of Wujal Wujal know that the Minister did not want them in his electorate. Despite all his crocodile tears in the local press, those people have seen quite clearly that, because they do not like the Minister politically, he does not like them and wants them booted out.

In 1949, the then honourable member for Nanango had some interesting things to say about the electoral laws of those days.

Government Members interjected.

Mr HAMILL: Government members are interjecting. They all liked listening to the Premier's spurious points of order earlier but, when it comes to what the Premier said, I thought that this was almost like Holy Writ to the National Party.

On 29 March 1949, the honourable member for Nanango said—

> "It is a 'bill of sale'—"

it is a bit like selling off Wujal Wujal; it is in the western far-northern zone—

> "over the lives of the majority of the people of this State for the benefit of this Government and the minority they represent."

Such prophetic words!

He continued—

> "Truly, these are grave days for the people of Queensland, not so much because of the enemy without as because of the enemy within. Little do the people realise the grave injustice that is silently being inflicted upon them. In a most subtle way their freedom to select the Government they want to represent them is being taken away from them.
>
> The Bill, by the method by which it is to be applied or executed, is a crafty and vicious piece of legislation, if ever there was one."

If the Premier and Treasurer were in the Chamber, he would have to acknowledge that he admitted to this House that he is guilty of the very same charge. Perhaps one could not describe the clumsily, incompetently drafted legislation as crafty; one could only describe it as blatant.

The amendments to the Electoral Districts Act that have been brought before the Chamber for debate this afternoon illustrate beyond reasonable doubt the total incompetence of the Premier and Treasurer and his Government. The Premier and Treasurer is obviously past it. He cannot even put together legislation that will adequately describe the electoral boundaries that he sees as the potential future electoral salvation of his tired, crooked old Government. He cannot even put the gerrymander into legislative effect without making a hash of it.

Once again, I remind the House that the Queensland Government does not hold a mandate to govern. It does not enjoy the support of even 40 per cent of the Queensland electorate. It is a Government that gained office with less than 39 per cent of the vote and through the dangling of 30 pieces of silver in front of the honourable members for

Wavell and Merthyr. They took the bait and they gave the Government its majority. That is why the Minister is on the Treasury benches today.

If he thinks that the people of Queensland will be duped by this sort of shoddy, incompetent legislation, he has another think coming. The sort of hash that he made of his Electoral Districts Act, the arbitrary zoning, and the dislocation and truncation of communities that those zones encompass is the best and overwhelming argument for the total abolition of the iniquitous zonal system that distorts the electoral face of Queensland, and its replacement with a single zone electoral system that is totally in accord with the principles of the basic democratic right of any person in this State, whether he is black or brindle, living in Weipa, Cunnamulla or Brisbane. It is the basic right of people, regardless of their residential address, to have an equal say in the government of this State. Every person should have an equal vote that is of equal value.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (3.39 p.m.): The honourable member for Ipswich referred to matters of political chicanery, unfairness and inequality. He also referred to the fact that the present Government is representative of a minority of voters. I would like to put some of those comments into context.

One would have to agree that the present Queensland Government is the first Government since 1957 that represents a minority of voters in Queensland. That minority is only translated into a majority by the self-interest, the opportunism and the fraud on the electors perpetrated by two members of Cabinet. Things that are tainted have a habit of staying tainted.

Mr Newton: Don't lump me in with them.

Mr INNES: I am not suggesting for one moment that the honourable member for Caboolture has made any misrepresentations to his electors.

I am saying that any administration that represents a minority of the people faces problems and there are problems for any system, committee or executive which is based upon—

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr INNES: No, upon a fraud, upon the acquisition of vital numbers of people who are prepared to say one thing and do something else.

Chicanery is not confined to those who jump the fence. The attitude of the Labor Party in this House smacks of chicanery. It is marvellous to listen to the people who stand for principles, equality, and a fair electoral system and to recall what happened on the last occasion in this House when the Labor Party had an opportunity to vote on an electoral system. Members of the Liberal Party—and anyone else who was in this House at the time—can well remember the false outrage of members of the Labor Party, their crocodile tears and the charade that was played out in relation to the Brisbane City Council. The Labor Party suggested that the National Party Government was doing something that was wrong in principle, that there was no real need to reform the Brisbane City Council and that it was being done for political purposes, and, come the vote, sneaked across the floor to vote with the National Party, leaving the Liberal Party alone as it was substantially alone in the House of Representatives and the Senate in opposing an increase in the size of that Parliament, although, in Canberra, it was the other way round; the Labor Party proposed it and the National Party voted with it. So this is a trifecta for the National Party and a double for the Labor Party.

Because it suits the interests of Labor Party members, for the first time they are invoking holy principles and saying, "On a matter of principle we will continue to oppose the Electoral Districts Act in Queensland." It has been said a thousand times, and all honourable members know, that members of the Labor Party were the authors of the system of which they now complain.

The reality is that Liberal Party members believe that the system is unfair. That is why the Liberal Party opposes it. Democracy must involve the representation of people. It does not represent distance, cattle or trees and it does not represent people of one political economic group. It represents people. The wisdom of the whole exercise is that, if the majority of the people are not represented, then the majority that are not represented can get so discontented and so disgruntled that the system can be converted into anarchy.

Mr Fouras: Would you join the workers? Would you join us to force fair boundaries? You wouldn't, would you?

Mr INNES: The honourable member for South Brisbane should watch the voting patterns of the Liberal Party in this House. They are a darned sight more consistent than those of the Labor Party.

Mr Fouras: After the next election would you join us with new boundary legislation?

Mr INNES: The Liberal Party could not trust the Labor Party. Liberal Party members saw how Labor Party members changed between the start of the debate and the conclusion of the debate on the Brisbane City Council matter. They made a false protest and said, "This is terrible," then scuttled across the floor at the end of one debate. How could the Liberal Party trust the Labor Party? Liberal Party members could not trust Labor Party members as far as they could throw them. Members of the Labor Party cannot be trusted to end up the same way at the end of a debate as they were at the beginning of it.

The reality is that, until this occasion, the Labor Party has voted consistently for an increase in the size of Parliaments, councils and anything else involving additions to the public sector, anything involving the filching of the private purse for the benefit of the public coffers.

Mr Davis: You are so stupid you were not in the Chamber when we voted against a reduction in the size of the council which your crowd put up.

Mr INNES: I was not a member of this Assembly beyond seven years ago. I can only speak directly about what has happened in the last seven years.

The reality is that the Liberal Party believes that the system is unfair. Undoubtedly, it suits the Government. One would hope that, within the limitations imposed on the commissioners, they will exercise some fairness. There are those who would suggest that it is all a charade. I know some of the gentlemen involved. They are men of good standing, and one would choose to believe the best of them. The Liberal Party will certainly examine the product of their work.

It does not matter what the result of the redistribution is, a number of people in this House will have headaches. Some of those who comfortably think that the whole exercise is designed for their benefit will find that they are fighting with their neighbours and suffering heart-burn over territory the voting patterns of which they knew but which they have lost. The exercise is fraught with all sorts of interesting dynamics that will ensure that many people sweat before the next election is held on the boundaries that are proposed.

The Liberal Party dwells on the principle of whether the increase is warranted.

Mr Stoneman: Reduced representation for north Queensland is what you want.

Mr INNES: If the member for Burdekin had listened to my contribution on the Electoral Districts Bill, he would be aware of my argument that the problems in Barron River and other selected places in north Queensland—those selected carefully by the present boundary arrangement—are similar to those of electorates in south-east Queensland. I myself represent 21 500 people, which is vastly different from the situation in electorates only 15 miles away.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr INNES: The area west of the Great Divide is different from the coastal strip. The problems of the coastal strip are sufficiently common to merit dealing with the coastal strip in the same way as the area west of the Divide is dealt with.

Mr Tenni: interjected.

Mr INNES: Barron River is over quota. Sherwood is over quota.

Mr Tenni: What about distance?

Mr INNES: The majority of the constituents of Barron River are between north Cairns and Mareeba—a drive of an hour and a half.

As I have said, electoral representation is not about distance; it is about people. It is not about how many people they employ and it is not about how much tax they pay. If it was, millionaires would have more votes than ordinary people. That has been rejected by anybody who accepts any version of democratic principles. Electoral representation is about people. The end result must be equality of people. Further, it is usual to look for community of interest.

I can never understand how, in setting boundaries, one separates sugar towns from sugar-fields. Where is the logic in separating people vitally dependent on the same industry from one another? It is done because the country zone is the basis of the National Party vote, and it must ensure that it retains the number of National Party members in country areas. It is as simple as that. Never mind about comparing north Queensland with south-east Queensland; when one moves from the mill towns to the cane-fields, the weight of the vote drops dramatically. It ought to be considered in terms of locality.

It is not valid simply to compare the south east of Queensland with the north. There is distortion between adjacent areas, even when the community of interest is identical.

The same happens in local government. Some towns have both a town council and a shire council, each with problems in meeting its budget. Interestingly, it is reflected in the argument I have about the unnecessary, unwarranted increase in the number of elected members. Whether it is Federal, State or local, the principle is the same. Australia is going through a tough time. Tough times mean not embarking upon the luxury of adding to the number of people on the public pay-roll.

Mr Hugh Morgan of Western Mining, who is one of the influential and leading articulators of a philosophical view of conservative free enterprise politics—not a self-seeking, opportunistic view, but a consistent philosophical view—has said that about 830 or 840 people—the number increases in this State every six months—are fully paid elected members, each costing $236,000, when salary is added to the cost of superannuation and other benefits, postage, air fares, office space, parliamentary accommodation and other servicing.

Mr Fouras: Can we afford you?

Mr INNES: The reality is that the people can afford only one of the two of us—and it is not I who should go.

In times such as this, people in our position should accept a commitment to set an example. We do not do it by self-indulgence or cheap party political purposes by adding such a burden to the public purse.

I referred earlier to some of the indications that are given by statistics that relate to Queensland. There has been consistent rubbishing of the socialist States of Victoria and New South Wales, which the State of Queensland has joined in and even led.

Members of Parliament should not rubbish things simply because they represent a different political persuasion.

For example, I heard many speeches made in the House this week about the extent of the overseas debt. Honourable members referred to the enormous size of that overseas debt, and I heard reference made to the review by the Institute of Public Affairs that reflects concern about the growth of the public sector. I point out that growth of the public sector is not confined to Canberra, to the Wran socialists of the Labor Government of New South Wales, or to the Cain socialists of the Labor Government in Victoria; it extends into Queensland as well. If a bench-mark is to be used as a measure by which to condemn the Governments in Canberra, New South Wales and Victoria, Queensland's performance must be measured by the same bench-mark. Something cannot be bad merely because it is done by socialists; it must be bad because certain things being done by those Governments are bad. If the Queensland Government does things of the same type and acts in a socialistic way, it will be condemned on exactly the same bench-mark.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics regularly produces information about public-sector employment. When one examines the statistics, it is rather intriguing to find that the number of people who are dependent upon the public sector for employment in Queensland is higher than that in the dreaded socialist States of Victoria and New South Wales—irrespective of the number of Commonwealth public servants in each State. As a proportion of the employed wage and salary earners, approximately 32.8 per cent of Queensland's employed work-force belongs to Government service, and that represents approximately a third of the total. Is that the fault of the dreaded socialists in Canberra?

I should point out that Queensland has one of the lowest proportions of Commonwealth employees among the States. Only 6.4 per cent of Queensland's work-force is employed by the Commonwealth Government, compared with 7.2 per cent in Victoria, 8 per cent in New South Wales and 6.9 per cent in Tasmania. Because Queensland maintains one of the lowest levels of Commonwealth-employed workers, especially compared with the other States, the question must be asked: How does Queensland reach a level of one-third of its work-force employed in the public sector? The answer can be found in the size of the tentacles that reach into the public sector through the State Government and local government. In the local government sector, Queensland has the highest number of employees in Australia, and honourable members have been party to adding to the burden by increasing the size of representation, which, in turn, increases the number of people employed at the broader base of the pyramid.

In Queensland, approximately 3.7 per cent of employed persons are employed by local government, compared with 3.3 per cent in New South Wales and 2.7 per cent in Victoria. Because it might be said that those States are smaller in geographical terms but bigger in terms of population and that there is greater cost efficiency per unit of service, I shall examine Western Australia's situation, because that State is so often compared with Queensland. In Western Australia, approximately 2.2 per cent of the work-force is employed in local government. That probably raises a very good argument for rationalising the extent of the local government network, when the absurdity of having the headquarters of two local authorities in the same town is taken into consideration.

The same principles of frugality and prudence must be applied to Queensland State Government operations. There is no way in the world that a proportion of workers representing 22.8 per cent of all people employed in this State, compared with 19.2 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, in the dreaded socialist States of New South Wales and Victoria, will ever be reduced if the number of full-time Parliamentary representatives is increased by seven. Honourable members should think of the effects of all the questions that are asked and all the inquiries that are made and demands that are made upon the system in an effort to prevent a member losing a seat in future elections. As the number of Parliamentary representatives increases, so too will the staff employed in the public sector increase, and that can only mean more public expense.

It is about time that honesty was introduced into this debate. Last night in this Chamber, I spoke about hypocrisy, and today, rather tellingly, by way of interjection, an honourable member from the Government side said that the sugar industry is not as important as the Government of Queensland. If that is the case, honourable members have forgotten what Government is all about. Government is all about the welfare of this State, the welfare of the people, and the welfare of Queensland's great industries. If that is the case, it is a sad reflection of the total self-interest of politics.

Mr Campbell: Which honourable member said that?

Mr INNES: I will not point the finger at an honourable member because of an interjection. However, that was said this morning, and it is exactly the sort of philosophy that underlies what is happening in this Chamber.

It means seven more members of Parliament, not because of any theoretical exercise to do with the growth of the State. The distorted logic presented by the member for Mount Gravatt would have been comical had there not appeared to be an element of seriousness in it. This Bill is based on pure, party-political interest; the desire after the next election not to run the gauntlet of the extraordinary events of 1983, with the fence-jumpers. It is an attempt to maintain government in one's own right and to do it by a redistribution.

The people of Australia and, I hope, particularly the people of this State, have had a gutful of the self-interest of politicians. The people are concerned about their State, the extent of public spending and the amount of money they pay unnecessarily to the public sector. This is absolutely the wrong time for the House to increase the number of its members. The principle itself is absolutely wrong.

The Liberal Party maintains its opposition to the Act and the Bill. It is sad that we should be back again talking about public sector efficiency. The Bill was mistaken. We have talked before about the quality of the workmanship of Parliament. We have talked about arrogance and, today, we have seen the arrogance with which the traditions, the Standing Orders and the conventions of this House are treated by some people who believe more in power than in principle.

Mr Campbell: It is totalitarianism.

Mr INNES: Members of the Opposition cannot talk about that.

We had third-party insurance debauched on the people of the State through the *Government Gazette,* repealed and rethought. Licence fees in the fishing industry have been promulgated and withdrawn. Licence fees for electricians were imposed and cheques returned. A fire services levy was set and suspended. The Minister told people to ignore the law and not to worry about what the *Gazette* said. He said, "Don't pay it. Something has gone dreadfully wrong." This is what happens with minority Governments. They do not listen. They do not have a sufficiently wide information base to lead them to act correctly.

The Land Sales Bill, which was supposed to help the private sector, was brought in early last year despite warnings by people in this House who knew something about the subject. The Bill was not proclaimed. A year later, it was the subject of total amendment. Again warnings were given—I issued some in the House—about the right people not being consulted sufficiently but, because of ministerial vanity, we were told, "No, it will be proclaimed." That was said despite half the people in the industry saying that it was totally unworkable. The people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries have found that it does not work.

Before we went into recess, the Auctioneers and Agents Act was on the list, but it was not replaced. It was, I think, a further 39 pages, in the same vein as the Land Sales Bill, to achieve something that could have been done in two lines. The amplification meant so much regulation that the real estate industry said, "Hold up! This is insanity."

When a Government talks about deregulation and reduction in the public sector we should expect a more thorough, a more informed, a more efficient, a more competent and a more economical approach. We are not getting it.

I am afraid that this Bill involves all the sorts of things that are going wrong. It involves further amendments and further modifications, and it will mean further duplication and further growth in public expenditure.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (3.59 p.m.): It is a pity that members of the Liberal Party do not remember some of their history. I should think that, if Mr Lane and Mr Austin had not crossed the floor and joined the National Party after the last election, the Liberals would be here today supporting this Bill, because they supported every other redistribution and gerrymander Bill that went through this Parliament from 1957 onwards. It is nice to find that the Liberals have a little conscience when they have only six members in this Parliament. They did not have any conscience when they were part of the majority of the Parliament and part of the National Party team.

Mr Hamill: They were offered an opportunity to join us.

Mr BURNS: That is right. I offered them the opportunity in my day as Leader of the Opposition. I said to them, "I will vote with you if, for one single session, you will vote for a fair and honest redistribution of electoral boundaries in Queensland." They used the old cop-out and said, "We cannot mix with the socialists."

What the member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss) and others meant was, "We like power and we want to be in Government." The members of the Liberal Party are snivelling, crawling and trying their best to get back onto the other side of the Chamber. They are against these proposals as a matter of principle, but when the crunch comes after the next election, the smell of ministerial leather and posh cars will get them back onto the Government side. It will have nothing to do with principles.

Today, I want to talk about the myths surrounding the National Party. Of course, one of the myths is that the National Party has to rig the boundaries to look after people in the smaller towns in western Queensland. A redistribution is foisted upon us by the National Party at regular intervals not so that it can win an election but supposedly so that it can look after the people of Roma, Charleville or Longreach. Let us see how it has looked after those people. Let us look at the fate of those towns in western Queensland since the Liberal and National Parties gained power in 1957.

The first period at which I look is the period from 1954 to 1961. I have been able to obtain figures from the Bureau of Statistics for that period. During that period, western Queensland recorded generally strong growth, with gains in urban areas and in the smaller towns. Labor went out of office in 1957. From the growth that Labor started, western Queensland grew during that period. The total gain for western Queensland was 15.5 per cent, which was a little greater than the figure for the whole of the State. Only the north-west statistical division had a rate of growth that was higher than that for the State.

At that point in time, rural settlements with populations of under 1 000 people were growing much faster in western Queensland than in the State as a whole. That is a fact of life from the statistical division reports of that time. The figures come out of the Government's own Queensland Year Book. Labor made the west grow and the National Party has killed it. Members in those areas, such as the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal), can see the towns dying around them as a result of a failure by their Government to do the job that it had to do in those areas. I ask the honourable member for Balonne to tell me how Dirranbandi has grown in the last few years as a result of his representation and how other country towns have dropped away. Chemists and doctors have left, grocery stores have closed, the police force has been reduced in numbers and schoolteachers have had to leave. I ask him to tell me about those people in the west for whom the Government has pretended to rig the boundaries. Towns have dropped away and the Government has failed to do its job.

The National Party says that it believes in decentralisation and that it stands up for country people, but its record is second to none in letting those towns decay.

I move to the period from 1961 to 1966. The coalition Government had been in power for four years. Compared with the State's growth of 10.2 per cent for the period, the western area suffered a significant reversal of fortunes, with a population decline of 4.5 per cent from the 1961 total. The central west lost the highest proportion of people, 6.4 per cent, most of whom were residents of small towns, which lost 6.7 per cent, and rural areas, which lost 11.4 per cent.

I move on to 1966, which was nine years after the Country-Liberal Government was elected. That intercensal period included the maximum population decline within the 1954 to 1976 interval. Although the State recorded a growth rate of 9.1 per cent for the period, western Queensland's population diminished even further by 12.6 per cent, or 8 610 people. People left the west and went to the cities because Country Party, now National Party, members were not doing their job in representing them. The members of the National Party failed to represent the people out there.

In the decade from 1961 to 1971, the whole State grew by 20.3 per cent, while western Queensland declined by 16.6 per cent.

Mr Davis: Shame!

Mr BURNS: Shame indeed, and a scandal!

Although the extent of the population loss in western Queensland in the period between 1971 and 1976 was less than for the previous intercensal period, the State population increased by 11.5 per cent during the same period. What happened to the western areas? The two southern statistical divisions continued to lose population, but at a reduced rate.

Rural areas of the south west, where the member for Balonne comes from, showed the highest rate of loss, amounting to 19.5 per cent in that period. That is the highest rate of loss since 1954. The central west recorded a sharp decline of 18.8 per cent.

The National Party Government has rigged the boundaries so that it can protect the people out in the rural areas. However, it is protecting them out of their homes and their towns. Those people are being protected in the cities where their kids cannot get a job. Unfortunately, the Government has done nothing about proper decentralisation because it has no policy.

The record shows that the decade following 1961—four years after the Government was elected—saw an exodus of residents from the west, mainly from the small towns in the rural areas. Between 1961 and 1980, the central west lost 31 per cent of its population.

Mr Stoneman: Why?

Mr BURNS: Because of the National Party's poor representation and because it failed to keep its promises. Government members keep asking me, and how many more times do I have to say it? The National Party has failed to look after the people in the rural areas.

In that time, rural areas lost 41.9 per cent of the population. Government members should take a look at the electoral rolls and study the voting patterns for the 1977 and 1983 elections. In Longreach, numbers down; in Quilpie, numbers down; in Cunnamulla, numbers down; and in Mitchell, numbers down.

Government members should go further and look at the population loss from June 1982 to June 1983 caused by centralisation. I will read the figures for the central west as an example. In the shire of Aramac, the figures were down; Barcaldine, down; Barcoo, down; Blackall, down; Ilfracombe, down; Longreach, down; Tambo, down; Winton, down; Banana shire, down; Duaringa shire, down; Jericho shire, down; and Mount

Morgan, down. These areas are going backwards, but National Party members are elected on a policy of rigging the boundaries to help the people in those areas.

The other myth that the National Party Government expounds is that 1 000 people a week come over the border into Queensland and are all stopping on the Gold Coast. According to the statistics supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, not in the last 10 years have 1 000 people a week come over the border. However, the Premier and Treasurer gets up in this place and keeps telling us about this migration. In December last year, 561 people left Queensland to go overseas. The latest figures available to me indicate that, for the quarter to March 1983, 3 200 people came to Queensland and, for the quarter to March 1982, 6 700 came. This is not even half the number suggested by the Government. The figures for the June and September quarters are nowhere near 1 000 a week.

Mr Hamill: Can you blame the people for leaving?

Mr BURNS: No, I do not blame them.

Mr Newton: They're still coming, though.

Mr BURNS: Three-minute Billy went north and told people that he could put a prison near their homes and that it would be a tourist attraction. He said that he could guarantee that people would stream in to see the prison. I read about the honourable member in the local rag there, and it was the first statement that I have ever read from him. I suggest that he keep his mouth shut. He has convinced me about reincarnation, and I ask him to tell me which part of the horse he was in his previous life.

People are pouring out of the country towns that are represented by National Party members and, other than blaming everyone else, the Government seems to have no answer, no plans, no goals and no objectives. It has not implemented any policies to ensure that more and more Queenslanders are not concentrated in the 2 per cent of the State's land area, which is at the bottom of the State. The Government keeps telling people that it has to rort or rig the system so that more people can be elected to represent them in this place. The facts are that the constituents of Government members get less out of them.

I wish to talk now about what the people get out of their Government members. The member for Burdekin has been very loud in his comments, so I will refer to the gerrymander of Imperial honours, particularly as it relates to the honourable member's electorate. Since 1980, there have only been two occasions on which at least one member of the community in the Barambah electorate has missed out on inclusion in the honours list. On one occasion, four Barambah electors were awarded honours by the Queen; on another, three; and on another couple of occasions, two. On the latest roll that I have, the Burdekin electorate has 12 395 electors and Barambah has 12 141. In the last five years the Premier and Treasurer has had 17 people given royal honours and the honourable member for Burdekin has had one. Government members are talking about representation. Are the electors of Burdekin less loyal, or less royal? Or is it that the Premier and Treasurer is pork-barrelling his electorate? The honourable member asked me to give him some facts and I am giving them to him. Are his electors less loyal or less royal? Is it because of his lazy or indifferent representation? Or is the Premier pork-barrelling his own electorate at the expense of all of his mates in the National Party?

Mr Hamill: It may be that the people of the Burdekin electorate are not as rich as the people from Kingaroy.

Mr BURNS: That may be.

I will now consider another National Party electorate. I have examined the press statements of the Premier in that collection of press releases that the Government issues every fortnight and the Ministers recommend that all members read because they contain the story of capital investment in this State and the decisions of Ministers. In the period

from July 1984 to July 1985, on 31 occasions the Premier and Treasurer announced some form of capital works program in his electorate. I challenge each and every honourable member to find 31 such cases of expenditure in his electorate. I challenge each and every member of the National Party to find 31 in his electorate. In one case the Premier said that the Kingaroy State High School has the best reference library in Queensland. That high school is attended by about 500 children. I know of schools that have an enrolment of 1 000 schoolchildren and cannot get a library because there are allegedly not enough children at the school. Although the Kingaroy State High School is attended by only 523 children, the Premier was able to announce that that school has the best reference library in Queensland. Altogether, the Premier made 31 announcements, some on roads and many on housing for teachers and public servants and other things like that.

Kingaroy has a population of 5 134 and Roma has a population of 5 706. They have roughly the same number of people. The Barambah electorate is 7 950 sq km in area and the Roma electorate, 57 150 sq km. As it is about seven times the size of the Barambah electorate, one would expect a great deal more money to be spent on roads in that far-flung country electorate. However, what happens in that electorate?

I will just dig out a few little facts to remind the House what the Government has done for the Roma electorate in that period. One statement was released to say that a Minister was going to the electorate. That Minister described the Roma electorate as a high priority for a soil conservation service. One statement was issued on teacher accommodation and housing. Another statement was that there was land for sale at Wallumbilla. One statement was about a factory and there were 10 statements on roads. In contrast, 31 press statements were released relating to the Barambah electorate. Members of the Government are suggesting to me that members of the House should vote for a Bill that will allow the Government to rig the boundaries so that it can look after the country people of Roma, but the National Party itself has never done the job there.

In his contribution to the House today the honourable member for Mount Gravatt did a disservice to his profession. As to his contribution, I make only one suggestion to him: he should have put the finishing touches to his speech with a match.

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (4.14 p.m.): In joining in the debate, I wish to clear up a few points. Firstly, I wish to prove to the people of Queensland that the member for Ipswich deliberately misled the people of this State.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. Observing previous rulings, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement. I did not mislead the people of Queensland; I did not mislead the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! The House has not heard anything, yet. If the occasion arises, the honourable member for Ipswich will be given the opportunity to take a point of order.

Mr TENNI: By way of interjection I said to the honourable member for Ipswich that the National Party did win the vote in Wujal Wujal. I have the records here. At the last election to take place, in the Wujal Wujal mission the National Party received 91 votes and the Labor Party obtained 36.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is deliberately misleading the House. I was talking of the last State election. He is using figures which are incorrect.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no personal reflection on the honourable member for Ipswich. I call the Minister.

Mr TENNI: They are the facts—in the last election held in this State, 91 votes for the National Party and 36 for the Labor Party.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! Persistent interjections will not be allowed.

Mr TENNI: The people of Wujal Wujal would love to remain with me and I would love to remain with them. If the National Party candidate in the last election could obtain that sort of vote, I can assure honourable members that I would take nearly every vote at the next election.

Mr Comben: Why didn't you the time before?

Mr TENNI: Because of the road situation.

The honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) is hypocritical and deceitful. The Federal Labor Government refused to supply any funding for that road to help the Wujal Wujal mission. In fact, it withdrew $96,000 for the road. That is the sort of support that the people of Wujal Wujal receive from the Australian Labor Party. It is a shocking indictment of that party and a deceitful statement by the honourable member for Ipswich.

He referred to a gerrymander. What a shocking statement! He should think about the people of this State as a whole instead of looking at one coloured race. All Australians, no matter what their colour, are entitled to equal representation. The honourable member should have supported, in this Chamber and in the press, the Commonwealth Government's funding of that road to help the people in the Wujal Wujal area. The Opposition has brought about a situation in which the Wujal Wujal community, which supports the National Party by a ratio of 2½ : 1, is now forced into the Cook electorate. The Cook electorate representation is not worth two bob. It is not worth a packet of PKs.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member for Ipswich would not know whether he is coming or going. He is deceitful and despicable. He is not the sort of person who should be representing the electorate of Ipswich.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. The Minister described my comments and me as despicable and deceitful. I ask him to withdraw those comments and start admitting that he did not win a majority of the vote at Wujal Wujal at the last election and that he received only a third of the votes at Wujal Wujal.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order ! The honourable member for Ipswich has made the point that a personal reflection has been made against him. I ask the Minister to withdraw the word "despicable"

Mr TENNI: I withdraw it. I will use the two words used by the honourable member in reference to me. The honorable member is deceitful and hypocritical. He deliberately misled the people of Queensland. For the Wujal Wujal mission the community of interest is with the people of Cooktown. They will have an opportunity to go there.

My investigations reveal that the honourable member for Ipswich has never been to Wujal Wujal. He does not know what he is talking about. He is typical of members of the ALP—full of hogwash. He has been caught out. He has made statements that have been proved to be totally incorrect.

I do not want to take up too much time of honourable members. However, I point out that the State Government is doing the right thing by the people of Wujal Wujal. Even though the Wujal Wujal mission will no longer be in the electorate of Barron River, I assure the people of Queensland that I will still look after the Wujal Wujal

mission. With the assistance of the State Government, not the socialist Government in Canberra, I will continue to raise funds to upgrade the road from Mossman to Wujal Wujal, which will reduce by 171 km each way the distance that needs to be travelled by the people of Wujal Wujal. The Queensland Government, not the socialist or communist Government in Canberra, will continue to do the right thing by the people of Wujal Wujal. Whether I am their representative or not, I will continue to work for them.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (4.19 p.m.): When the Act being amended was introduced earlier this year, it was rushed through for political opportunism. The plan was wrecked through arrogance and incompetence. That is shown by the Bill that has been introduced this session.

The Minister (Mr Tenni) referred to Federal Government funding. I always thought that funding for local roads was a State Government or local government priority, not a matter for the Federal Government.

I will deal with the theoretical example that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) gave. As the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) said, the honourable member for Mount Gravatt used distorted logic, and the example that he gave was theoretical in the extreme. Most importantly, what the honourable member for Mount Gravatt did not say in relation to the voting figures that he used is that a gerrymander—or a "Bjelkemander"—in which there is a weighting—when one person's vote is worth, say, three times another person's vote—will distort even further the results of fair representation.

The honourable member for Mount Gravatt gave the example of first-past-the-post voting. He said that 26 per cent of the vote would be needed to get a majority. If a weighted system of, say, three to one was introduced in 11 electorates out of 21, it could be possible that one party would need only 14 per cent of the vote. The honourable member for Mount Gravatt was giving the example of a first-past-the-post system of voting.

Under a preferential system of voting, a weighted system—a "Bjelkemander"—of three votes for one vote value in different electorates, with first preferences, there could be an elected majority Government with only 7 per cent of the first-preference vote. The honourable member for Mount Gravatt did not tell honourable members in his example that with weighting—with gerrymanders—there will be a further distortion of fair representation in an electoral system. That is what he failed to point out.

I will give further examples. If it is so important to get more and better representation for rural and provincial areas, would National Party members please tell honourable members why provincial and rural areas can be disadvantaged and actually get less fair representation under the amended Electoral Districts Act?

Mr Davis: Do you reckon it is a "Bjelkemander"?

Mr CAMPBELL: It could be a "Bjelkemander"

Mr Prest: Did you hear that Gerry Connolly wants to get to heaven before Joh changes the boundaries?

Mr CAMPBELL: I thank the honourable member for Port Curtis for his interjection.

My basic concern is with the provincial city zone of Bundaberg, which covers the Wide Bay area. To that area, which has a fairly fast-growing population, two shires have been added—more people, and a larger area with the same number of electorates. It is very important to note that there will be poorer representation for the Wide Bay area in spite of the zonal system embodied in the Act.

I turn to the distance-or-travel argument. It is said more representation is needed in the west. That argument might have been relevant in the horse-and-buggy days back in the early 1900s.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (4.24 p.m.): The Bill amends the Electoral Districts Act of 1985. That Act was introduced on 27 March and debated at length on or about 10 April.

I have been a member of Parliament for almost 14 years. During that time, the Parliament has increased by only two members. In 1972 Queensland had 80 members of Parliament; today it has 82. I believe that the people of Queensland do not need more politicians, more councils or more quangos. They need representation from Cabinet. Parliament meets 50 or 60 days a year, but Cabinet meets every week.

People in remote areas are very disturbed by recent events in Canberra. This State's primary industries have received a raw deal and people are concerned about their future. When they wish to see a Minister, they are pushed aside and told to see a board or a commissioner of a quango. Parliament is delegating its responsibility.

In the horse-and-buggy era, Queensland had a Minister for Agriculture. In those days, a minute part of Queensland was ploughed and cropped. Queensland had very few cattle, sheep and horses. Today, we have a Minister for Primary Industries who administers 55 different areas of responsibility. He has 55 different commissioners or directors. Instead of the Minister having the power to answer for the numerous needs of primary industries, he has a committee to govern the allocation of poultry farmers, a statutory authority to govern the destiny of fishermen, wheat boards, grain sorghum boards, peanut boards and milk boards. Queensland has enough boards to rebuild the Bellevue building.

I ask members to consider the matter from an economic point of view. Where will another seven be seated in this Chamber? Where will they be accommodated? I have done a quick calculation of the annual cost to the people. At a time when the economy is depressed, the Government will incur the following additional costs of seven members—

	$
Salaries ($50,000 each)	350,000
Electorate allowances ($12,000 each)	84,000
Electorate offices ($100 a week each)	35,000
Electorate secretaries	120,000
Air fares	35,000
Telephone, postage and other expenses	35,000
	659,000

When that is added to capital expenses such as providing seating in the Chamber and more librarians and other staff, tax-payers will have to provide the best part of an additional $1m a year.

Yeppoon is in need of a water pipeline. If the council could obtain a few million dollars, it would be very handy.

The State needs more ministerial representation to minister to the needs of the people outside the city of Brisbane. People in the country are becoming very concerned. The sugar industry is in the doldrums. People on the land are paying from 15 per cent to 18 per cent interest. They are called upon to put up with all sorts of inconvenience. They do not need more members of Parliament. They need more attention and more direct help—more Ministers. The Government ought to be more positive and administer the affairs of Queensland from here, not through quangos and boards.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (4.29 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. Although the proposed amendment is very minor, speeches have wandered all over the countryside.

The Leader of the Opposition attempted to turn a small technical error in the Act into a major incident. The fact of the matter is that Division 4, which forms part of

the Rosalie shire, was located in Somerset. I represented that area for approximately six years until it was changed in 1977. In 1977, under the redistribution proposals, that portion was included in the seat of Lockyer, and the zones never changed at all. The matter has been explained fully by the Premier and Treasurer in his second-reading speech.

The electoral commissioners were mentioned. I inform honourable members that they are men of high repute. It is therefore not surprising that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) would denigrate these very fine men. However, if the Leader of the Opposition considers that he knows anything that would be to the detriment of the electoral commissioners, he ought to go outside Parliament and say what that is. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition would not be game to do that; but if he did, at least it would give the electoral commissioners the opportunity of defending themselves.

I thank the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) for the contribution that he has made. The honourable member was present at the Australian Constitutional Convention when the Democrat, Senator Macklin, who votes with Labor most of the time, condemned the Queensland Government on the basis of the principle of one vote, one value. Of all people, it was Senator Macklin who criticised the Queensland Government, but he was elected to the Senate on only 5 per cent of the vote. If one cared to examine the support of the Australian Democrats in the Senate, it would be seen that less than 10 per cent of the Senate vote was gained by that party. Yet a great deal of power is held by the Democrats, and a Queensland senator has the hide and audacity to criticise the electoral strength of the Queensland Government.

When a Labor Government was in power in Queensland prior to 1957, it was the case that many people who had died were still being counted in the vote. In fact, a well-known Labor representative of the seat of Warrego spent most of his time registering names on the electoral roll from those he collected in the cemeteries round his electorate. His "Tombstone Territory" was more important to him than electoral equality, and that particular member carried on that practice for years and years. Moreover, in the area that surrounds Cloncurry, the electoral boundaries were so drawn that they resembled a preying mantis on its back. That illustrates the kind of electoral procedures that were followed by previous Labor Governments.

The honourable member for Ipswich has referred to electoral equality. I could ride round his electorate in a morning on a bicycle with two flat tyres, and I would not even be tired. Only approximately 24 000 or 25 000 people live in that honourable member's electorate, but in my electorate, which has an area of approximately 9 000 sq. km. approximately 28 000 people reside. The honourable member for Ipswich ought not talk about gerrymanders.

Once again, I point out that this Bill is merely a small amendment that will correct a mistake that was made in framing the Electoral Districts Act 1985.

Motion (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Menzel (Mulgrave) in the chair; Hon. W. A. M. Gunn (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Schedule—

Mr HAMILL (4.34 p.m.): I wish to address my remarks to the matters contained in clause 3. This is the heart of the legislation, so I will direct my first comments to clause 3 subclause (1). One might say that, if this were the United States of America, the legislation presently before the Chamber ought to have the name of honourable members concerned memorably attached to it by calling it the Gunn-FitzGerald legislation. It should be remembered that this legislation contains the amendment that is

designed to overcome the acute embarrassment that is shared by the two honourable members I have mentioned, who really do not know the boundaries of their electorates although they have been the parliamentary representatives in their respective areas for eight years.

It is passing strange that, after what has been described as an extensive process conducted by the Queensland Government in bringing this legislation before the Parliament, the National Party organisation, which drafted the set of electoral boundaries that it desired, did not give the riding instructions to the parliamentary members of the party or to the ministerial committees and the Ministers responsible. In this case, of course, the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, who has guided the legislation through the House this afternoon, were also blissfully unaware of the imperfections of the legislation brought forward in their names. As I pointed out in the debate at the second-reading stage, this piece of legislation is one acute embarrassment from go to whoa for the Government of Queensland.

I dare say that we will have to wait some time for the colour to drain from the faces of those two members whom I have mentioned. Both of them, I might add, made significant contributions to the debate on the measure when it came before the Chamber.

The part of clause 3 on which I am seeking information is subclause (3). Subclause (2) is the retrospective clause, Subclause (3) seems to make suggestions that I find somewhat disconcerting.

honourable members have already heard from the Leader of the Opposition about the propriety of the electoral commissioners appointed under the 1985 Act. If my understanding of subclause (3) is correct, it would seem to give effect to all the work that the commissioners may have completed already in relation to the electoral redistribution. I should like some comments from the Minister on that matter. If what I have in mind is so, we really have the sham that the Opposition has described.

When we were debating the 1985 Act I referred to the limited discretion that the commissioners have. The legislation lays down the boundaries and, basically, the commissioners can only join the dots because the work is already done for them in the Act.

In this instance, I assume that, under their authority, the commissioners would have acted in accordance with the requirements of the 1985 Act, that is, they would have treated this area of the Rosalie shire as part of the country zone because of the defective nature of the original portion of the schedule which allocated the Rosalie shire.

Honourable members may recall that the original provisions seem to suggest that part of Division 4 of the Rosalie shire in the south-eastern zone was located in the electorate of Somerset when, for the last eight years, it has been in the electorate of Lockyer. If that is so, the commissioners would need to start all over again in their work because, presumably, they do not have the power to take discretion unto themselves and try to make allowances for an incompetent Government that cannot get its legislation right.

My understanding of the role of the commissioners is that it is an administrative function. They act under the authority given to them by the legislation of this Parliament. If I understand correctly that the commissioners have some sort of independent authority to make allowances for the Premier's incapacity to get the legislation right, I suggest that the whole conduct of this redistribution to date has been anything but above board and beyond reproach.

I have a couple of points to make on clause 3 because it says that anything done pursuant to the 1985 Act has been affirmed and made effective by this legislation.

As to the references to the community at Wujal Wujal which so hurt the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services this afternoon—I have a return for the electoral district of Barron River at the last election. It shows quite clearly that

the Minister did not receive the majority of votes at Wujal Wujal. He got a third of the votes. It is quite dishonest of him to claim otherwise. I can only believe that the figures he was quoting were figures for another district in which, presumably, the National Party candidate was far more popular than the local member.

I now seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard.* I point out, Mr Menzel, that I have discussed the incorporation with the Chief Reporter and Mr Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

ZONE 2 (PROVINCIAL CITIES ZONE)

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF BARRON RIVER

Number on roll qualified to vote 23 460

Names of Polling Booths	Voting for Candidates		Valid Votes	Informal Votes	Total Number of Votes
	M. J. Tenni, N.P.A	W.E. Litja A.L.P.			
Single					
1. Aeroglan	125	148	273	4	277
2. Biboohra	99	58	157	1	158
3. Brisbane	19	12	31	..	31
4. Cairns Central	75	75	150	..	150
5. Cairns Hospital	41	50	91	1	92
6. Clifton Beach	169	155	324	8	332
7. Daintree River	77	45	122	10	132
8. Edge Hill	1 999	1 567	3 366	70	3 636
9. Emerald Creek	108	58	166	4	170
10. Enmore	70	83	153	4	157
11. Freshwater	418	362	780	6	786
12. Holloway	369	274	643	8	651
13. Julatten	64	73	137	1	138
14. Koah	35	25	60	1	61
15. Kuranda	334	459	793	17	810
16. Machens Beach	127	243	470	9	479
17. Mareeba	1 376	1 149	2 525	38	2 563
18. Mareeba Hosptial	199	233	432	4	436
19. Mareeba West	491	543	1 034	20	1 054
20. Miallo	169	97	266	2	268
21. Mossman	676	548	1 224	29	1 253
22. Mount Carbine	39	50	89	4	93
23. Mount Molloy	65	55	120	3	123
24. Newell	131	54	185	..	185
25. North Cairns	259	287	546	16	562
26. Palm Cove	130	75	205	6	211
27. Port Douglas	325	233	558	8	566
28. Redlynch	162	150	312	5	317
29. Smithfield	390	280	670	15	685
30. Stratford	320	316	636	6	642
31. Trinity Beach	446	391	837	3	840
32. Wujal Wujal	36	71	107	13	120
33. Yorkeys Knob	389	339	728	6	734
Polling-Booths Total	9 792	8 598	18 390	322	18 712
34. Votes (Section 45)	14	15	29	..	29
35. Absent Votes (Section 82)	671	576	1 247	33	1 280
36. Absent Votes (Section 83)	11	17	28	..	28
37. Absent Votes (Section 84)	291	192	483	12	495
38. Electoral Visitor Votes (Section 85)	104	109	213	3	216
39. Postal Votes (Sections 87 and 88)	83	135	218	..	218
Total First Preference Votes	10 966	9 642	20 608	370	20 978

Percentage of Valid Votes given to Successful Candidate—First Preference, 53.21.

Mr Gunn: I cannot make it any plainer for the honourable member if he does not understand——

Mr HAMILL: Hold on; I am not finished.

I know that the Minister is quite eager to get his embarrassment off the slate and get home this afternoon. His ears are flapping. If he were to take his time, I am sure that we would be able to help him out of this acute embarrassment as painlessly as possible. This embarrassing legislation underlines the Opposition's assertion very clearly. The zonal system, the arbitrary truncation of local authorities that the National Party Government's legislation provides for, is totally alien to good government. It is the best argument for a one-zone system with electorates of equal size and votes of equal value and with each person having a vote of equal value. If that were the system, we would not be treated to the sort of bungling and incompetence for which the Government has been responsible. The Government is bringing the legislation before the House on one of the first sitting days since the legislation being amended was enacted in the Chamber some four months ago.

Mr GUNN: I cannot make it any plainer for the honourable member. Division 4 of the Rosalie shire has been in the south-eastern zone for as long as I can remember, and I have been in Parliament for 14 years. The division was in that shire prior to that time.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—Construction of provision with respect to lodgment of suggestions—

Mr HAMILL (4.41 p.m.): This clause provides for submissions to be called in the case of the south-eastern zone and the country zone. As I outlined earlier, this is a face-saving exercise. This afternoon, the National Party is trying to make its endeavours much better.

I was interested in the comments of the member for Somerset and Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, who said that, for as long as he can remember, that part of Division 4 of the Rosalie shire containing Yarraman has been in the south-eastern zone. I respect the Minister's point of view. Now I can readily accept how this legislation would have come about in the first place. If he had a hand in the drafting of the legislation, I can see why it was so defective. He obviously does not know much about the electoral history of this State or of his own electorate.

Prior to the enactment of the Electoral Districts Act in 1971, which created the four-zonal system, that part of Rosalie shire and the surrounding rural shires were all part of the country zone that was devised by the Nicklin Government in coalition in 1960.

The Minister has been exposed as a total fool in relation to this legislation. His incompetence is well known. Even his own ministerial colleague the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) is on record as saying that the Minister's election as the Deputy Premier of the State has been no good for the State of Queensland. Although I cannot agree with much of what the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing says, he certainly hit the nail on the head when it comes to assessing the Deputy Premier's competence as a Minister of the Crown in the State of Queensland.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY (STATE PROVISIONS) BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 27 August (see p. 287) on Mr Harper's motion—

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

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.44 p.m.), in reply: I thank the members of the Opposition and of the Liberal Party for the contributions that they have made to the debate.

The spokesman for the Opposition referred to some degree of delay by Queensland in implementing this legislation. I say to the House without equivocation that the fact that Queensland is the last of the States to implement the National Crime Authority legislation has not been detrimental to the interests of the State, or to the interests of the Commonwealth or any other State. Queensland has always participated, and continues to participate, in the activities of the National Crime Authority at all levels, including the ministerial council, on which I have the privilege to represent the State.

The honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) should be aware—he certainly may be assured—that the Costigan commission reports do not embarrass the Queensland Government. To the contrary, the one public hearing into a contention of Costigan directly involving Queensland—that was the coroner's inquiry into the death of Ian Percival Coote—resulted in doubt being cast on the credibility of Costigan's conclusions and in the commendation of Queensland police officers and their investigatory ability.

This is a very sensitive area, and I do not intend to respond to the Opposition's provocation, other than to say again that we in Queensland are fulfilling our role in the National Crime Authority to the satisfaction of the chairman and the members of that authority. In private conversation, the chairman has expressed to me highly complimentary remarks about the work undertaken by Queensland and, in particular, the work undertaken by seconded police officers.

At the Committee stage, I will move an amendment to clause 28 to remove from the Bill the ability to appoint a holder of a judicial office to the National Crime Authority. It is not considered by Queensland to be appropriate that a judge should act as an investigator and then revert to his former office. The two offices are separate and have quite distinct functions. I reiterate that this is uniform legislation agreed to by the States and the Commonwealth. Queensland will be amending the legislation to remove from the Bill the ability to appoint a judicial office-holder to the authority.

Clause 30 relates to the tenure of a holder of a judicial office regarding title, status and other matters while the holder is exercising functions in the National Crime Authority. It follows from what I have just said that, when the amendment is made to clause 28 regarding judicial office-holders, clause 30 is not required in the Bill. It is therefore omitted in its entirety.

Clause 32 also needs amending. In the previous parliamentary session, an amendment was made to the Justices Act that altered its title to the Justices Act 1886-1985. Accordingly, it is now necessary to change the year in that clause to 1985 instead of 1982.

I again commend the Bill to the House.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. N. J. Harper (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Functions under laws of Queensland—

Mr HAMILL (4.49 p.m.): Subclause (5) provides that a reference to the authority under subclause (1) may be withdrawn by the Minister by notice in writing to the authority. I understand that, in the original legislation that was drafted by the Fraser Government, there was considerable concern about the reference of powers. In the conferences and discussions that led to the drafting of the model Bill, States' rightists, particularly in Queensland, were very concerned about the reference.

I raised this concern during my speech at the second-reading stage, and in no way am I impugning mala fides against the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. The

Costigan royal commission, which, hypothetically, could have been an investigation undertaken by the authority, and which was set up principally to investigate the Federated Ships Painters and Dockers Union, amassed considerably more information and indicated that the tentacles of crime reached out through corporate life in Australia and into the hallowed halls of the Western Australian Liberal Party.

Those tentacles also extended to the bottom of Sydney Harbour, where many companies found their final resting-place. It is conceivable that a State Minister, who was concerned about some sort of political ramification caused by an inquiry going too far, could inhibit the full and thorough investigations that the authority may wish to make into organised crime and avail himself of that provision to withdraw the reference. I would be appreciative if the Minister could comment on that. I certainly ask him for an assurance that no Attorney-General in this State, and certainly not he himself, would, pursuant to clause 5, in any way seek to hinder an inquiry or investigation into organised crime undertaken by the National Crime Authority.

Mr HARPER: This clause has been varied on a number of occasions by the ministerial committee. All jurisdictions share the concern that the States should not be overridden by a Commonwealth Minister. The clause provides that the Minister has the ability, with the approval of the Inter-Governmental Committee, to refer a matter to the authority. The honourable member may rest assured that, just as it has until the present time, the Queensland Government will act quickly.

In the case that I quoted in regard to the death of Coote that was revealed by the Costigan report, through me the Queensland Government acted most expeditiously and with a degree of speed that surprised even the authority. We in Queensland are determined to stamp out these illegal activities. The Government has agreed to participate in the National Crime Authority and I give the honourable member an assurance that the Government will do all in its power to co-operate with the authority.

What this Government and other Governments are insistent upon is that the rights of the States should not be overridden. The Government has set out to protect the rights of the States in this area. Where it is appropriate, Queensland will make references to the authority. I have a very good working relationship with the present members of the authority and, for that matter, with the Commonwealth Minister who is responsible for the authority. The honourable member can be assured that, from my point of view, that relationship will continue.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 24, as read, agreed to.

Clause 25—Contempt of Authority—

Mr HAMILL (4.53 p.m.): Again I rise to ask some questions and make some inquiries, understanding as I do that the National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Bill is one of a number of similar pieces of legislation that are being, or have been, enacted in the State Parliaments of Australia complementary to the Commonwealth Parliament's National Crime Authority Act and other legislation. In the case of clause 25, there seems to be some considerable variation between what is in this Bill and what is contained in the legislation in other States.

I was particularly interested in the Victorian legislation, which is very, very close indeed to this Bill. However, whilst containing the provisions that are contained in this Bill, and indeed containing similar penalties for any offence against the clause—that is $2,000 or one year's imprisonment—the Victorian legislation goes on to provide a whole range of other measures that certainly impress me in that that legislation provides some protection for people giving evidence and wishing to appear as witnesses before the authority.

It also provides penalties for people who, in various ways, would seek to hinder and obstruct the activities of the authority; for example, it mentions hindering through

acts to affect the testimonies given by witnesses, penalties against those who would seek to hinder the authority's activities by way of destroying documents or making documents illegible or unidentifiable and prevent witnesses from appearing.

As the Minister would realise, the authority has been established mainly to deal with organised crime, which was subject to considerable investigation, as I pointed out last night, by Mr Costigan, the Williams committee, the Stewart royal commission, and so on. The people who are making the money have no respect for the law of the land, law enforcement agencies or Governments. Those people are capable of any act that will serve their purposes. I can envisage circumstances in which, in order to protect their position in the crime world of this country, they would seek to place as many obstructions as possible in the way of inquiries being conducted by the National Crime Authority.

Clause 25 of the Bill provides a penalty for a person who obstructs or hinders the authority or a member or an acting member in the performance of the special functions of the authority, or who disrupts a hearing before the authority. A construction of that would seem to be that the clause provides a penalty for persons who interfere with members of the authority—presumably, the chairman of the authority, Mr Justice Stewart, or one of the other members of the authority—or the actual physical hearings of the authority.

The Victorian legislation goes further than the Queensland legislation. It provides penalties for those who would try to stop witnesses coming forward, people giving evidence and those who would try to influence the evidence being given. Therefore, I ask the Minister: Is there any reason why the protection that is afforded to witnesses in the State of Victoria and the sanctions against those who would seek to impede the proper conduct of the authority are not to be found in the Queensland legislation?

Mr HARPER: I assure the honourable member that the usual protection afforded to witnesses will be available. Clause 25 of the Bill follows the model legislation. Of course, the Queensland Criminal Code covers many of these areas. It is a very simple clause. Probably its strength lies in its simplicity.

Mr COMBEN: Last night, at the second-reading stage of the debate, I referred to the penalty provisions in the legislation. I said that the penalty provided in this clause is similar to the penalties provided for most offences under the Act. It is expressed as a fine of $2,000 or imprisonment for one year. In the four other jurisdictions in which similar legislation has been passed, the penalty has been expressed as a fine up to $2,000 or imprisonment for a period of up to one year. I still query why it is necessary for the legislation to contain mandatory provisions, whereas the penalties in other jurisdictions are fairly discretionary.

Mr HARPER: The honourable member should pay attention to some of the utterances of his colleagues. Earlier today, or last night, Opposition members challenged the Government to indicate when Queesland would introduce legislation to combat the drug problem and when it was going to get tough, as the Premier promised it would get tough. I am surprised that the honourable member should now be critical of a mandatory penalty of $2,000 or imprisonment for one year. Queensland is serious in its approach to matters of drug-trafficking and drug offences. As the honourable member would well know, one of the major problems with which the National Crime Authority is involved, and will be involved, is criminal activity in drugs.

I make no apology for the fact that Queensland has adopted a penalty of $2,000 or imprisonment for one year when a person is found guilty. Honourable members should always remember that a person has to be found guilty of this offence in the courts.

As I indicated a few minutes ago, the clause is simple. Its strength lies in its simplicity. There is ample opportunity for a person to mount a defence to any charge brought under the proposed section.

Mr COMBEN: I accept the validity of most of what the Minister has just said. Certainly, I support all my colleagues on the need for stronger penalties in relation to any form of drug-dealing in this State. However, I believe that the mandatory-sentencing provision is worthy of comment because the second part of the section deals with disruption of a hearing before the authority. Anyone disrupting a hearing before the authority commits an offence under the Act, and the penalty is $2,000 or imprisonment for one year.

I suggest that there are various ways in which a hearing could be disrupted. If parents are not happy with the ways things are going concerning a son or a daughter, they could suddenly put on a blue in the visitors' gallery of a court or, if being examined as witnesses, could suddenly decide that they are not in agreement with the authority and state in quite specific terms that they are not in agreement with the authority. However, that does not necessarily mean that that person should be imprisoned for one year or have a penalty of $2,000 imposed.

Last night, the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) spoke about the necessary differences in penalties so that the penalty will fit the offence in a given case. The phrase "disrupts a hearing before the Authority" is very broad. It may well be that if a witness says, "hear, hear" to the person examining him, that could be construed as being a disruption. Under the provisions of the Bill, that would mean imprisonment for one year or a penalty of $2,000.

This does not tie in with drug-peddling or drug-running of any sort. In my opinion, the provisions to be found in similar legislation passed by other State Parliaments would be more appropriate than the mandatory provisions contained in this Bill.

Mr HARPER: Very simply, I suggest that the honourable member for Windsor refer to the Acts Interpretation Act.

Mr HAMILL: As the Minister will remember, I made comparisons between the Queensland legislation and the legislation that has gone through other State Parliaments in relation to the variance between the Queensland clause and that of the Victorian Parliament. My colleague the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) has referred to variations in terms of the penalties that are attached to similar offences in other jurisdictions.

Queensland has model legislation. To what extent is there an undertaking that the legislation should be uniform across Australia? After the consultation and the commitment to following a model Bill, is it envisaged that the States could go their own merry ways and vary the terms of this legislation from State to State? My understanding was—and the Minister's speech indicated—that the idea behind the Bill was that States would have complementary legislation that would be almost as one so that there was a uniformity in the law across Australia. To what extent is that sort of idiosyncratic approach permitted in this regard?

Mr HARPER: Honourable members should be aware that the Queensland Government will never abrogate its responsibilities to the people of Queensland. Model legislation was drawn up, but there never was any intention that the legislation should be totally uniform. All other Attorneys-General, in particular the Commonwealth Attorney-General, and the Special Minister of State are aware that Queensland introduced this Bill prior to the recent recess. It has been lying on the table for a considerable time and no adverse comment whatsoever has been made.

To a degree, the legislation is uniform throughout the States and Commonwealth. However, as the Opposition spokesman for Justice is well aware, in the next clause, clause 26, the Commonwealth legislation is a variation of that included in the State's legislation. As the word "model" connotes, the Bill is a model. The legislation is not necessarily entirely uniform. The degree of uniformity is very nearly 100 per cent throughout.

Clause 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26—Double jeopardy—

Mr COMBEN (5.5 p.m.): I realise that the Minister has had discussions with my colleague the member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) about clause 26. Could the Minister explain why there is a provision allowing action to be taken against a person who has been prosecuted under the Act and found not guilty? It seems to me that the State is able to have two bites at the cherry. I realise that the Bill contains a provision stating that a person is not liable to be punished twice, but there does seem to be the possibility of a person being tried twice for the one offence. I cannot understand why the provision is in the Bill. It has always been my understanding that the basic tenet of law in our nation is that a person acquitted remains acquitted.

Mr HARPER: Before I answer the question posed by the honourable member for Windsor, I point out to members of the Opposition that Victoria is the only State that has varied the model legislation to a considerable degree. That point was made earlier. By and large, the other States have accepted the model and, to that extent, it is uniform legislation.

I appreciated a discussion on clause 26 yesterday evening with the Opposition spokesman. I indicated to him that it was the desire of the ministerial council to include a double jeopardy provision so that a State would not be inhibited in proceeding with a charge if a prosecution had been laid under an overriding power embodied in Commonwealth legislation. The Commonwealth has worded its double jeopardy clause slightly differently.

The honourable member for Windsor must realise that the Attorneys-General of the States and the Commonwealth have jurisdictional responsibilities which should not be subjugated one to the other. The matter turns on section 109 of the Constitution, which gives a paramountcy power to Commonwealth legislation. If the honourable member followed the proceedings of the Australian Constitutional Convention, which was held in the Parliamentary Annexe only a few weeks ago, he would realise that much discussion took place on section 109. The ball is back in the court of the present Commonwealth Labor Government.

Clause 26 has been inserted to cover circumstances in which a charge is laid under Commonwealth legislation, developed to a certain stage and a decision is taken to lay a charge under State legislation by the authority under reference. It could be that, for some reason or other, the Commonwealth may lose interest in the charge and not proceed; or, if it does proceed, the matter is not pursued to finality. The decision taken by the Inter-Governmental Council, which is comprised not exclusively of Attorneys-General or Police Ministers but by a combination of both, as an honourable member has already pointed out, with the Special Minister of State as chairman, was that the right to proceed should be retained at both Commonwealth and State levels. Explicit in the clause is the provision to which the honourable member for Windsor referred. Even though a person may be convicted, he shall not be punished twice for the same offence. The provision is included to forestall a person from entering as a defence that he has already been charged or dealt with under Commonwealth legislation and therefore cannot be proceeded with under State legislation.

Clause 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clause 28—Administrative arrangements with Commonwealth—

Mr HARPER (5.9 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 29, omit all words comprising lines 29 to 32 and substitute the following words—

'(a) make available a person who is the holder of an office, or persons who are the holders of offices, of the State of Queensland to hold office as a member or members;'."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 28, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30—Appointment of Queensland Judge as member not to affect tenure, &c.—

Mr HARPER (5.11 p.m.): I oppose the clause.

Clause 30, as read, negatived.

Clause 31, as read, agreed to.

Clause 32—Proceedings for offences—

Mr HARPER (5.12 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 31, line 14, omit the expression—

'1982'

and substitute the expression—

'1985'."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 33 to 35, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

Third Reading

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 19 March 1985 (see p. 4103, vol. 298) on Mr Harper's motion—

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

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (5.14 p.m.): The Opposition is happy to support the Bill that has been presented by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper). It seems to be a sensible and practical piece of legislation, and it should have the effect of reducing costs, delays and inconvenience in general for all of the people who have dealings with the Titles Office. I refer not only to members of the public but also to members of the legal profession and other people who have dealings in real property.

One of the amendments related to the difference between a bill of encumbrance and a bill of mortgage. I agree with the thrust of the legislation in that it will effectively remove the need to lodge two bills with the attendant additional expense and delay.

The next amendment relates to making things easier for registered proprietors to correct the name on a title.

The more substantive amendment, I should think, is the one that relates to easements. For many years this has been a problem area that has resulted in quite costly and confusing litigation over whether or not one land-owner has an enforceable easement over an adjoining property. I know people personally who have been caused a lot of heartache, expense and trouble because of confusion that has arisen relative to exactly what their rights are. This legislation will probably overcome the confusion. I am pleased to see it.

The balance of the Bill deals with computerisation and increasing modernisation of the Titles Office. With reference to that amendment and all the measures, it has been my experience, as both an articled clerk and a solicitor operating in the Titles Office, that this is a very difficult and confused area. There are many problems and delays associated with the Titles Office. It is good to see such measures coming forward. It is hoped that they will be a part of further measures that will come forward, until the Titles Office is made much more efficient. Much has been done, but more could be done. I do not say that that will be an easy task. I do not expect the Minister to introduce more amendments or changes overnight, but improvements are required.

Many years ago, when things were busy during the boom, it was very difficult to operate at the Titles Office, because delays and confusion arose about exactly what was registered, what was lodged but subject to requisition and where documents actually were. Sometimes it took a long time to find out what was going on about a property one was interested in buying, or about documents that had been lodged.

These are positive and sensible measures. I am happy to support them.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.17 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the proposed amendments.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.18 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contribution. I agree with the Opposition spokesman that more can be done at the Titles Office. I give him and the public of Queensland an assurance that more will continue to be done. We are determined to bring about greater efficiency. The introduction of computerisation to the Titles Office will give us an opportunity to do that and we will continue to proceed accordingly.

As a consequence of the insertion of the new clause 9A relating to "prescribed forms of instruments", the interpretation of section 35 of the Real Property Act may possibly be rendered unclear. It is my intention to move an amendment in Committee to clause 5.

Section 35 of the Real Property Act 1961-1981 provides that upon entry of particulars the instrument from which the particulars have been taken is deemed to be part of the register.

It could be argued that the instruments prescribed in the regulations referred to in the new clause 9A are not within the ambit of section 35.

In order to avoid any ambiguity and accepting a need for caution, I consider that section 35 should be amended by omitting from that section the words "for the same purpose may be authorised as herein provided" and substituting the words "may be authorized or prescribed by this Act and every plan".

The amendments that I intend to place before the Committee will remove any possible ambiguity in this area.

I again commend the Bill to the House.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. N. J. Harper (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of s. 35; Upon entry of particulars instruments deemed to be part of register book. Schedule—

Mr HARPER (5.20 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 4, omit all words comprising lines 17 and 18 and substitute the words—

'amended by omitting the words "for the same purpose may be authorised as herein provided" and substituting the words "may be authorized or prescribed by this Act and every plan" ' "

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

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

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH LANDS BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 26 February 1985 (see p. 3389, vol. 297) on Mr Harper's motion—

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

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (5.23 p.m.): The Australian Labor Party takes the view that this is a sensible piece of legislation that will assist the Roman Catholic Church in ordering its affairs, and it is happy to support the Bill.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.24 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.25 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their support of the legislation, which obviously is sensible. It is good to see some legislation receiving the unanimous support of the House.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, schedules and preamble, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

VALUERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Valuers Registration Act 1965-1984 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (5.29 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of the Valuers Registration Act of 1965 was to establish a register of valuers in Queensland and to provide standards of competency that valuers should achieve before being permitted to practise in this State.

The Act has been amended on several occasions since its introduction, and the present Bill provides for two major amendments to the principal Act together with relevant minor amendments. The major amendments relate to—

repealing those provisions of the principal Act that deal with provisional licensed valuers; and

making provision for a corporation to carry on the business of a valuer.

These amendments are supported by the Australian Institute of Valuers and represent the first stage of a review of the Act, the balance of which I will introduce at a later date.

The 1965 Act limited registration to valuers who had both academic qualifications and practical experience, but it also contained transitional provisions which allowed registration on the ground of experience only, provided that an application was made within two years. Subsequently, this was extended to four years and the transitional provision expired on 14 February 1970.

However, some experienced valuers without the required academic qualifications had not exercised their right to register and, as there was some shortage of rural valuers at the time, amendments to the Act were made in 1971, and a new category of provisional licence, as distinct from registration, was created.

Those amendments provided that a valuer granted a provisional licence was restricted to valuing in a geographically defined area. In 1979 the Act was further amended to limit the granting of a provisional licence to practise in areas in which the services of a registered valuer are not readily available.

Although the system of provisional licences has operated since 1971, there are only 22 provisional licensed valuers, compared with 1 024 registered valuers. Registered valuers are not restricted as to locality, and may practice in any part of the State.

It is therefore considered appropriate to discontinue the category of provisional licensed valuer and, instead, have a single system of registration for all valuers practising in Queensland. Those 22 valuers presently holding provisional licences will be granted registration so as to allow them to practise as fully registered valuers.

This will have several advantages, not the least of which will be uniformity in the standards set for registration and practice as a valuer, thus affording a greater measure of protection for the public. The Valuers Registration Board will have the same disciplinary powers in respect of all registered valuers without concerning itself with artificial and arbitrary boundaries for practice.

The Bill provides that a person who currently holds a licence as a provisional licensed valuer will be registered as a valuer, with a classification appropriate to his or her knowledge and experience. However, on and from the date of assent to the Bill, no further applications for such licences will be received by the board. Any that have been received, but not determined by the board at that date, will be treated as applications for registration and will be subject to the same requirements in terms of education and experience as would apply to any other application for registration.

The Bill provides for a transition period within which the board shall register, as valuers, those persons holding licences as provisional licensed valuers on the date of assent.

The Bill recognises that there may be some outstanding appeals or disciplinary action by, or against, a provisional licensed valuer, or that a period of suspension may be in force on the date of assent.

Accordingly, the Bill provides that the transition period of one month runs from the date of assent or from the day on which any appeal or disciplinary proceedings are finalised, or period of suspension is completed, whichever is the last to occur.

The Bill also provides for a review by the Minister of the board's decision in any case in which a former provisional licensed valuer who is registered under the new provisions is dissatisfied with the classification determined by the board; for example, if such a valuer is classified as either rural or urban, but considers that the classification should be both rural and urban, that valuer may seek a review of the matter by the Minister, whose decision shall be final.

Corporations Carrying on Business as Valuers

The present Act provides that only a natural person who is a registered valuer can carry on the business of a valuer. The corporate structure of many valuation and real estate firms makes it desirable for the corporation itself to be able to carry on the business of a valuer. The Bill makes provision for a corporation to advertise and carry on the business of a valuer subject to the following conditions as safeguards—

the valuation must be signed by the individual registered valuer who made the valuation;

the classification of that registered valuer must match the class of property being valued, whether rural or urban; and

the registered valuer must be either a director, or member of the board of management, or a servant of the corporation.

This provision is similar to one contained in the New South Wales Valuers Registration Act, which has proved to be satisfactory both to valuers and to members of the public.

Many other professions allow their members to practise within a corporate structure with appropriate safeguards and the Queensland division of the Australian Institute of Valuers welcomes this opportunity to clarify the position with regard to taxation and professional indemnity cover in the same way as its New South Wales colleagues and members of other professions have done.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.