

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1985

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

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Queensland Temperance League Lands Bill reported by Mr Speaker.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts**

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts for the year ended 30 June 1985.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Education 2000

From Mr Powell (21 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will extend the closing date for *Education 2000* submissions to the end of the school year.

Amalgamation of Nursing Boards

From Mr McElligott (857 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to intervene in the proposed amalgamation of the Board of Nursing Studies and the Nurses Registration Board of Queensland.

[A similar petition was received from Mr Austin (137 signatories).]

Nurse Education

From Mr McElligott (369 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide funds for post-registration degree courses in nursing and for the acceptance of Federal funding to provide for basic nursing training at colleges of advanced education.

Third-party Insurance Premiums

From Mr Warburton (4 317 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke the recent increases in third-party insurance and for future increases to be determined after public hearing.

Petitions received.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE**Death of Hon. J. P. Goleby, MLA**

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.5 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“(1) That this House desires to place on record its sense of the loss this State has sustained by the death of the Honourable John Philip Goleby, lately serving as member for the electoral district of Redlands and Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services.

(2) That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the widow and family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy

and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

John Philip Goleby was an honoured member of this House and a valued friend to many, not only in his electorate of Redlands but also throughout the country.

Besides being a political colleague, John Goleby was a personal friend, a man I respected and admired greatly. To me, he was a dear and trusted friend, and I was deeply saddened by his passing, at such a comparatively young age, at a time when he had achieved so much and had the ability to achieve even more. Almost from the first day he entered Parliament, there grew a deep friendship between John and myself and our wives and families. We shared the same Christian beliefs, the same attitudes.

John Goleby was born and bred in the Redlands, a district he loved, an area he championed at any and every turn. He grew up in the district and never left it.

From the time he left school, his life was almost totally devoted to the service of the community. He gave in full measure, unselfishly and in great volumes, for the progress of the Redlands region and later, as a Minister of the Crown, for Queensland as a whole. John was no parliamentary idler; he was a person devoted to serving the public.

He had many achievements, and perhaps the greatest, and the one for which the people of the Redlands will have greatest cause to thank him and honour his memory in the times ahead, was his devotion to have the railway line from Brisbane to Cleveland reopened. As all honourable members know, he worked tirelessly in that endeavour. In this area, of course, he was following the path set by his mentor and adviser, the late Mr Dick Wood, who was himself a former National Party member for Logan, as the electorate was then called. That railway line will remain as a perpetual memorial to John Goleby.

John Goleby was born at Cleveland and educated at the Mount Cotton and Thornlands State Schools and the Wynnum State High School. Upon completing his education, he followed in his father's footsteps, working the family property. From his teens, he displayed a keen interest in community affairs and the willingness to assist his fellows was one of the great attributes he possessed.

With that keen interest, it is not surprising that he was elected to the Redland Shire Council in 1961 and remained on the council until 1980, serving as chairman of the Works Committee from 1967 until 1980 and as Finance Committee chairman from 1967 until 1975.

His tireless efforts for the rate-payers did not go unnoticed, and, as a member of the National Party for about 21 years, he was asked to seek endorsement for the seat of Redlands, then held by the ALP. Suffice it to say that he won the seat at his first attempt, entering Parliament on 7 December 1974. In this House, as many honourable members will clearly recall, he applied to his parliamentary duties the same zeal and unflagging devotion as had marked his career previously.

That zeal and devotion can be seen in the fact that he served on no fewer than 12 parliamentary committees, gaining an admirable knowledge of government and Parliament in the process. Consider the committees on which he served so tirelessly—police, local government and main roads, tourism and marine affairs, works and housing, primary industries, fisheries and Aboriginal and Islanders advancement, Premier's, mines and energy, health, transport, education, parliamentary buildings, unemployment. These groups are the milestones in the parliamentary career of a most devoted servant of the people and of the electorate.

From all that hard work came the recognition he deserved, and he became Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services on 6 December 1982. Having become a Minister of the Crown, he maintained his zeal. As a farmer, he well knew the value and importance of water resources and he criss-crossed this State to gain an intimate knowledge

of the problems of primary producers as they affected his portfolio. Indeed, it may be said that it was through his zeal and forceful, persuasive and convincing arguments that major water conservation programs at Bundaberg and Eton are now well under way, with the Government pouring \$100m into water resource works in Queensland. Within his department, he was most highly regarded and respected.

He held the responsibility of guiding the program of construction of the mighty Burdekin Falls Dam and irrigation system, at a cost of \$277m, and is second only to the Snowy Mountains scheme in Australia.

Despite the heavy pressure of his ministerial and parliamentary duties and the work-load that this very willing worker cheerfully accepted, he never lost his love of the land, and his favourite relaxation was a hard day's work on his property at home.

He remained a member of almost every community, sporting and social group in the electorate, and was always a most welcome and honoured guest of the people because they knew that John Goleby the man did not change when he became John Goleby the member and then John Goleby the Minister. His humility and modesty were the shining lights that lit his path through life.

He was a keen sportsman, especially as a cricketer, as members of the parliamentary and press gallery teams will readily recall. He could not and would not lose the common touch.

Within the National Party, he was highly regarded and respected, again giving wonderful service. He was chairman of the Logan and Redlands Electorate Council for nine years from 1965, chairman of the Small Business and Consumer Affairs Committee and a member of the Transport Committee.

Those of us who attended his funeral last week saw the high regard in which the people of Redlands held this man. That was a fine testimonial to him. He enjoyed the honour of being not merely their member but totally their friend, and we all saw that friendship exhibited by the mourners at the church and by the small groups of people who stood by the kerbside as the cortege went by.

John Goleby could best be described as a very gentle, Christian and kindly man, ever ready to help the underdog. Indeed, his unobtrusive acts of charity within the electorate were endless.

It would be totally true to say that this man was a gentleman in every sense of the word—never knowingly giving insult to others, ever helpful, patient and kindly, treating all people alike, without prejudice and free of bias in accordance with the Christian principles which had been instilled in him by his parents and which he, in turn, undoubtedly instilled in his own family.

In all his work over more recent years he had his wife Betty as a most dedicated and willing helper who was well known and respected by the people of the Redlands region. She truly played her part, not only as a loving wife but also as an able assistant in electorate matters, serving the needs and aspirations of his constituents.

His untimely death is indeed a tragic loss—to the Parliament, to the State, to the electorate, to the people he served so well, and to the family he loved so much.

To his widow Betty and his children and to the rest of his grieving relatives, I offer my very deep personal sympathy, and I am sure that all members of the House will join with me in extending our most sincere condolences.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.13 a.m.): Mr Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of regret and loss that I second this motion to express sympathy to the family of our late colleague John Philip Goleby. Through his death, fate has indeed struck a cruel and tragic blow. His family have lost a caring and dedicated father; his electorate has lost a conscientious, hard-working member; and this State has lost an excellent Minister.

John Goleby was born at Cleveland on 22 March 1935, and such was his love for the Redlands district that most of his working life was spent contributing to its development. His untimely death has left in the district a void that will be difficult to fill.

I first met John Goleby through our mutual involvement with local government. He was with the Redland Shire Council and I was chairman of the Laidley Shire Council. However, it was not until after his election in December 1974 that I had the opportunity to get to know him really well. From our first meeting, he always impressed me as a sincere and dedicated man—a thorough gentleman—and our friendship since he entered this House constantly served to reinforce the high esteem in which he was held.

He brought to this House—and subsequently to Cabinet—valuable knowledge and experience gained as a successful primary producer and businessman. He was also deeply involved with district sporting and welfare organisations, all of which, I am sure, would acknowledge the support and effort that John Goleby put into community life.

John's experience and community knowledge equipped him well for his role as a Minister of the Crown, and it is a tragedy that he has been deprived of the opportunity of giving further valuable service to this State.

As Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, John Goleby served Queensland with distinction, and I have no doubt that he would have gone on to more senior portfolios later in his career. He was never backward when it came to standing up for issues and projects that he believed would benefit the State. The problems that he confronted with projects such as the Burdekin irrigation scheme and the Stradbroke Island bridge link are testimony to John Goleby's resilience and determination. The fact that he could back such qualities with a practical knowledge of irrigation and water conservation gained from his farming activities was a major factor that contributed to his success as a Minister.

In conclusion, I believe it is fair to say that in many condolence motions it is only the longer-serving members who can relate to the person having passed. On those occasions on which a sitting member is involved, it serves only to compound the shock and reminds all of us of the frailty of life.

Undoubtedly, the unfortunate accident that claimed the life of our former colleague John Goleby brought a premature end to a distinguished career of service to the community. He will be missed by the many friends he made, both within this Parliament and in the community, and I am proud to have had the opportunity to know him well and to have worked with him.

I join with the Premier and Treasurer in offering to his wife, Betty, and members of his family my condolences on their sad and tragic loss.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.17 a.m.): Members of the Opposition fully support the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and seconded by the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn).

Undoubtedly, John Goleby's quiet, unassuming nature was a great asset to him, first when he became a member of this Assembly in December 1975 and later as a Minister of the Crown. Many other positive qualities of John Goleby the man were related to many people for the first time at his State funeral service, which was held in the Cleveland Uniting Church. The Reverend Barry Dangerfield certainly gave an insight into the life and times of John Goleby, including matters of which many people would not have been aware.

The Premier and Treasurer has already made reference to many local organisations with which John Goleby was involved in some way. Unfortunately, in recent times, condolence motions have become a rather frequent occurrence in this Assembly. Often such motions are moved for persons who were members of this Assembly many years

ago. The condolence motion moved today for John Goleby is the third such motion moved for members elected to this Parliament at the 1983 State election, the two previous motions being moved for our late colleagues Kevin Hooper and Dr Denis Murphy.

Although John Goleby spent all of his working life in south-east Queensland, obviously he won many friends throughout the State, including north Queensland. That was typified by remarks made recently by Townsville City Council representatives, who gave John Goleby the highest praise. It is important to note also that these comments came from members of a political party of a different persuasion to that of John Goleby. As far as the council representatives were concerned, John Goleby was a Minister first and a member of a political party second, and that is very high praise indeed.

Members of the Opposition take this opportunity to extend to Mrs Goleby and other members of the Goleby family their very sincere condolences.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.19 a.m.): I support the remarks made by the mover and the seconder of the motion of condolence and by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton). As has already been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, this is the third occasion on which a motion of condolence has been moved for a serving member of this Parliament. It is an especially sad occasion because honourable members have had a close association with John Goleby both in the Parliament and outside it.

His service to local government has been detailed by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). John Goleby led a very distinguished life both in local government and in this Assembly. However, it is perhaps as a person that honourable members got to know John Goleby best.

My first contact with John Goleby was when I was Attorney-General and he brought to my attention the problems associated with the offshore islands that were part of his electorate. I spent many hours with him visiting the people on those islands and listening to their legal problems. I noticed then that he was tremendously interested in their problems. It was a genuine interest; he knew everybody and everybody knew him, and favourably. He impressed me enormously with the way in which he went about the duties of councillor and ultimately as a member of the Assembly. He served on my ministerial committee when I was Minister for Health, and was certainly a very good attender at and contributor to its meetings.

Perhaps more than anything else, his quiet demeanour very often misled people into believing that he was a retiring person, but he could mix freely with people from all walks of life, as I noted in his electorate on a number of occasions. As a Minister, he had no difficulty in dealing with all comers and all problems. It would be true to say that he was one of the few people we could look to as the model of a comprehensive member of Parliament able to handle all of the community's problems objectively and sympathetically.

His premature and tragic death is a great loss to all members of the Parliament. To his widow and relatives, we extend our condolences.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (11.21 a.m.): I join with the Honourable the Premier and Treasurer and other members who have spoken to the motion to convey condolences to Betty and the family of our late colleague and ministerial friend John Goleby. Such a tragic happening will probably in future save the lives of others.

Because of the long association between John Goleby and me—11 years in the Assembly and 20-odd years as chairmen of neighbouring shires prior to entering Parliament—we grew up together in the Redlands and that part of the State that I have had the privilege and honour to represent.

I endorse what other members have said: John was a model of everything that is good. He did all that we are supposed to do. At his last meeting of Cabinet, I believe

that we put the seal on construction of a bridge to North Stradbroke Island, which was one of his dreams. He continually talked about the islands in Moreton Bay. The Premier and Treasurer has already referred to the extension of the railway line to Cleveland. Those of us who represent the Gold Coast are aware that John was directly responsible for the commencement of the training walls at the Nerang River outlet. Those projects will be monuments to our friend. They set the seal and stamp on his service in this part of the world.

At his funeral service last Thursday afternoon, we sang that great Charles Wesley hymn—

“Jesus, lover of my soul

Let me to Thy bosom fly.”

That is the way John Goleby would have wanted it.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (11.23 a.m.): It is with sadness that I join in the motion of condolence to the widow and relatives of the late John Goleby.

The respect for him was evident to all who attended the funeral last Thursday afternoon. It was rather a moving experience to see so many townspeople standing at attention at the roadside as the funeral procession passed by. Not only has the electorate of Redlands lost a member but also the Parliament has lost a dear colleague and a member with whom we have worked for a number of years. Since I entered the Parliament, I enjoyed an excellent relationship with John Goleby, who was then on the back bench.

John Goleby's elevation to the Ministry did not change the man. It did, however, allow his character to develop even more. As has been said, John was a quiet person, but those who knew him realised how strong were his convictions. He was a very solid man who possessed a great deal of sympathy and understanding for people's problems, for which he was willing to search for solutions.

Those members who served on John's ministerial committee came to know him even better. He looked after his ministerial committee, which did a great deal of work for him.

As a member of that committee, I became familiar with various problems associated with the provision of water resources throughout the State. It was only in last May that I accompanied him and other members of the committee to north Queensland to inspect the Burdekin Falls Dam.

That reminded me of a time 12 months earlier when the committee travelled to the north coast area to examine problems that had arisen because of the drought. From shire to shire, John Goleby listened with sympathy to the delegations that expressed the need to provide more water resources in that area. Most of the people who were members of the delegations recognised that John was doing everything in his power to attend to their needs, and nowhere was that more apparent than in the Lockyer Valley. Residents in that area fully realised the sympathy and understanding that John Goleby brought to consideration of their problems. John Goleby understood fully the problems associated with water storage in the Lockyer Valley area, and up till the time of his death he had actually gone a long way towards their rectification. He will be remembered for ever for his understanding of such problems.

John's death has been a loss to all of his parliamentary colleagues. All honourable members would realise that a man who was gentle but had very strong convictions has been lost. John had a great love of the Christian faith and he never wavered from that. On behalf of Government members, I offer sincere sympathy to John's wife, Betty, and her family. I also offer sympathy to members of his personal staff who were close to John Goleby and were his great friends; no doubt they, too, have suffered a great loss.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.26 a.m.): I join with previous speakers in the tribute they have paid to John Goleby as the parliamentary representative for the electorate of

Redlands. Up till 1977, the electorate of Redlands adjoined mine. When I came back to Parliament, I took over a large sector of the Redlands electorate in the Springwood area and I noticed that John was very well respected by the residents of that area.

Through his participation in local government, I got to know him and I had known him for many years. Comments made by previous speakers about his participation are very true, and his death is a sad loss to this House. Because John was with us on the last day of sitting, it should cause most of us to reflect on where we are going. The fact is that none of us is here for very long, and when such a man as John Goleby—one of nature's gentlemen—parts from us, perhaps all honourable members should think more about the future.

Above all else, John Goleby was a family man. Although he loved politics very dearly, he put his family above that. I am proud to have known him on a personal basis. We shared a love of the coastal rivers area of Queensland, of Noosa, and of good seafood. Those of us who knew him on a personal basis would have realised what a hard worker he was and how serious was his approach to life. He very rarely relaxed; in everything he did he put his best effort into it. His activities took up a great deal of time. How many members of this House have been given fresh fruit by him over the years as a personal gesture? That is something that very few of us have time to bother with as we lead our busy lives. John was a very personable man, he put his family first, he worked very hard, and he was a credit to the State and the Parliament.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.28 a.m.): I wish to associate myself with the motion that is presently before the House and endorse the remarks made by previous speakers. It is essential that I add that, throughout his time in Parliament, I found John Goleby to be an exemplary member. There can be no doubt that his heart and soul were with the people and in serving the people. The dedicated way in which he served the people of his electorate of Redlands will go on record in this House.

John Goleby was a friend of everybody. He was a kindly fellow and a gentleman. Manners go a long way when it comes to what one wants to do. I pay tribute to the way in which he endeavoured to help people all along the line.

I also wish to commend his work as chairman of the works and housing committee. He made an excellent contribution to that committee. His innovative ideas helped to make the Government the better for his being with us.

On behalf of the Burnett electorate I pay tribute to him for the help he gave to the electorate in the field of water resources and harbours and marine matters. I thank his wife Betty for allowing him to be so readily available and for encouraging him to do what he did for everybody. The Parliament is the poorer for his passing. The residents of his electorate no doubt appreciate the wonderful work that he did, and they are certainly the poorer for his passing, as are all other Queenslanders.

I extend my sympathy to Betty and his family in their very sad bereavement.

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (11.31 a.m.): I support the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). It has been said in the newspapers and here today that John Goleby was a gentleman. He certainly was that, and more. He was a good Christian man, a family man, a man of total loyalty and a person whom one could trust entirely.

John Goleby entered this place, as did many others, following the election on 7 December 1974. In fact, we were called "The Class of '74". When a person enters this place he is basically on his own. He makes his own way, irrespective of party. That is the immediate reaction of every member following his election. He soon discovers who his friends are. They are the people with whom he has something in common, can talk to, confide in and trust. Certainly I found those qualities in John Goleby.

Following the 1974 election quite a few of us formed an association based on friendship. The Honourable Bill Gunn, John Goleby and I were sometimes referred to as the three Gs; something of which I was quite proud to be a part because it epitomised the common bond of loyalty, understanding and friendship that we had formed with many people.

John Goleby was a very hard worker. When I first became Minister for Mines and Energy it was not very long before I found myself inspecting the bay islands, which, at that time, were not serviced by electricity. It was due to his knowledge and understanding, perhaps the fact that both of us had a background in local government, and the willingness of the Redland shire, that today the islands have electricity. Had it not been for John Goleby's leadership, his ability to persuade people to work willingly with him and the respect that he had built up, island residents would still not have electricity. Each time an island resident uses a light switch he would do well to remember that he would not be doing so if it were not for the quality of John Goleby's representation.

The Premier and Treasurer referred to perpetual memorials. The Honourable Russ Hinze spoke about the stabilisation of the Southport bar which, despite years of effort by other people, had not been completed. When John Goleby took over the new portfolio of Water Resources and Maritime Services, he was affectionately known as the Minister for fresh and salt water. Because of his experience of the magnificent top end of The Broadwater and the islands, he was rock solid behind the stabilisation project, and it is to his great credit that that project finally came to a satisfactory conclusion. As I drive up and down to the coast, I think, as I did particularly last Friday after the funeral, of the projects that John started throughout this State that will become memorials to his understanding, hard work and dedication.

On Sunday morning the Apex Club of Southport held a breakfast in the area between the two rock walls that will form the new entrance to the Broadwater. It was a magnificent setting and the weather was wonderful. On such an occasion, one could only think of all the work on that project on which John Goleby's name was so heavily branded. To me, that will be a perpetual memorial to him.

Some people are on this earth for longer than others, but we are all here for only a very short time. During his 50 years in Queensland, John Goleby played a great role in all aspects of life. He had the misfortune to lose his first wife, and he suffered at that time. Later, Betty appeared on the scene, and she was a marvellous person for John and for John's family. The relationship worked out wonderfully.

At night-time in this place, we used to talk a lot confidentially about family and business matters, and I know what John went through from time to time. He did a marvellous job with his new family. He glued them together as one family. That, in itself, is a challenge in life. John Goleby is perhaps one of the few people who successfully met that challenge and brought the matter to a happy conclusion.

I conclude by saying that John Goleby is in very good hands; he is in the hands of God. Many of us will have John's memory in our hearts for ever. I ask God to bless the family and give them the strength to carry on and become an even stronger family.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (11.37 a.m.): I, too, add my sympathy to that which has been expressed to the family of the late John Goleby. Unlike many members who have spoken to this motion, I knew him for only a comparatively short time.

As Opposition spokesman for Water Resources, I had many meetings with John. Unfortunately, because the problems are sensitive or are of a personal nature, quite often the good work of members and Ministers goes unnoticed. I had many discussions with John about problems in my electorate and also about problems throughout north Queensland and other parts of the State. He was always open, honest and frank. When he was unable to accede to a request for an interview, he made his departmental officers available. On many occasions, he said to me, "Don't hesitate to go to the members of

the staff, should you require any information or anything like that." I was very appreciative of that.

Queensland is a big State, and a Minister on tour has his hands full. John Goleby was always open and helpful. If it was possible to reach a compromise, he would. From time to time, members and Ministers have to stand firm on their decisions, and John Goleby did that. Although we could have a disagreement, we always left the discussions respecting one another.

Many members knew John and his family better than I did. There is the saying that if one rubs shoulders with champions long enough, a bit of the dust must fall off onto one. I am sure that his family and many of his friends will benefit from having known John over the period of years that they did.

John always paid me, as Opposition spokesman on Water Resources, the courtesy of inviting me to be present at any major functions that he and his wife attended. I can say with all honesty that they were great company to be in. They played their role and worked as a team. I could not ask for anything better than to be at an official, social or informal function with John Goleby and his family. I express my sympathy and extend my condolences to John Goleby's family.

John Goleby had many ambitions for his Water Resources Commission, because, as other members have said today, he knew of the need in those areas of Queensland that have problems caused by the shortage of water.

John also had a good sense of humour. I remember one day when we were talking about the dams that should be built and where they should be built. I was making my contribution—it was more or less an informal discussion—and I said, "John, you should have a dam here and a dam there." He said to me, "Bill, you will have me known as that 'dam' Minister." Had it had been possible, John Goleby would have done it.

John was able to get a sizeable increase in the allocation for water resources in the most recent Budget. That shows that his fight did not go unnoticed. Over the years, before each Budget was presented, a meeting was held to discuss the allocations and where the priorities lay, and very often John had to say that, because of the lack of finance, his portfolio had missed out again. However, in the last Budget, John Goleby's work came through and he gained a sizeable increase.

As I said, John Goleby had great ambitions for his portfolio and it was untimely that his life was cut short just when he was about to achieve great things, not only for himself but for the State.

I join with other members of this House in expressing my sympathy.

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.41 a.m.): I rise to support the motion so ably moved, seconded and spoken to. Along with John Goleby and 27 others, I entered this Parliament in December 1974. On many occasions during that time John and I were together on different parliamentary committees and we were sworn in together as Ministers. Like others, I feel John's loss from this place. He died as too many farmers die—in a tractor accident. I know the sense of loss suffered by his family.

On behalf of my electorate I place on record an acknowledgement of the contribution that John made to water resources in the Isis area. There is no doubt in my mind that, but for his becoming Minister in 1982, the opportunity of water being provided for that dry area would not have arisen.

John was a dear friend of mine and when, in 1975, a group of us decided that we should meet together as a group and have a prayer breakfast, John was one of our greatest supporters. That little group, which is not organised in any particular way, goes ahead today. We are thankful that John was able to join with us and be a stalwart member.

I remember the time in 1979 when his first wife passed away. The way in which John took her death showed his true Christian courage. He recognised that his wife had been taken and that she was far better off, although the rest of us were at a loss. I am sure that Betty and the family, who have a similar background and attitude, while sorrowing because a dear friend has left us, know truly that John is in a place where there is no sorrow, only joy, and we rejoice in that fact. I extend my condolences to Betty and the family and trust that they will be comforted in the knowledge that John has passed from this world to a better place.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.44 a.m.): This is a sad occasion, which marks the loss of our friend and colleague John Goleby. Anyone who attended his funeral at Cleveland would appreciate the respect with which the man was held by the community at large.

I entered State Parliament with John in 1974. I sat on the back benches with him and I sat alongside him as a Minister. I opened the batting with John against the press in the press versus members cricket matches, and we had a degree of success. John Goleby enjoyed his sport. Indeed, he was a wonderful man, and I was fortunate to get to know him very well.

He was a hard-working man who was honest, conscientious and dedicated in every way. He served his State with distinction and dignity. I owe a debt of gratitude to him for the work that he carried out in my electorate. John Goleby was not interested just in the big schemes, such as the Burdekin Falls Dam. He took an active interest in his portfolio right across the length and breadth of this State. He helped me considerably with small water and irrigation schemes in western areas, and I must pay tribute to him for that.

John Goleby was not just an MLA; I would term him an MP. I do not mean a member of Parliament; I mean a man of the people. He will be sadly missed by all who knew him. To Betty and all of the family and friends of John Goleby, on behalf of my wife and myself, I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroola) (11.45 a.m.): I rise to support the motion of condolence and to acknowledge a great Queenslander. The words that have already been expressed today have outlined so many of those things that John has done that have left a mark on the lives of all honourable members, all Queenslanders and this great State.

A person enters Parliament to represent the people. He or she often needs certain qualities and needs to be in touch with the people he or she serves. John had a tremendous love for his family and love for the community. He gained experience, which can only come from practical application. One of the great ingredients that helped to make up the man who was John Goleby was his observation of everything round him. He knew not only of the concerns of others but also the work of nature. He knew the problems associated with people in rural industries. His love of horticulture, plants and animals was the basis of the service that he gave to primary industries, and this State will always be indebted to him for that service.

He worked in the community. He was a member of Rotary. Whatever he did, he did with great application. He supported many service clubs in the community. As has already been mentioned, he was a generous man. I am speaking not only of the fruit and vegetables that he often gave to people but also his generosity with his time for the concerns of those in his electorate and beyond its boundaries.

He was a great sportsman. He played cricket and other sports and he loved to fish. Regularly he came to Noosa, in my electorate, to enjoy those pursuits. An example of his magnanimity was that often he shared his catch with others.

Honourable members witnessed the development of John's political career. I entered Parliament in 1974, at the same time as John. Because those who enter Parliament at the same time are very dependent on one another and have to learn together, they feel very close and become part of a team.

His role as a Minister and his service to the State were outstanding. Members of the community often do not realise the sacrifices that have to be made in giving service to the State. In a democratic process it is essential that some people aspire to be representatives of others, and then aim to become Ministers of the Crown and carry out those extra duties on behalf of the whole State.

I wish to acknowledge his love for his family, a love which stems from a Christian background. Margery, Esther, Peter, Betty, Betty's family and John's family were all part of the Christian heritage, in which John believed so dearly. His love for his church and his sense of priorities and values devolve from his being a great Christian. To know John was a great experience for me. Today we acknowledge a great Queenslander.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (11.50 a.m.): I join in the motion so ably moved by the Premier and Treasurer and offer my sympathy to Betty and her family. I recognised John as a colleague who gave so much of himself. He gave a great deal of support, instilled confidence and was very understanding.

John owned a property in my electorate. For that reason I extend to his family the sympathy of many persons in my electorate who came to know John very well. They came to understand him so well that one day a person said that he would like to attend John's funeral, which was held last week, mainly because he liked the guy. That was indicative of John and the understanding that he was able to maintain through his friends and relatives not only in his electorate but also throughout the country. Those of us who were closely acquainted with John knew him as a first-class fellow who was able and willing to give of his best at all times.

As a member of John's parliamentary committee, I gained a knowledge of the work that he performed throughout the State, including the inspections in which he took part. John not only gave members of his committee a greater understanding of the workings of his portfolio and of the State but also gave himself and the areas in which he served a greater understanding.

Recently, when the construction of the dam at Cedar Pocket was still at the discussion stage, very early one morning, when everybody else was going about his normal chores, John was inspecting the area, the facilities and the industry that it would serve. He did that without anybody knowing that he was there or being able to influence him one way or the other. That type of inspection showed what John was worth and what he was prepared to give to the area that he served.

I support the motion not only because John was a good friend, not only because he was a worthy Minister, not only because he was greatly respected, but also because no-one will really know whether he reached his peak or whether the best was yet to come. Like so many others in my electorate and many of John's colleagues, I support the motion of condolence because I liked the guy.

Mr RANDELL (Mirani) (11.53 a.m.): I rise also to place on record my sympathy and sorrow at the recent tragic death of the late John Goleby. It was with a great sense of loss and shock that I heard the news of his fatal accident. It is unbelievable to me and to many members of this Assembly that a man should be cut down in the prime of his life when he had so much to offer to this Parliament, to this State and to this nation.

When I entered Parliament, I served on the back bench with John. I always found him to be a man of the highest integrity and honour. He was well liked by his colleagues and by everyone who knew him. He was always ready to advise me and extend any help to me that he could. That is something that I greatly appreciated.

As the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) said, the parliamentary cricket team played against the parliamentary press cricket team. John was an unassuming fellow. He was a batsman of the highest calibre. He was certainly a great help to our cricket team.

Following his appointment as Minister for Water Resources, I served on his parliamentary committee. During that time I got to know him very well. I respected his ability, his dedication and his hard work. John was a good friend not only to me but also to my electorate and to the Mackay region. The continuing progress on the Eton Irrigation Project is certainly a monument to him. I will see that that monument will never be forgotten.

Anyone who attended John's funeral service, which was held in his home town, would know the high regard in which John was held in his own community.

John Goleby was a true gentleman and will be sadly missed by many persons. I extend my condolence and sympathy to his wife, Betty, his family and his friends.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (11.55 a.m.): I support the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and seconded by the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) and endorse the comments made by previous speakers.

Over the last few years, I had a very close association with John Goleby, particularly in connection with the planning and construction of the Burdekin Dam and associated works. John Goleby's ability during the delicate negotiations on the Burdekin Dam project certainly played a major part in bringing it to the stage that it has now reached.

John Goleby's door was always open. He was always ready to discuss problems. He was always willing to travel and broaden his knowledge and understanding of the Burdekin Dam project, as well as many other projects throughout the State. It is very sad that John will not see that project, in which he took such a tremendous personal interest, come to fruition.

I was fortunate to have enjoyed hospitality in what could only be called the welcoming and loving atmosphere of the home of John and Betty. Of course, the tragedy is heightened by the fact that John died working on the property that he loved.

I extend my deepest sympathy and that of my family and the people of the Burdekin to Betty and to the Goleby family.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Delegation of Authority; Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.57 a.m.), by leave: I inform the House that His Excellency the Governor, by virtue of the provisions of section 8 of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896-1982, has authorised and empowered the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 12 September 1985 and until another person is appointed to perform and exercise all or any of such duties, powers and authorities.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the *Queensland Government Gazette* of 14 September 1985 notifying this arrangement.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the Queensland Government Gazette on the table.

PAPERS

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

Sixth Report by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamation under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Canals Act 1958-1984

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Land Act 1962-1984

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1984

Supreme Court Act of 1921

Regulation under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1985

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Cairns Airport Act 1981

Rules of Court under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1985

Report of the Law Reform Commission for the year ended 30 June 1985.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Death of Nicholas Bowkett; Staffing at Royal Children's Hospital**

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (11.59 a.m.), by leave: I refer to a report published in *The Sunday Mail* newspaper last week-end relating to a child, Nicholas Bowkett, who was a patient in the Royal Children's Hospital. Following publication of the report, I sought advice from the Royal Children's Hospital about the circumstances surrounding the case and allegations about the child's treatment. I now have to hand that advice from the hospital, which establishes beyond any doubt that *The Sunday Mail* report was a gross distortion and misrepresentation of the facts of this tragic case.

At first glance, *The Sunday Mail* report to which I have referred might appear to be a simple case of a distressed mother speaking publicly about her experience with the care provided at the Royal Children's Hospital. I am now informed that that was not the case. This story was, in fact, the result of a disgusting conspiracy in which this distressed mother was used as a pawn in a deliberate attempt to smear the Royal Children's Hospital and the State Government.

The perpetrators of this sickening and abhorrent act were none other than Mr Deane Wells, former ALP Federal member for Petrie, and Lee McGlynn, a media officer, both of whom are employed by none other than the Queensland Nurses Union. I have been reliably informed that those two people had been pushing the tragic story of Nicholas Bowkett round Brisbane news media circles for several weeks prior to its publication in last week-end's *Sunday Mail*. They had been attempting to use, in a most callous and cynical fashion, the plight of this poor child and his family to support the Queensland Nurses Union campaign against the State Government.

What a disgraceful act of treachery on the part of the Queensland Nurses Union, which, by this act, has now caused untold distress and suffering among the nursing staff at the Royal Children's Hospital! In a deliberate and calculated campaign with the Queensland ALP, the Nurses Union has seriously damaged the high standing and reputation of the Royal Children's Hospital.

In the past few days, we have had the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton), the member for Townsville (Mr McElligott) and members of the Queensland Nurses Union executive demanding an inquisition over standards at the Royal Children's Hospital—all from a newspaper report which was compiled in secrecy without reference to the hospital or the Health Department and in such a way as to prevent a fair and accurate presentation of the facts.

For the information of all honourable members, I read the report on this matter by Mr T. P. Tolhurst, manager of the Royal Children's Hospitals Board. He said—

“The Staff of the Royal Children's Hospital again wish to express their deepest sympathy to Mr & Mrs Bowkett over the loss of their son Nicholas. Whenever a child dies in hospital, all staff are distressed and particularly in the case of a child they have known over a long period of time such as Nicholas.

Members of the Royal Children's Hospitals Board Executive Committee, viz., the Medical Superintendent, Nursing Superintendent, Manager and Assistant Manager, discussed the above newspaper article in detail this morning and that group provides the following comments in relation to matters raised:

Firstly, we would like to record our deep concern for the ramifications of the unsubstantiated claims in the last issue of *The Sunday Mail*. These unsubstantiated claims may cause other parents to be concerned regarding admission of their children to the Royal Children's Hospital.

Parents of Queensland children should be reassured of the high standard of care provided at the Royal Children's Hospital.

We are aware that members of the Hospital staff are most upset with the content of the article referred to above and also that the reporter made no effort to verify the claims prior to publication.

The facts of the matter are that no children have died as a result of a shortage of staff in the Royal Children's Hospital. Nicholas died as a result of his medical condition and his death was not in any way connected with staffing levels at the Royal Children's Hospital.

It is Hospital policy never to release medical details of a child without the permission of the parents, and we totally respect the parents' privacy after the loss of a child. No statement could therefore be made about details relating to Nicholas's condition unless there was a written request by his parents requesting us to do so.

Nicholas's condition did cause the medical staff great concern. He was under the care of a senior consultant, who sought the opinions of the general paediatricians in the Hospital. Five specialist paediatricians were also called in for their opinion. Nicholas's case was presented to Professor Jean Aicardi from Paris and Dr. Engel from San Francisco, both international experts in this problem area, and the combined Hospital Medical Staff.

It is the policy of the Royal Children's Hospital never to leave a stone unturned in arriving at a diagnosis and always to call in whatever expert opinion which can be of assistance. Nevertheless, in some rare and complicated situations, it is not always possible to reach a totally satisfactory and complete diagnosis within the state of medical knowledge that exists today. In all cases and in particular in such tragic cases it is the Hospital's policy to keep the parents fully informed of the medical conditions as far as they are understood.

The Hospitals Board denies that the workload of medical staff was a contributing factor to the patient's death. As indicated above, relevant doctors were available at the appropriate times and were involved in assessing the patient's condition.

The Board understands that the patient's condition was discussed in detail with the parents at the appropriate times. In addition, the Ward Sister spoke to at least one parent on almost a daily basis.

The statement that 'Wards with up to 18 very ill children are being staffed at times with only one trainee nurse' is totally incorrect. Nursing staff requirements in the wards are assessed on a regular basis and staff are allocated to match the workload involved with the patients in the wards at a particular time. There is always at least one registered nurse with other nursing staff in each ward.

The article refers to the patient being desperate for a drink on the 28th August 1984. This was part of his medical treatment as the patient was on restricted fluids.

The reference to the 9th October 1984—Board records show that the patient was bitten on the toe and thumb by a very sick three year old child and sustained superficial injuries but these were not to the extent described in the article.

The reference to the 1st February 1985 includes a comment on insufficient staff. Board rosters indicate that on that day the following minimum nursing staff were deployed in the relevant ward:

Day Shift	Total of 8, including 4 registered nurses
Afternoon Shift	Total of 6 including 2 registered nurses
Night Shift	Total of 3 including 1 registered nurse

Additional nursing staff could have been allocated from time to time, depending on the workload in the ward and the remainder of the hospital.

Nursing staff allocated to the ward on the 2nd February 1985—a Saturday—was as follows:

Day Shift	Total of 5 including 2 registered nurses
Afternoon Shift	Total of 4 including 1 registered nurse
Night Shift	Total of 3 including 1 registered nurse

Normally on a Saturday, nursing staff allocation to wards is decreased, consistent with the decreased number of patients in hospital over the weekend.

In addition to the above nursing staff, the patient referred to in the newspaper article was provided with a special nurse on numerous occasions. This special nurse was involved directly and totally with that particular patient and not any other ward duties.

The article contains many statements which are difficult to comment on as there is no evidence available either to support the claims or refute them.

Hospital staff can understand parents of the patient being upset as a result of the loss of their child. However, the hospital staff believed then and now, that everything possible was done to diagnose the patient's illness and care for the patient. This belief was confirmed by members of staff receiving written comments from members of the family indicating, without qualification, how thankful they were for the care and attention given to their late son by staff of the hospital. For example, the family wrote to one of the senior hospital staff on the 7th April 1985 in the following terms:

'It is difficult for us to know how to thank you for everything you did for Nicholas and for us as a family. We deeply appreciate your thoughtfulness and for the way you made Nicholas's last weeks as comfortable as possible.

... we take comfort in the fact that whilst in your care, he wanted for nothing.'

Since that time, the mother has rung nursing staff in the ward on several occasions.

Many of the nurses were deeply attached to Nicholas and when he died, at least three nurses in their own time, attended his funeral and other ward staff sent flowers.

As far as staff are aware, the parents of the deceased have made no effort to contact and/or discuss the alleged complaints with any member of the hospital staff. All available Ward Sisters have been interviewed today and there is no evidence to suggest that either of the parents raised any of the issues during the patient's stays in hospital. If such consultation had have taken place, then staff would have been in a better position to provide the parents with more detailed response to the matters raised directly and indirectly in the newspaper article.

The Hospitals Board and staff are very proud of the record of treatment provided to children for more than 100 years. It is intended to maintain and even improve this level of treatment and there are many examples of how this has been and will be achieved. Some of these matters are:

Complicated liver transplantation operations have been undertaken by hospital staff of the Royal Children's Hospital and this has allowed two children, the first two survivors of this operation in Australia, to return home in a satisfactory condition.

International recognition has been given to work undertaken in children's leukaemia and one of the Board's senior medical staff is currently in West Germany undertaking further research in this area.

With a \$20m grant from the Government, the Hospitals Board is providing a new building to house six new operating theatres, intensive care ward, babies ward, surgical wards, outpatients, casualty and radiography. This building will be completed by the end of 1985 and patients will be admitted to these areas in early 1986.

Additional parent accommodation will be provided in the new building as well as in a \$¼m extension to Leonard Lodge.

Recently, a new Oncology Outpatients Department was opened for the benefit of patients.

Yours faithfully,
(signed)
T. P. Tolhurst,
Manager."

Mr Speaker, that report provides clear and indisputable evidence that the care provided by the Royal Children's Hospital for the child Nicholas Bowkett was of the highest order. Yet, to their eternal shame, the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Townsville have attempted to use the death of this child for nothing more than the basest of political motives. Together with the Queensland Nurses Union, they have sought to blacken and besmirch the reputation of one of the State's finest institutions over its record in a heroic yet unsuccessful battle to save the life of this child.

There is now a clear and compelling obligation on the part the *The Sunday Mail* to apologise to the Royal Children's Hospital and its staff for this unfounded and vindictive attack on their character and reputation. That newspaper had an ethical responsibility to give the Royal Children's Hospital the opportunity to respond to the matters raised before publishing this report. That did not occur, despite the fact that the reporter whose byline appeared on the story, Drena Parrington, was discussing other matters with the hospital's public relations officer as recently as last Friday.

Those involved in this cruel conspiracy stand condemned, the Queensland ALP, the Queensland Nurses Union and *The Sunday Mail*. They have demonstrated through their actions that they have no regard for ethics, human dignity or the truth.

I now table the report of the Royal Children's Hospital on this matter.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

VOTING AS AND FOR A MEMBER ABSENT THROUGH ILL HEALTH

Minister for Transport

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to report that I have received the following medical certificate—

"John Graff
F.R.C.S., F.R.A.C.S.
Surgeon
Telephone 831 8147
Residence 262 1426

John F. H. Graff Pty. Ltd.
Alexandra,
201 Wickham Terrace,
Brisbane, 4000

13th September, 1985.
The Speaker,
Parliament House,
Brisbane, 4000

Dear Sir,

Mr. Donald Lane had major surgery performed on Saturday, 31.8.85.

He will be convalescent for a period of about a month following this date, and will not be able to attend to his parliamentary duties without gravely endangering his health.

Mr. Lane's ill health has been caused through no fault of his own.

(signed) Dr. J. F. H. GRAFF."

I have received a second medical certificate in these terms—

"Bruce Spork
M.B., B.S.(Qld), F.R.A.C.C.P.

79 Racecourse Road
Ascot 4007
Telephone: 268 1566
268 1566
After Hours: 268 1566
13th September, 1985

The Speaker,
Legislative Assembly,
George Street,
Brisbane 4000
Dear Sir,

This is to certify that I have this day examined Mr Donald Frederick Lane born 18.7.1935.

On the 31st August, 1985 an operation was performed on Mr Lane to remove a section of his bowel. He is in consequent ill health through no fault on his part.

In my opinion he has been and will be unfit to attend meetings of the State Legislative Assembly from August 31st 1985 to September 28th 1985. The duties of attending sessions of the Assembly would, in my opinion, gravely endanger his health.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) BRUCE SPORK"

I have further received a notification from the honourable member for Merthyr that he has endeavoured to secure and through no fault on his part has failed to secure a "Pair" during the period specified in the beforementioned certificate, and that he desires to vote as a member at every sitting or sittings of the House and of every Committee of the whole House by means of a proxy in the person of the Honourable Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen or, in his absence, by means of a proxy in the person of the Honourable C. A. Wharton, both of whom are members of this Assembly.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922, I declare that I am satisfied that the matters stated in such notification are true.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (12.13 p.m.), by leave: A moment ago, in his ministerial statement, the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) reflected on the integrity of the Opposition, me as Opposition spokesman on Health and my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) in regard to a *Sunday Mail* article. I want to place on the record the fact that the Opposition has not once criticised or cast doubts upon the professional integrity of hospital staff—doctors, nurses, wardsmen or others. The Opposition's accusations of dereliction of duty have been directed solely at the Minister for Health. *The Sunday Mail* contained numerous direct quotes from Mrs Sue Bowkett. The Minister's attack on *The Sunday Mail* amounts to his calling Mrs Bowkett a liar. The Minister is again attempting to generate a smoke-screen by claiming that anyone who voices concern about the health system is casting a slur on the entire system and staff. The fact is that the Minister ought to leave his ministerial office and look at what is happening.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not consider that that is a personal explanation.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Housing Commission Accommodation

Mr YEWDALÉ asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

Will he provide the statistics relating to applications for Queensland Housing Commission accommodation throughout the State as at 30 July 1985, and list the number of applicants from each individual departmental office where such applications were received for (a) family accommodation—houses, (b) supporting mothers and widows—houses, units, (c) pensioners—houses, units, (d) single persons—houses, units and (e) any other category?

Answer—

Figures are not available in the categories requested. It is not practicable to supply the number of rental applications listed by each departmental office throughout Queensland. As an alternative, the honourable member could request information on particular areas of interest.

At 30 July 1985, there were 8 788 rental applications, the details of which are—

	Metropolitan	Country	Total
Families	1 303	1 834	3 137
Single parents	2 468	2 107	4 575
Pensioners—			
Single	329	483	812
Couple	80	184	264
	4 180	4 608	8 788

Only 32 per cent of applicants for houses and apartments have a priority assessment. The remainder are considered to be satisfactorily housed. In the metropolitan area, if an applicant is prepared to accept housing where the commission has sufficient housing, accommodation can be offered almost immediately.

Queensland is the only Australian State with falling housing wait-list numbers. Since July 1984, they have fallen by 14 per cent from 10 200 to 8 788. Numbers are now below the June 1982 figure. There is every indication that the downward trend will continue. This is clear evidence of the success of the housing policies of this Government and undeniably establishes Queensland in the forefront of public housing in Australia.

2. Electricity Industry Dispute

Mr HENDERSON asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

With reference to industrial relations issues—

(1) Has he read daily of the so-called plight of “sacked” SEQEB workers?

(2) Has he ever read in the press, however, any reports of the two Federal Government inquiries titled (a) *The National Road Freight Industry Inquiry* and (b) the *Inquiry into Australia's Industrial Relations Law and Systems* and, if not, could one perhaps safely conclude that the media seem to be uninterested in those two nationally important inquiries?

(3) Has public attention been drawn to the plight of 43 owner-drivers whose businesses in Queensland have been totally destroyed by ACTU-affiliated unions, which have flatly refused to abide by a Federal Court decision delivered by Mr Justice Northrop?

(4) Has his attention been drawn to the plight of 76 parents and 161 Queensland children who are now receiving Government hand-outs after losing approximately \$15m

in business and property as a direct result of union thuggery and criminal action by ACTU-affiliated unions?

(5) Is he aware of press comments by Transport Workers Union of Australia officials to the effect that they would deliberately crush owner-drivers despite Mr Justice Northrop's decision and is this a clear example of union contempt for our system of justice?

(6) Has the Hawke socialist, centralist, union-dominated Government refused to act on complaints against those unions and, if so, what is the reason?

Answer—

(1) Yes. There have been frequent articles in the daily press concerning the situation of an inflated number of former employees of SEQEB. Most of these stories do not acknowledge the fact that these people, in failing to return to work when directed, voluntarily terminated their employment with SEQEB. It is a shame that these former employees so blindly followed the misguided directions of those irresponsible trade union leaders who caused the dispute in February this year.

(2) Naturally, given my responsibilities, I am aware of (a) *The National Road Freight Industry Inquiry* and (b) *The Inquiry Into Australian Industrial Relations Law and Systems*—the Hancock report.

Both of these inquiries concern owner-drivers and independent contractors. Although the National Road Freight Industry Inquiry made no recommendations on this vital industrial relations matter, the Hancock report recommended that—

The Federal tribunal should have jurisdiction to determine disputes involving persons who are “quasi-employees”; that is, persons who contract for service of their labour only or for the provision of labour and equipment if they are in all other respects employees.

The Federal arbitration legislation be examined to ensure that it provides a remedy for genuine independent contractors.

The recommendation is being closely examined. Many of these people are not employees. They are self-employed and should be allowed to conduct their affairs free from the interference of the unions and the Federal Government.

(3 & 4) The public should be vitally concerned about the refusal of the Transport Workers Union to abide by the 1981 decision of Mr Justice Northrop. That decision indicated that persons who were not employees are not eligible to become members of employee organisations.

Despite this judgment, self-employed owner-drivers have been subjected to boycotts, black bans and intimidation aimed either at coercing them to join the Transport Workers Union or, alternatively, to prevent them from securing contracts and so ruining their livelihood and their families' future.

My attention has been drawn to the effect, on Queensland owner-drivers and their families, of this union action, which also contravenes Federal arbitration legislation as well as the Federal Trade Practices Act.

(5) I am not directly aware of such comments by TWU officials, but I would not be surprised if they said the comments attributed to them by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt. If these remarks have been made, they would merely confirm the disdain for the law that is regularly demonstrated not only by the TWU but also by some other trade union officials, as in the current Mudginberri dispute in the Northern Territory. Hopefully, though, the progress of this to date will encourage a greater respect for the law by some unions. That will certainly happen when they have to pay the fines that have been thrust upon them.

(6) The Federal Government has taken no action to prevent such irresponsible and illegal action by the TWU. The only reason that I am able to suggest for this is that it is yet another example of the controlling influence of the ACTU and its affiliates over

the present Federal Labor Government. The Federal Government stood idly by while the ACTU organised a blockade of Queensland, which was a flagrant breach of Commonwealth law. It stood by in the Mudginberri dispute, and continues to stand by and do nothing while all sorts of impositions are thrust upon the innocent public of Queensland and the nation.

3. Credit-betting Activities of Sir Edward Lyons

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

With reference to an article appearing in *The Courier-Mail* on 5 September headed “7 TAB Board men got legal advice on Lyons Betting” and to the fact that there is no doubt, in the light of remarks made by him following the TAB meeting that recommended the removal of the chairman, Sir Edward Lyons, that he was privy to the contents of the legal opinion given by Mr C. E. K. Hampson, QC, which opinion, as he is well aware, contains information and opinions that must be viewed as very serious—

(1) Why has not he, as the Minister for Racing, initiated action for a police investigation, which should have occurred immediately the legal opinion was made known to him in April 1985?

(2) If it was his intention to initiate appropriate action against any person or persons who acted improperly and/or illegally, what prevented him from proceeding as was his duty to do so?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The meeting of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland which recommended the dismissal of the then chairman (Sir Edward Lyons) was held on 22 April 1985. If the honourable member had read the opinion given independently to seven members of the board by Mr C. E. K. Hampson, QC, which he tabled in this House, he would have seen that it was dated on 26 April 1985. Obviously, I could not have been privy to that opinion four days before it was even written.

If the honourable member had taken the trouble to read Mr Hampson’s opinion, he would realise that one of the questions on which Mr Hampson was asked to advise was the standing of the conclusions reached by board members in making their recommendation.

The records show that Sir Edward Lyons resigned as chairman of the Totalisator Administration Board on 29 April 1985.

Although it is true that about that time I became aware of Mr Hampson’s opinion, I decided that the pursuit of the matter further at that stage would have implicated a number of board officers and staff who, I considered, did not deserve that additional burden of worry. In any event, as pointed out by the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General in the House on Thursday, 5 September 1985, legal advice given to the Crown at that stage placed doubts on the likely success of any proceedings that might have been implemented.

4. Credit-betting Activities of Sir Edward Lyons

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

With reference to the tabled legal opinion by Mr C. E. K. Hampson, QC, regarding the credit-betting activities of former Totalisator Administration Board chairman, Sir Edward Lyons, and as this opinion indicates that a *prima facie* case exists against Sir Edward in relation to an offence under section 427 (2) of the Criminal Code—

Will he now forward a copy of the opinion to the Commissioner of Police requesting that Sir Edward Lyons, the general manager of the TAB and other relevant witnesses be questioned with a view to establishing whether a charge or charges should be laid?

Answer—

It is quite incorrect to state that the legal opinion by Mr Cedric Hampson, QC, regarding the credit-betting activities of the former TAB chairman (Sir Edward Lyons) indicates that a prima facie case exists against Sir Edward in relation to an offence under section 427 (2) of the Criminal Code. Mr Hampson's opinion said only that, if there were evidence that Sir Edward had obtained credit by inducing an employee of the TAB to believe that the board had approved his credit, it might be possible to establish such an offence. Mr Hampson went on to say that it was possible that no inducement was offered by the chairman. In such case, there would be no offence.

5. Franchising Arrangements, South Coast Dairy

Mrs CHAPMAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Is he aware of an article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* of 4 September headed "South Coast Dairy In Pay Offs, Claims MP", which relates to certain uninformed and misleading allegations in this House by the honourable member for Archerfield, Mr Henry Palaszczuk, in which he also alleged milk quota stripping and greedy anti-free enterprise franchising arrangements and that the Gold Coast Dairy has failed to pay up to \$1m in dairy levies to the Federal Government?

(2) If he is aware of the article and the outrageous statements by the honourable member for Archerfield, will he advise the House of the correct situation?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I thank the honourable member for Pine Rivers for raising this matter. I recall the misinformed and fallacious statements made by the honourable member for Archerfield in this House on 3 September 1985.

My Government has been aware for the past seven to eight years that Queensland dairy-farmers should be in a position to operate their properties in a commercial manner to enable them to meet the substantial economic problems confronting their industry. These problems have been severely aggravated by the over-production that has been allowed to develop in Victoria as a result of the policies adopted by the Government of that State and its producers.

In contrast, the Queensland Government has, over this period, rationalised the Queensland dairy industry to ensure the continuing viability of remaining dairy-farmers and a reliable supply of fresh dairy product of high quality to our consumers. As part of this rationalisation, the Milk Entitlements Committee, through its operations, has redistributed over 30 per cent of the south-east Queensland market milk sales in order to achieve a progressively more equitable situation amongst producers. This redistribution has clearly provided substantial benefits to previously disadvantaged producers.

As honourable members would be aware, charges made by the member for Archerfield in respect of alleged misdealings in dairy transactions were completely discounted by my predecessor, the Honourable Mike Ahern. All dairy farm transactions from standard walk-in, walk-out sales through to various forms of property amalgamations have been thoroughly checked by my department and the Milk Entitlements Committee. The formal legal advice obtained in relation to these transactions involving amalgamations has been, and remains, that they are commercially and legally valid.

The Honourable Mike Ahern previously introduced into the Milk Supply Act provisions to allow a producer to divert his market supply from one association to another association with the restriction that the producer could divert only 50 per cent of his market milk access. Very few producers were able to transfer their milk supply access under these arrangements, and I introduced, by regulation, the option from 1 July 1985 of 100 per cent transferability under certain specified conditions to allow producers to obtain the maximum return for their product. 100 per cent transferability has the overwhelming support of producers through the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation.

However, in practical terms it is clear that producers will avail themselves of 100 per cent transferability only where they are substantially disadvantaged by remaining within their existing processor association. Evidence analysed by my department revealed that in certain instances disadvantaged producers have been incurring annual losses of between \$4,000 and \$40,000.

On 9 September, I took the further initiative of introducing into Cabinet a concept for establishing negotiability of market milk access between producers within a processor association. This concept will allow producers to deal with their market milk access in a more commercial manner and will bring substantial benefits to south-east Queensland producers in the middle and lower market milk access ranges.

I will introduce legislation into this current session of Parliament to establish and implement the proposed negotiability arrangements. In the meantime, under the powers of the Dairy Produce Act, I have imposed, on and as from 9 September 1985, a freeze on those dairy property transactions which intend to apply the principle of amalgamation of the operations. This freeze will apply until the new legislation has been enacted and its detailed implementation finalised and put into effect by the Milk Entitlements Committee.

I will now deal specifically with the misleading and non-factual statements presented to the House on 3 September by the honourable member for Archerfield. It would interest the member for Archerfield to know that the franchise system for market milk in this State, of which he is so critical, was introduced by a Labor Government in the 1940s.

In 1975, the Logan and Albert Co-operative and Gold Coast Milk entered into an agreement and formed a proprietary company, Beaudesert Milk Pty Limited. QUF Industries Limited and Gold Coast Milk Pty Limited supplied packaged milk to the town of Beaudesert up until that time. A franchise was granted in 1975 to Beaudesert Milk Pty Limited for distribution of packaged milk in the Beaudesert shire.

To argue that the Beaudesert plant should be allowed to sell packaged milk in the Brisbane and Gold Coast markets is nonsense. If all country suppliers of milk to Brisbane were given this right, we would have up to 10 brands of milk on the market and 10 different depot and distribution systems to support them.

The member for Archerfield appears to be critical of the fact that QUF can offer a reasonable price for milk to producers. At this juncture, I might ask what price the Logan and Albert Co-operative is currently paying its producers for market milk.

I understand that, out of a total of 57 producers currently supplying milk to the Logan and Albert Co-operative, about 30 producers have indicated they wish to transfer their supply on 1 October to another processor. The obvious reason for these transfers is a better financial return. In fact, some figures presented to me indicated that producers would, on last year's figures, receive approximately \$18,000 per year more income for the same amount of milk.

The prime concern of this Government must be the financial return received by producers, irrespective of whether the processor involved is a co-operative or a proprietary company. Self-aggrandisement by certain people with vested interests in keeping their seats on boards is not the main concern of this Government. The main concern of this Government is to maximise the financial returns of dairy-farmers in this State.

I might add that the opening 1985-86 manufacturing milk returns in Queensland will be about \$3 to \$3.30 per kilogram of butterfat compared with the opening rate in Victoria of about \$2.30 to \$2.40 per kilogram of butterfat. If the Federal Labor Government scheme for national marketing arrangements was introduced, the returns to producers in this country, and particularly in Victoria, would be further diminished.

As to the statement that 20 families in Beaudesert would join the unemployment queues—the amalgamation offer made by the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association

to Logan and Albert Co-operative was that management and staff of Logan and Albert Co-operative would be placed in employment with the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association either at Southport or Beaudesert or in Brisbane. To this end, an amalgamation for the betterment of returns to producers would also ensure that the current Logan and Albert Co-operative employees continue in their employment.

The member for Archerfield would achieve benefits for the Queensland dairy industry if he spent his energies on having the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) relinquish his efforts in bulldozing through the Senate the Federal Labor Party's requirements for the Australian dairy industry. If Mr Kerin introduces his destructive policies into the industry, the Queensland dairy industry will be brought to its knees, as has already been the case through Labor's policies applying in the Victorian dairy industry.

6. Taxation of Rural Sector

Mr LINGARD asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to an undertaking given by the Prime Minister at the farmers rally in July that the Federal Government would put together a package that would reduce the cost impact, on farmers, of fuel costs, and to the comments made in Cairns on 9 July by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry that the undertaking no longer applied—

In view of this total sell-out of the rural sector by Prime Minister Hawke and Treasurer Keating, will he make the strongest possible protest to Canberra and will he actively encourage moves by the National Farmers Federation to force a better tax deal for the rural sector?

Answer—

The Hawke Labor Government has been selling out the rural sector since its election on 5 March 1983. Labor promised to reduce petrol by 3 cents. Instead, the price of petrol has increased by 13 cents.

The removal of the excise on diesel fuel in the August 1985 Federal Budget was merely a move to give back to primary producers one concession out of the 40 adverse budgetary decisions it has made against the rural community since coming to office. This was not a fulfilment of a promise at the farmers' rally. It must be remembered that in the May mini-Budget, the price of petrol increased by 4 cents when the \$116m petroleum products freight subsidy scheme was abolished.

Indeed, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) made it crystal clear that primary producers can expect no help from Labor with farm fuel prices. This was said in the full knowledge of the fact that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has estimated that farm costs will rise by 6 per cent in 1985-86.

The National Farmers Federation is supporting Queensland's proposals for a single rate tax because the rural sector will get a fair deal—not more taxes such as Labor's capital gains tax.

The honourable member can be assured that I am making every effort to let Canberra know that its fuel and tax policies are wrong. These policies are going to lead to the end of the ALP Government in Canberra. Already we have witnessed the various factions fighting amongst themselves, and at the next Federal election the Australian people will let the ALP know exactly what they think of a faction-ridden party by throwing it out of office.

7. Federal Government Approval of Nursing Homes

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to a recent application by the Wongaburra nursing home at Beaudesert requesting approval to build extra facilities for those people who require aged nursing

care, as this approval was refused by Dr Blewett because, and I quote: "The area is already served by sufficient nursing homes", because the Wongaburra nursing home has a long waiting-list and because it is obvious that the Federal Government is using this as an excuse—

Has the Federal Government approved any new nursing homes in Queensland since it won Government?

Answer—

Approvals that have been issued have been in respect of nursing homes for which an approval in principle existed prior to the current Federal Government winning office. No approvals in principle have been issued for additional new nursing homes over that time.

A Government Member: That is a disgrace.

Mr AUSTIN: As one of my colleagues said, that is a disgrace.

Mr McElligott interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: It is interesting to hear the interjection from the honourable member for Townsville. The State Government has viewed the nursing home issue so seriously that it has now pulled out of what is called the Commonwealth/State Co-ordinating Committee and has refused to take part in that committee—

Mr McElligott: That is typical.

Mr AUSTIN:—until some positive initiatives are shown by the Commonwealth Government.

I will take the interjection from the honourable member that it is typical. Is he aware that since the last election, not one new nursing home bed approval has been made in this State? I have received letters from Opposition members who have sought to have their constituents put into nursing homes. The honourable member has the audacity to say to me, "That's typical." What about the elderly and the infirm—the people in the community who write to the honourable member every day seeking nursing—

Mr McElligott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this matter to be turned into a debate. I ask the Minister to continue with his answer.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr AUSTIN: Mr Speaker, I will endeavour not to turn the matter into a debate. I will simply ignore the interjections from the honourable members on the other side of the House.

Mr Prest interjected.

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

Answer (continued)—

In answer to the honourable member's question—honourable members will remember that prior to going to the people at the last election, the Federal Government had great difficulty with the nursing home question. To that end, it came up with the ingenious scheme of running advertisements in the paper asking the people to put in submissions, claiming that consensus and co-operation—I believe honourable members have heard those words before—and public input would be achieved. The public has made its input.

It was expected that new nursing beds would be approved and that additional nurses would be provided in the community, but nothing has happened.

Prior to the last Federal election, the Federal Government said that it would provide \$300m to compensate adequately for its lack of approvals of private nursing home beds in the community. When the last Federal Budget was announced, the \$300m had disappeared. The Federal Government announced that it would spend \$10m, not \$300m. The \$10m was announced not in the last Federal Budget but in the one before that.

I refer honourable members to a statement made by the Federal Minister for Community Services (Don Grimes) in his Budget papers.

Mr Price: You just happen to have them with you.

Mr AUSTIN: I just happen to have them with me. In fact, I always carry them with me.

Answer (continued)—

He said—

“In the 1984-85 Budget, the Government announced its intention to restructure support for Home and Community Care services for the aged and younger disabled. Funds allocated in this Budget will consolidate the initiatives in this area.

The Commonwealth contribution to the Program in 1985-86 consists of maintenance of the base level funding in real terms, which will involve funding of some \$82.45 million in 1985-86, plus an additional unmatched contribution of \$10 million which will be allocated to the States and Territories subject to acceptable progress in negotiations.”

That \$10m is the same \$10m that was allocated last year, and not one of the States has received 1c of that \$10m. It went from \$300m two years ago to \$10m last year, and the same \$10m is allocated this year. It is an absolute disgrace.

People in the community need nursing homes. As I said, honourable members opposite have written to me seeking to have people admitted to nursing homes. Only last week I received a letter from an ALP branch—and I will not name the branch because I do not want to embarrass honourable members opposite; if I am asked, I will table the letter—asking why there was such a disgraceful lack of nursing home beds in the community. It is fairly obvious that that branch of the ALP was attempting to attack the Queensland Government in the belief that it was the responsibility of the Queensland Government to approve nursing home beds. In fact, it is not a State responsibility; it is a responsibility of the Federal Government.

I will not name the particular ALP branch; its members would probably be attacked. I will take great delight in informing Senator Grimes of what State ALP members think of his policies.

I really feel sorry for the elderly in the community because of what this dreadful Federal Government has done to them.

8. Application by Junefair Pty Ltd for Totalisator Administration Board Subagency

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

With reference to his statement on 5 September and his denial when asked whether he attended a Totalisator Administration Board meeting to ask for the Oxenford TAB agency licence for his company Junefair Pty Ltd—

(1) Did he at any time attend a TAB meeting when the Oxenford TAB agency was discussed?

(2) If so, did he express the view that Junefair Pty Ltd should not be prejudiced in its application because of the connection between his family company and himself?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I have never, at a meeting of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland, expressed the view referred to in the honourable member's question.

9. Capital Gains Tax Proposed by Australian Democrats

Mr BAILEY asked the Premier and Treasurer—

What effects would the capital gains tax proposed by the Australian Democrats have on the economy?

Answer—

I thank the honourable member for his question, because all Queenslanders should be made aware of policies that are being adopted by the Australian Democrats that are very harmful to them and to their families. Senator Chipp has made it known that his party would support a capital gains tax if it is fair and equitable. How can it be? He has talked about an exemption for the family home and protection for small family farms and small family businesses. Can anyone put any trust in the Australian Democrats any more? That is the question I ask. No-one can continue to support them. They have let the nation down so often.

When the Commonwealth Government introduced its discriminatory legislation to assist the Electrical Trades Union to override this State's legislation, what did the Democrats do? They said that the legislation would have their support because they had secured undertakings from the Australian Council of Trade Unions in relation to cessation of union industrial action. What nonsense!

The industrial action initiated by militant union leaders, aided and abetted by their ACTU comrades, continued. What has Senator Chipp had to say about it? Nothing at all! Nothing about how he was deceived and had his leg pulled by the ACTU. Obviously, he is a simple soul who can easily be hoodwinked.

Now, when all of the High Court judges have held that major parts of the Commonwealth legislation were invalid, has Senator Chipp said anything about his support and that of his party for the blatant attempt by the Federal Government to deny Queensland its rights under the Constitution? Not a single word has come from him.

Now Australia has a Commonwealth Government about to embark on another ill-conceived venture to placate the ACTU. In fact, the capital gains tax is being introduced because the ACTU has ordered it.

I remind honourable members of the words spoken by Mr Hawke at the Sydney Opera House in February 1983 at the launch of the ALP election campaign. This is what he said—

“And here let me make one point so that even our opponents can understand it, and let me make it beyond all their powers of misrepresentation and distortion.

There will be no new capital gains tax.”

So said Mr Hawke. Of course, that was long before the ACTU gave him its instructions at a Canberra hotel in the middle of the night.

What is Senator Chipp now doing? He is giving his support to the ALP's capital gains tax proposal. He sees nothing wrong in it. He obviously sees nothing wrong in Mr Hawke's breaking another of his promises to the Australian people. He sees nothing wrong in the introduction of a tax that must have an enormously detrimental effect on this nation's economy and on employment. He sees nothing wrong in free enterprise once again being penalised and discouraged.

Just as this State led the way in the abolition of death duties, so it will fight the introduction of this iniquitous tax. I assure Senator Chipp that it is my intention to

ensure that all Queenslanders are informed of what the Australian Democrats are doing. When Senator Macklin next faces the electors, he will find out what the people of this State think of a person who has so readily given his support to ALP policies that are of such great disadvantage to our State and its people.

10. Governor's Remuneration

Mr WILSON asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to the remuneration entitlements of the Governor, Sir Walter Campbell—

In addition to the payment of the Governor's salary of \$74,000 tax free, which is equivalent to a normal salary of \$160,000, is the Governor, Sir Walter Campbell, entitled to receive his judicial pension of approximately \$60,000 per annum, taking his remuneration package to the equivalent of \$220,000 per annum, or is section 17 of the Judges' Pensions Act 1957-1985 interpreted to mean that the office of Governor is also a judicial office and that, while Sir Walter Campbell remains in that office, he shall not be entitled to receive his judicial pension in addition to his Governor's salary?

Answer—

Queenslanders have become used to the ALP, in its constant efforts to downgrade the monarchy in the eyes of the people of Queensland, offering criticisms of our vice-regal representatives at every possible opportunity. It even seems to be the policy these days for the ALP to boycott functions associated with the Governor. In typical fashion, it has now turned attention to the remuneration of the Governor.

I inform the House that the Governor of Queensland earns every cent that he is paid. I certainly cannot say the same thing about all honourable members opposite. All we ever hear from them is criticism and negative thinking. I consider it a great pity that the ALP members of this House have not seen fit to put Queensland first and to criticise their Canberra colleagues for the treatment this State has received. When they do, there might then be some justification for their receiving the salary they are paid.

The position of Governor of Queensland is not a judicial office; nor is section 17 of the Judges' Pensions Act 1957-1984 interpreted to mean that it is a judicial office. Since he resigned as Chief Justice of Queensland in July this year, Sir Walter Campbell has been paid the pension to which he is entitled under the Judges' Pensions Act 1957-1984.

11. Proposed Merger of Building Societies

Mr WILSON asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Is he aware that the Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Benefit Building and Investment Society and the Metropolitan Permanent Building Society have announced that the two societies propose to merge?

(2) Is he aware that the SGIO Building Society is trying to disrupt the merger by: (a) hiring an Ipswich and West Moreton Building Society executive immediately after the plan was announced and having him criticise the merger proposal in *The Queensland Times* newspaper, (b) having this executive approach and hire other Ipswich and West Moreton staff, thereby posing service problems to the public, (c) making public comments through the SGIO Building Society general manager, Mr A. Goldsworthy, in *The Queensland Times*, designed to damage the merger prospects, and (d) having an SGIO Building Society staff member, D. Cuskelly, from its Townsville office, publish a letter in *The Queensland Times* criticising the merger proposal?

(3) What action will he take to investigate whether the SGIO Building Society is supporting financially, materially or personally an Ipswich opposition group known as "Save our Society"?

(4) Why is the Queensland Government, a so-called free enterprise Government, allowing one of its quasi-government institutions to interfere in a normal business

arrangement, which is subject, in the final course of events, to agreement by members of the Ipswich and West Moreton building society?

(5) As the SGIO Building Society itself is successor to the operations of other building societies, will he remind Parliament of the names of these other societies?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) I have not inquired about the attitude of the SGIO Building Society to the proposed transfer of engagements from Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Benefit Building and Investment Society to Metropolitan Permanent Building Society. I am aware that the SGIO Building Society has employed Mr Peter Venning, former marketing manager of Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Benefit Building and Investment Society. Officially, I have no knowledge of the terms or functions of his appointment. Public comments by any person in relation to the proposed transfer of engagements are matters for the individuals concerned.

(3 & 4) The matter of whether or not the SGIO Building Society is supporting the group known as "Save our Society" is one for its board, not one for the Government.

(5) The SGIO Building Society was registered on 10 May 1976, and subsequently received transfers of various engagements from the following societies—

Family Permanent Building and Bowkett Society;
Trade Union Building Society (Permanent and Bowkett);
Tasman Building Society (Permanent and Bowkett);
Town and Country Permanent Building Society;
Commonwealth Public Service Permanent Building Society;
Queensland Permanent Building Society;
City Savings Permanent Building Society; and
Great Australian Permanent Building Society.

12. Taxation of Rural Sector

Mr STONEMAN asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to the superficial about-face by Federal Primary Industry Minister, Mr Kerin, on the question of a capital gains tax—

Is Mr Kerin only trying to restore some of his lost credibility in the rural sector?

Answer—

In a previous answer this morning, I commented on the Australian Democrats' support for a capital gains tax and I drew attention to Mr Hawke's statement in February 1983 that the Australian Labor Party would not introduce such a tax.

The Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) is reported to be opposed to a capital gains tax if it clearly disadvantaged the rural sector. Mr Kerin cannot have it both ways. As a member of the Federal Cabinet, he has to accept responsibility for the introduction of any capital gains tax measures.

If he does not believe in it, why is he supporting it? The answer very simply is that he knows full well if he does not support it he will not only be out of the Cabinet but he will also lose endorsement for his seat at the next election. He knows, too, that the Australian Council of Trade Unions cannot be opposed.

For Mr Kerin to talk about rural problems and his concern for farmers, if a capital gains tax is introduced, is one of the most hypocritical statements to have ever come from a Federal Labor Minister. That man—and his party, too—advocates one vote, one value in an attempt to eliminate many of the seats in the country area. The party he

belongs to supports such a tax. The ACTU has directed the Hawke Government to introduce it and the Government, of which he is a Cabinet Minister, supports a capital gains tax.

The rural sector knows full well what to expect from Mr Kerin. Since his appointment as Minister for Primary Industry, the primary producers of this country have had 40 major concessions withdrawn.

Mr Kerin supports an ALP policy of one vote, one value, which, if applied to Queensland, would see seven electorates taken from northern and western Queensland and placed in the south east of the State. What a sell-out of the people of the north and of rural areas of our State.

Any goodwill Mr Kerin had with primary producers was lost long ago. His recent statement on his opposition to a capital gains tax will be treated with the contempt it deserves.

13. Export of Live Sheep

Mr STONEMAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the concern expressed by thousands of primary producers at the suggestion of the Labor Party's Senator Georges that the export of live sheep, which is worth \$200m to producers each year, should end in about seven years' time—

Is this in fact a possibility?

Answer—

I understand that the Senate Select Committee on Animal Welfare, of which Senator G. Georges of the Australian Labor Party was chairman, concluded that, if a decision were to be made on the future of the live-sheep trade purely on animal welfare grounds, there was enough evidence to stop the trade. However, I believe that the committee also agreed that animal welfare aspects could not be divorced from economic and other considerations.

It was apparently on these grounds that the committee proposed that the trade continue for some years, provided that significant improvements were made in respect of animal welfare aspects.

I also understand that the committee considered that the substitution of a refrigerated sheep meat trade for the live-sheep trade may offer a longer-term solution.

It is interesting to note that the National Farmers Federation and the Federal Opposition, along with almost every other grazier organisation throughout Australia, have been highly critical of the remarks of Senator Georges.

Although Queensland's export trade in live sheep is relatively small, the trade is of considerable importance to some other States, and any attempt to stop or curtail this trade would cause serious economic loss to the sheep industry in those States.

One cannot, of course, predict what the present Labor Government in Canberra is likely to do on this issue, but I would expect and will demand that the whole question be thoroughly discussed by the Australian Agricultural Council before any action is taken.

14. Queensland Public Debt

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

(1) What is the total debt, both domestic and overseas, of the Queensland Government and its statutory authorities as at 30 June?

(2) What is the total amount borrowed by each Government department or statutory body?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Full details of the information sought by the honourable member are available in either the Budget document titled *Summary Tables Relating to the Public Accounts 1985-86* and/or the Auditor-General's Report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts for the financial year ended 30 June 1985, which was presented to Parliament today.

15. Applications for Land and Areas Over Water, Mourilyan Harbour

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

What are the number and names of applicants for land or areas over water, in, over, or around Mourilyan Harbour for (a) oyster leases, (b) fish or prawn farm leases and (c) other businesses or tourist projects?

Answer—

(a) The granting of oyster leases is a matter for the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner), and I would suggest that the honourable member direct that part of his question to that Minister.

(b) An application has been received from a firm trading under the name of Sea Hatcheries for the lease of approximately one hectare of land above and below high water in Mourilyan Harbour for the purpose of establishing a marine hatchery and fish-farming enterprise.

(c) A lease has been issued by the Harbours Corporation over an area in Mourilyan Harbour to a firm trading under the name of Nimrod Marine for the purpose of a marine laboratory and related facilities including the operation of a charter boat. An application has been made by a firm trading as Mourilyan Oyster Farm for the lease of approximately one hectare of land in Mourilyan Harbour for the preparation of oysters for market.

The two applications have only recently been received and are under consideration.

Mr EATON: I redirect the relevant part of the question to the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner).

16. Trailer Couplings

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Following the failure of two pig-trailer coupling shafts, one with fatal consequences, what action has his department taken in regard to this problem?

(2) Will he assure the House and the people of Queensland that he will continue to direct his departmental officers to check such trailer couplings to ensure that no fly-by-night operators are short-cutting in respect of design, materials or application in this most crucial area of safety?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I firstly emphasise that the Government views most seriously the danger that faulty trailer couplings represent to the motoring public and, in recognition of this danger, has acted promptly to determine the extent of the problem.

Detailed metallurgical and physical tests carried out on the drawbar eye from the pig-type trailer involved in the recent fatal accident on the Sunshine Coast revealed that the failure of the drawbar eye was caused by the presence of a large fatigue fracture, which grew to a critical size under the prevailing stress conditions.

The component was designed and constructed to the required national standards, but it was overextended at the time of the accident.

When my colleague the Minister initiated these tests, he also called a meeting of Department of Transport technical officers and representatives of the transport industry, trailer-manufacturers and coupling-makers, to provide the Government with a practical understanding of the issue and also to recommend strategies which may be implemented to overcome the problem.

It was the general consensus of the meeting delegates that the use of automatic pin-type couplings to connect pig-trailers with rigid drawbars could be hazardous, especially if the trailers were loaded incorrectly and the couplings or drawbars were faulty. They did stress, however, that the problem was restricted to a small percentage of trailers and did not apply to the standard semi-trailer combinations seen most frequently on the roads each day.

On evaluating the conclusions made at the meeting, the Government immediately announced that transport operators using pig-trailers with a rigid drawbar and using an automatic pin-type coupling must have them fitted with two safety chains.

A comprehensive information bulletin explaining the chain fitment requirements has been distributed, throughout the transport industry, by the Department of Transport and is available at every metropolitan and regional office of the department.

In the event of another coupling failure, the chains will provide directional stability and keep the trailer in line with the towing unit. The Transport Department is also examining the availability of a suitable coupling connection for rigid drawbar pig-trailers to replace the automatic pin type.

As a detection measure, transport inspectors have been instructed to pay particular attention to drawbar eyes and couplings during daily inspections and road patrols. Dye-testing kits, which detect evidence of initial cracking, have been supplied to the inspectors to assist in the detection process. In the last month, 27 trailers have been put off the road pending repair to faulty drawbars or couplings.

Honourable members would realise that this problem is not restricted to Queensland and, as such, the results of the metallurgical tests and departmental investigations will form the basis of a submission from Queensland to the next meeting of the Vehicle Standards Advisory Committee. The submission will seek a national policy on the trailer couplings.

Locally, however, in conjunction with the chain requirement and increased surveillance measures, an extensive media publicity campaign is being launched to warn transport operators of the danger of excessive and unbalanced loadings on trailers.

I am sure that honourable members will agree with the actions of the Government in this matter and would recognise that every effort has been made to identify and solve the problem.

17. Flat-rate Taxation

Mr MILLINER asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to his proposal for a 25 per cent flat rate of income tax as submitted to the recent tax summit—

(1) Is he aware that economists have estimated that tax-payers without dependants and on incomes between \$4,600 and \$21,000 would be losers and that the increase in tax would be as much as \$7.55 per week in the range \$12,500 to \$19,500 per annum under this proposal?

(2) Will tax-payers without dependants on high incomes enjoy substantial reductions in tax, for example, \$150 per week reduction at \$50,000, and will tax-payers with a dependant spouse and children at incomes up to \$28,000 pay more tax than at present, with the maximum detriment of \$19 per week occurring at around \$19,500?

(3) Is he also aware that 60 per cent of tax-payers are on incomes below the average weekly earnings level of around \$22,000 per annum and, as a consequence, the vast

majority of tax-payers, at least 3.9 million of them, would be worse off under his proposal than at present?

(4) As the proposal submitted by himself and a southern academic means that pensioners and others would pay tax and that 60 per cent of Australians would pay additional tax, why is he proposing such an unfair and unjust tax system and why did he oppose tax reform at the recent tax summit?

Answer—

(1 to 4) It is clear that the honourable member either has not properly understood or has deliberately misrepresented, for his own political purposes, the proposal that I presented to the national taxation summit in July.

For his information, I point out that the key points of my proposal are—

a single rate of tax on all income, set initially at 25 per cent;

introduction of a special rebate of \$1,150 to compensate for the loss of the tax-free threshold, with the rebate tapering to nil in the income range of \$25,000 to \$30,000;

Mr Burns: You would slug pensioners and people on the dole so you can get cheaper tax.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Just listen!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, the honourable member is beside himself with ignorance. He should not show how ignorant he is. I have some respect for him, so he should not make it worse.

Answer (continued)—

existing rebates (except the rebate for concessional expenditure) to be maintained but with all except the zone allowance to cut out at the same income level as the special rebate;

a tax reduction of \$5 per week paid as an additional rebate, and cutting out at the same level as the special rebate;

a \$5 per week increase in all Social Security Department benefits; and

exemption of Social Security pensions from income tax, thus alleviating an existing poverty trap.

Mr Burns: This is a simple scheme?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is simple. It is so simple that the simple Opposition members cannot understand it.

Mr Burns: You simply cannot understand it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am trying to go into a little more detail so that the honourable member can understand.

Mr Burns: You said it would be simple.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Today, the honourable member for Lytton has made some pretty ordinary interjections.

Mr Burns: Pretty simple ones.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, very simple ones. I cannot allow the honourable member to interject any longer. I warn him.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Perhaps the honourable member could understand the proposal better if I pointed out to him that if he earned 10 times what I earned, he would pay 10 times more tax. Those on the lower level would be better off, not worse off. If I put it as simply as that, perhaps the honourable member can understand it.

Answer (continued)—

Contrary to what is suggested in the honourable member's question, my proposal offers significant benefits to lower-income-earners. Indeed, all tax-payers, except tax-dodgers, would benefit under my tax reform proposal.

These benefits are possible because of the expansion of the tax base, which would occur with a single rate of tax. Additional tax revenue would be generated by the substantial reduction in tax avoidance and evasion, and by the once-off boost to economic growth, which academic research has suggested could be as high as 10 per cent.

The single rate tax system was the only proposal presented to the tax summit that would achieve genuine tax reform, because it would significantly reduce marginal tax rates, thereby—

striking at the root cause of tax avoidance and evasion; and

providing the necessary incentive and rewards for increased effort.

Moreover, it is the only proposal which offers substantial tax reductions to all honest tax-payers. The Commonwealth Government has not yet been able to come up with a proposal which offers such benefits, and it is unlikely to be able to do so unless it adopts a single rate tax system. I tried to educate them in Canberra, too, but again they could not be educated.

It is clear that members of the ALP at both a State and Federal level are deliberately attempting to distort the realities of a single rate tax. There is no doubt that their failure to come to grips with tax reform will lead to the demise of the Hawke Government.

Mr Warburton: Will you hold hands with Stone when you fall over the edge?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that that remark is irrelevant.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Opposition Members are experts at falling over the edge.

Answer (continued)—

Only yesterday, the paper presented by the former head of Treasury (Mr John Stone) gave confirmation even to the ALP economic dimwits opposite that a single rate tax of 25 per cent can be achieved and that options can be adopted to pay compensation to ensure that there are no losers under the system in the areas of concern.

There are attractive elements in my proposal to the tax summit and in the similar proposal advanced by Mr Stone yesterday. A combination of these could well form the basis of a tax platform that will sweep the coalition to government at the next election.

As I have said, the system can ensure there are no losers in the areas of concern, and the only real losers will be those who have tried to avoid tax in the past.

Opposition members know that we are on a winner with this one, and they are worried. I can understand that. Labor Party members in Canberra are heading for oblivion. They just cannot continue with their present basis of operation.

18. Committee Meetings, Pine Rivers Shire Council

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

(1) Who are the members on the health, building and town-planning committees of the Pine Rivers Shire Council?

(2) How many meetings have the health, building and town-planning committees held since the last council elections?

(3) What are the attendance times of each councillor for each of the meetings?

(4) What attendance fee is paid to councillors for attending committee meetings?

(5) Is the meeting fee paid to councillors irrespective of the length of time the councillor attends the meeting?

Answer—

(1 to 5) The information required to answer the honourable member's question is not available from records held by the department. To ascertain the information, I have sought representations from the Pine Rivers Shire Council, and I will advise the honourable member by letter as soon as the representations are to hand.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

19. Financial Assistance to Sugar Industry

Mr SIMPSON asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the statement of the Federal ALP Primary Industry Minister, Mr Kerin, that cane-farmers must be reduced in number, that they will not get any monetary assistance without first agreeing to the 100-day report recommendations, and that they will receive nothing before June 1986—

(1) Is he aware that growers want assistance immediately to pay for fuel and fertiliser for planting cane and ratoons for next year's crop and that Mr Kerin and the Federal Government do not support the industry's request for a minimum support scheme of \$240 per tonne?

(2) Will he explain the previous and on-going assistance by the Queensland National Party Government, both financial and otherwise, to this great Australian sugar industry, which is worth several billion dollars to Australia?

Answer—

(1) In this year's State Budget, the Queensland Government has recognised the need for immediate assistance to cane-growers to ensure the planting of next year's crop; \$20m has been made available in the Budget to provide loans to assist growers unable to meet expenses associated with planting and harvesting. Finance will be provided on the best possible terms and conditions, with concessional interest starting at round a quarter of normal rates.

Discussions with the Federal Government regarding a minimum price support scheme will continue, and I shall be pressing Mr Kerin to raise the level of support above the inadequate amount of \$220 per tonne in the first year, which is currently being suggested.

The provision of price support for the sugar industry should be met by the Federal Government in the same way as for other industries such as the steel and motor vehicle industries. The Federal Government receives approximately \$70m annually from excise on sugar products, in particular rum, and it should be putting this money back into the industry to assist it through these difficult times.

(2) Over the last few years, the Queensland Government has been able, to the extent possible within the tight budgeting limitations, to provide direct financial assistance to the sugar industry.

Assistance provided by the Queensland Government to the sugar industry over the last two years includes—

Since 1982-83, \$35.5m has been advanced by the Rural Reconstruction Board in loan assistance to cane-growers in financial difficulties. Carry-on finance and debt-reconstruction finance have been the most important avenues of assistance, at \$12.7m and \$21m respectively;

\$17.65m has been provided in carry-on assistance from the Agricultural Bank, with a further \$8m for assistance for drought purposes, and \$869,000 for flood assistance;

\$10m has been provided by way of special Treasury loans to six co-operative sugar-mills to assist with increased debt-servicing commitments;

\$175,000 has been provided to assist the sugar industry associations to conduct their sugar industry review program;

\$716,000 has been provided to assist the Sugar Board to undertake additional borrowing in order that the delivery advance to growers for the 1984 season could be increased from \$160 per tonne to not more than \$180 per tonne of sugar;

\$2m has been provided by way of equity contribution to a joint venture with Queensland Science and Technology Limited to establish a pilot scheme for the production of ethanol from cane juice; and

\$2.025m has been provided, over the period 1982-83 to 1984-85, towards the costs of the Sugar Experiment Stations Board.

In addition to this direct industry aid, other assistance has been provided in the form of rail freight subsidies, Government guarantees, and irrigation and drainage assistance.

20. Estimated Pay-roll Tax Collections from Sugar Industry

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

With reference to State Government pay-roll tax collections from the sugar industry—

What is the estimated total pay-roll tax collection for 1984-85 for (a) all Queensland sugar-mills, (b) all companies which have substantial interests in either sugar production or processing and (c) as an indicator of pay-roll tax collections from a sugar-dependent region, the Mackay statistical division?

Answer—

(a) \$7,900,124. That is the amount of pay-roll tax that Queensland received. The amount of excise received by the Federal Government from the rum industry in Bundaberg was \$62m.

(b) It is not clear from the honourable member's question what constitutes a substantial interest. If he wishes to specify the precise companies involved, I will endeavour to obtain the information in aggregate and reply.

(c) Details of pay-roll tax collections are not maintained on the basis of statistical regions.

21. Alleged Breaches by Sir Edward Lyons of Totalisator Administration Board Legislation

Mr LEE asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

With reference to the statement on 5 September by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing that he is transmitting to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General an opinion by Mr C. E. K. Hampson, QC, together with relevant documents for a legal opinion—

What is the opinion of his legal advisers, not as to breaches of the Criminal Code, but as to the number and type of any breaches of the statutory rules made under the

Racing and Betting Act, or breaches of the principal Act or of any fiduciary or statutory duty that Sir Edward Lyons owed to the Totalisator Administration Board?

Answer—

I am aware of the contents of the opinion of Mr Hampson, QC. Honourable members may recall that I have never indicated that there had not been contraventions of the rules of betting with the TAB. However, as these were only rules of contract, failure to comply with them did not constitute an offence against the Racing and Betting Act.

Advice that I have received does not disagree with Mr Hampson's analysis of the fiduciary duty of a person holding a position on a statutory board.

I take this opportunity to point out that media reports suggesting that there is a difference of opinion between Mr Hampson and my advice as to whether there was evidence of an offence against the Criminal Code by obtaining credit by false pretences are inaccurate. Mr Hampson's opinion clearly points out that, if there were no evidence of the chairman of the board making a false pretence, there would be no offence. The material available to my officers, which included some material not available to Mr Hampson, did not disclose any false pretence by the chairman. In the circumstances, there is no difference of opinion between Mr Hampson and the advice that I have received.

22. Railway Crossing, Yeerongpilly

Mr LEE asked the Minister for Transport—

With reference to my questions and his answers, in which he stated that the construction of a fly-over over the railway crossing at Yeerongpilly would commence prior to 30 June—

What progress has been made to date on this project?

Answer—

Negotiations between the Government departments concerned and the Brisbane City Council have been progressing and an acceptable scheme has been developed. Design work will now proceed for a road overpass structure over the three railway tracks crossing Fairfield Road, including access to Tennyson Memorial Avenue. The design work will be completed by December 1985, following which tenders will be called with a view to a commencement of work by March 1986 and completion in early 1987.

The honourable member will recall that the Brisbane Golf Club had expressed concern at the possible effect of that project on its premises. He will remember that, in company with the honourable member, the Minister and the Commissioner for Railways met with representatives of the Brisbane Golf Club in an endeavour to ensure minimal disruption to the club.

The importance of the project cannot be over-emphasised in relation to the elimination of this major point of congestion and frustration to motorists in that area.

23. Oxenford Property Owned by Hinze Family

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

In the period 1981-82 did he, or any Hinze family company, own any property in close proximity to the present site of the Oxenford Tavern, now owned by his family company?

Answer—

No.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Deposit on Lear Fan Aircraft

Mr WARBURTON: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the Auditor-General's report that was tabled in Parliament today. It indicates that \$247,925 paid as a deposit on the purchase price of a Lear Fan aircraft on 28 September 1982 has not been returned. The House knows that the company was in financial trouble when the aircraft was ordered, and the House is now told that the order was cancelled in January 1985. I ask: Why has the deposit not been returned? Is there a distinct risk that the deposit money will in fact be lost to Queensland? In other words, is this yet another case of financial mismanagement, with \$248,000 of public funds going down the drain?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I have been carrying the details with me for a little while, I thank the honourable member for asking the question.

On 28 September 1982, an agreement to purchase a Lear Fan E2100 aircraft was signed with Lear Fan Australia Pty Ltd. A deposit of \$247,925 was paid. Delivery of the aircraft was to be made during the month of March 1984.

On 23 January 1985, the company was advised of the termination of the agreement, and on that date Lear Fan Australia Pty Ltd was requested to refund the moneys paid plus interest. The Crown Solicitor is acting for the Government in the recovery of the deposit.

When the company was not able to supply that aircraft, the Government bought the jet that it presently uses.

Privatisation of Telecom Australia

Mr WARBURTON: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the recent, unqualified support given by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) for the privatisation of Telecom Australia. I would think that on this very important issue he, in his capacity as Minister, speaks for the Government and the National Party. Bearing in mind that this year Telecom will spend \$490m in enabling many subscribers outside capital cities to gain services at standard rates, and also bearing in mind that privatisation of Telecom would mean increased Telecom charges to many subscribers—

Government Members interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: Gee, they are touchy! I now ask the Premier and Treasurer: Will he refute the comments made by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, or does he also give unqualified support for the privatisation of Telecom?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: No, I do not disagree with my colleague the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology. On the other hand, this is a Federal issue.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members opposite can reserve their laughter till a little later. I want to put it this way, if the Leader of the Opposition can understand this: this is a private enterprise Government, and that says it all.

Australian Bureau of Statistics Economic Indicators

Mr NEAL: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Has he seen the table of economic indicators published in today's *Australian*, has he heard the subsequent media comment by the Leader of the Opposition, again criticising the performance of his own State, and does the table reflect the real and up-to-date situation in Queensland?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It certainly does not reflect the situation in Queensland. The Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. The New South Wales Treasurer (Mr Booth) has rejected and discredited the figures, saying that they were arranged inconsistently to suit Mr Greiner's argument. The figures are completely out of date and misleading. Mr Booth also knocked the figures sideways and said that they were not true.

In fact, the latest figures show that, for the 12 months to August 1985, Queensland had the highest growth rate in employment. Last month Queensland was the only State to create jobs—4 200 of them in one month! All the other States lost jobs. I know that the Leader of the Opposition has difficulty understanding things. However, those States lost jobs.

With Victoria, Queensland was the only State to reduce unemployment last month. All the other States went the other way. That shows that, for the sixth successive month, our policies are working.

Queensland's growth in dwelling units for the financial year compare more than favourably with the national average, as do motor vehicle registration figures. Our inflation is the lowest of all States and we are the lowest-taxed mainland State.

Any blame for industrial disruption can be laid fairly and squarely at the feet of the Australian Labor Party, which is encouraging and condoning such action in defiance of the law and against the best interests of the economy and the Queensland community.

Queensland, according to the August 1985 edition of the respected business journal *Rydges*—

“... is moving ahead with an entrepreneurial zeal that is making other bureaucratically dominated States look like do-dos...”

For southerners who think Queensland has fallen in a heap, then they are counselled to think again. The investment activity is staggering.”

The New South Wales Treasurer was wise to dismiss the figures for, as far as Queensland is concerned, the figures are, in fact, wrong.

It is strange for the Queensland Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) to be supporting the Liberal Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales against the Labor Treasurer. Then, it is not unusual for the Leader of the Opposition to support wrong figures and wrong policies. That is why he has the reputation of being “Mr Wrong” Shortly, he will be like the dodo—extinct!

I table the correct figures.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the figures on the table.

Mr Powell: And incorporate them in *Hansard*.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: And seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Employment	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	A/V
Aug '84	2,248.1	1,723.0	1,006.0	558.6	593.6	166.5	6,462.3
Aug '85	2,267.6	1,785.7	1,045.4	568.4	617.2	177.3	6,646.0
Growth Rate %	+0.9%	+3.6%	+3.9%	+1.8%	+4.0%	+6.5%	+2.8%

Queensland has the highest employment growth with 3.9%. 39,400 jobs were created in Queensland in the 12 month period. This was equal to 21% of all jobs created in Australia.

July '85	2,278.3	1,795.0	1,041.2	579.7	618.1	180.3	6,674.5
Aug '85	2,267.6	1,785.7	1,045.4	568.4	617.2	177.3	6,046.0
Growth Rate %	-0.5%	-0.5%	+0.4%	-1.9%	-0.1%	-1.7%	-0.4%

Queensland had the highest job growth for the month of all the States in Australia. Queensland was the only State to create jobs—4,200. Negative growth was recorded in the other States. Queensland led the way.

Unemployment	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	AUST
July '85	207.5	122.2	106.3	51.8	51.4	16.6	565.7
Aug '85	218.0	117.2	103.0	54.0	52.8	16.7	571.2
	+5.1%	-4.1%	-3.1%	+4.2%	+2.7%	+0.6%	+1.0%

Along with Victoria, Queensland cut back unemployment.

Queensland's August unemployment rate is 9.0%. This is the sixth month in which unemployment fell. Queensland's unemployment has been boosted over a 3 year period by a net gain of 13,000 in unemployment benefit transfers. Allowing for this increase, Queensland's unemployment rate would be cut by 1% to 8%.

Population	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	AUST
Pop'n growth	.96	1.01	1.43	.92	1.41	1.10	1.15
Net migrat'n	.19	.25	.46	.15	.39	.31	
Net Interstate Migration	-.18	-.10	+.33	-.14	+.09	+.11	

Queensland is the leading population growth state.

Dwelling Units	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	AUST
July '84	3,477	3,845	2,853	1,127	1,894	349	13,889
July '85	3,605	3,610	3,021	924	1,846	372	13,882
% Growth	+3.6%	-6.1%	+5.8%	18%	-2.5%	+6.5%	-0.05%

New Motor Vehicles	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	AUST
July '84	19,680	16,171	9,301	4,414	5,052	1,384	57,603
July '85	22,635	15,475	9,975	5,215	5,387	1,364	61,673
	+15%	-4.3%	+7.2%	+18%	+6.6%	-1.4%	+7%

Inflation	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	AUST
June '84	3.0%	4.4%	5.3%	3.6%	4.1%	4.0%	3.5%
June '85	6.5%	7.1%	5.9%	7.4%	6.7%	7.1%	6.8%
Growth Rate %	+116.7%	+61.4%	+11.3%	+105.6%	+63.4%	+77.5%	+94.3%

Taxation (Per Capita)

'84-85	\$781	\$754	\$511	\$589	\$655	\$494	
--------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

Retail Sales (June, '84-85)

Increase	+7.6	+4.8	+9.7	+5.9	+10.3	+12.4	+7.5
----------	------	------	------	------	-------	-------	------

Foreign Investment

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, I refer to a recent question asked in this House by the honourable member for Lytton on the subject of foreign investment and I ask: Has a subsequent check of the relevant statistics shown that the Labor member for Lytton was either attempting blatant deception or incapable of interpreting the report accurately?

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr GUNN: The scream—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order No. 123A. I warned him earlier.

I warn honourable members that questions will be asked and answers will be given in silence. I will not tolerate anything else.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, he screams round like a newly gelded donkey.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: Well, it's true.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the Minister did not mean those remarks.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, he made a tactical error. He should get new glasses. Those figures were for South Australia. Queensland had a figure of \$499m.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will answer the question.

Mr GUNN: All that I am saying is that the honourable member has the same glasses as he had when he entered this Parliament.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. That is a personal slur on my optometrist and I ask that it be withdrawn. I have used up the time allotted for questions.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The time allotted for questions has now expired.

SUPPLY

Committee—Financial Statement—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 5 September (see p. 805) on Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen's motion—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1985-86, a sum not exceeding \$609,000 to defray Contingencies—His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr Warburton (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (2.31 p.m.): Thursday, 5 September 1985, certainly was a day to remember. But it will not be remembered because of the Queensland Budget brought down on that day by Premier Bjelke-Petersen, who also doubles as Treasurer of Queensland. Certainly the highlight of Thursday, 5 September, was the depluming of Mr Peacock as Federal Liberal Opposition Leader in one of the best executed displays of political hari-kiri ever seen.

The darling of Queensland's blue-rinse set, Mr John Moore, was hauled out of the political shadows and given the nod for Liberal Deputy Leadership. And just as quickly, Mr Moore—still stunned and overwhelmed by the whole affair—found himself drifting haplessly back into the shadows whence he came.

Mr Howard, the Liberal Treasurer in the days of the Fraser Government, assumed the Liberal leadership in the most extraordinary circumstances. The new Liberal Leader, Mr Howard, will always be remembered as the Federal Treasurer under Fraser, when together they took our nation to the brink of economic oblivion; when together they took us into a recession that still is having an effect but, thankfully, to a much lesser extent.

I will remind honourable members of a few of the other events of Thursday, 5 September. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) desperately continued to defend himself against a proven case of conflict of interest.

The opinion of Mr Cedric Hampson, QC, relating to improper betting activities by the Premier's loyal mate and self-confessed minder, Sir Edward Lyons, was tabled in the Parliament and both the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing and the Minister for Police refused to answer questions directed at them over the issue.

The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) came rushing into the Chamber just prior to the luncheon adjournment, full of fire and brimstone, announcing what he described as a Queensland victory in the electricity industry High Court case. When the dust and smoke cleared and honourable members were all able to look at the

High Court decision rationally, it was found that the Minister had let his enthusiasm run away with him.

Then, at 2.15 p.m. on that day, the Treasurer and State Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, brought down a singularly unimpressive Budget—a Budget that turned out to be a damp squib. The Premier and Treasurer ran away from his own Budget by refusing, in an unprecedented way, to defend his Budget before the media on the Thursday afternoon.

Finally, on a slightly different note, it was announced on the morning of Thursday, 5 September, that a man who had recently visited Brisbane and had been involved with the Premier in a sickening boot-licking exercise at a function in front of many guests—where we heard this man talk about his love for Australia, and Queensland in particular—had forfeited his Australian citizenship and had become a citizen of the USA, all in the interest of the almighty dollar. No names, no pack drill.

In my preliminary assessment of the Budget on Thursday, 5 September, I commented that the Budget had failed to come to grips with the underlying problems in Queensland's economy. Now that the Opposition has had the opportunity to make a reasonably detailed analysis of the Budget, that preliminary assessment has been greatly reinforced.

The National Party Government's 1985 Budget serves as documented proof of its incapacity to govern Queensland in the best interests of the State and its citizens. It is a counterfeit Budget. Or, to put it more simply, it is a dud.

Last Thursday week, the Premier stood in this House and concluded his Budget speech with these words—

“This Budget provides a further impetus to the Queensland economy. It is in harmony with the needs of that economy and with the wishes of Queenslanders for their future.”

What utter rot!

What this Budget does is continue the National Party State Government's gross mismanagement of the Queensland economy. It fails to provide what the economy desperately requires. It fails to respond to the needs of Queenslanders.

The Budget as presented by the Premier is constructed around four major objectives, which are listed as—

- (1) bringing down a balanced Budget;
- (2) maintaining the Government's normal and so-called Special Capital Works Programs;
- (3) imposing no new taxes; and
- (4) maintaining essential services.

The first of these four objectives is a fallacy; the second is a fraud; the third is a falsehood; and the fourth is a farce.

Again the claim is made that Queensland has balanced its Budget, which is trotted out as proof positive of success where other Governments and, in particular, the Federal Government have failed. That is pure palaver. However, for the first time there is an admission that the Budget as a whole is not balanced; that only the Consolidated Revenue Fund budget is balanced. That is what the Opposition has been saying for years and I am pleased to see that Treasury has finally admitted that what I have been saying is true.

Before I continue, let me again, for the benefit of members and the public, put to rest the nonsensical claim that the Queensland Budget is balanced while the Federal Budget is not. As I said last year, the Opposition does not dispute the fact that the Consolidated Revenue Fund is drawn up to balance. Of course it is. Balancing that fund is an extremely simple accounting exercise, which I will deal with at a later stage in

much more detail. I have done the sums that the Government ought to have provided for the Parliament and the public.

What is of interest is the total picture of the Queensland Budget—covering the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund. One needs to look at the overall outcome of the three accounts to get the total picture. To claim, as the Government does, that the Consolidated Revenue Account is balanced and that the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund are intact, is to say virtually nothing at all.

In order to get the total picture, one needs to use the national accounts system of budgeting that was devised by the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund. Only that system allows a total overall picture of the public sector and easy comparison between budgets. The Commonwealth uses the national accounting system to calculate its Budget deficit.

Queensland uses traditional accounting methods, which do not allow for easy comparison between Budget papers and which do not make any calculation of the overall outcome. As a result, there is no calculation or estimate of the overall Budget deficit, as there is in the Commonwealth Budget.

If we care to compare the Queensland and national accounting systems, we need to compare like with like and, if Queensland's definition of "deficit" is applied to the Federal Budget, the Federal Government does not have a deficit at all. All it has is a \$4.9 billion borrowing requirement to balance its Budget, just as the Australian Bureau of Statistics calculates that the Queensland Government needed to borrow \$1,249m to balance its overall accounts, that is, to pay for its deficit. The deficit therefore represents the gap between total revenue and total expenditure—a gap of \$1,249m for Queensland last year.

It is nonsense to claim that Queensland has balanced its Budget while the Federal Government has not. The simple way to clear this up is for the Queensland Government to publish the outcome of the Budget in national accounting form—just as the Commonwealth and every other State Government do. The reason it refuses to do so must be obvious. It would explode once and for all this perpetual myth about the "balanced Budget". Another probable reason is that Treasury officials are no doubt terrified by the prospect of trying to explain to the Premier the difference between "balance" and "deficit". I understand, or at least I hope, that changes are in the pipeline, as the Treasury is at the moment seeking recruits who have qualifications in alternative budget systems. One can only hope that next year's Budget will show significant methodological improvement over this year's effort.

Let me now explain the con trick of this Budget—the hoax that allows the perpetration of frauds, such as the Special Major Capital Works Program. What a fascinating little double-shuffle it is. Honourable members will be aware that again, this year, Queensland does not break down the Consolidated Revenue Fund into its recurrent and capital expenditure components. That break-down would just provide too much embarrassing information, and too many questions would be asked. It is much simpler and much more convenient for this Government to lump it all together and hope that no-one is able to sort out the mess. Well, again, I am pleased to announce that the Opposition has done the Government's job for it and broken down the Consolidated Revenue Fund into its recurrent and capital components.

For the benefit of the National Party back-benchers here today, and probably most of the Ministry, I point out that recurrent expenditure is the expenditure required to carry on the normal day-to-day running expenses of the Government, and to provide money for services so badly needed in this State. Capital expenditure, of course, goes towards capital works.

Mr Menzel: We knew that.

Mr WARBURTON: Some Government members did not.

If the capital transfers are taken out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, that is, those amounts transferred to the Special Major Capital Works Program, the Special Projects Fund and Special Capital Assistance to Local Authorities, it is found that the consolidated revenue account is drawn up to run a very substantial surplus on the recurrent Budget.

Again, for those of you in the National Party who are a little confused about the surplus/deficit problem, I point out that it is quite possible to have a surplus on one account, but still to have an overall deficit on all accounts.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: I have heard all about the honourable member's managerial skills and, quite frankly, I would not take too much notice of him.

Honourable members will recall that Commonwealth payments to Queensland are broken down on both a recurrent and a capital basis. What the Queensland Government does is siphon off recurrent funds to capital works and other unforeseen expenses, such as the Premier and Treasurer's jet. Services are cut to the bone to allow this transfer to occur.

Last year it was estimated that \$129.4m was to be transferred from consolidated revenue to capital works—with \$90m going to this so-called Special Major Capital Works Program; \$24.4m to the special projects fund and \$15m to special capital assistance to local authorities. Evidently, it was a much better financial year than the Government expected, largely as a result of increased mining and rail freight revenue and interest receipts.

At this stage, I seek leave to have a table relating to the Queensland Recurrent Budget incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Attachment 1 QUEENSLAND RECURRENT BUDGET
(Consolidated Revenue Fund less identified capital transfers)

Revenue	1984-85			1985-86	
	Estimated \$M	Actual	% Change on Previous Year's Actual Spending	Estimated \$M	% Change
Commonwealth Grants	2,236	2,228	7.4	2,358	5.8
Taxation	921	941	7.5	1,009	7.2
Mining Royalties	140	141	33.0	182	29.1
Interest	167	174	-2.8	220	26.4
Railways	865	872	26.4	916	5.0
Other	316	326	13.2	364	11.7
	4,644.617	4,681.674	11.1	5,048.583	7.8
Expenditure					
Education	1,073	1,070	11.6	1,175	9.8
Health	909	915	11.7	990	8.2
Transport	941	964	16.8	973	0.9
Lands, Forestry, Police	249	254	9.5	271	6.7
Other	1,344	1,479	7.4	1,539	10.8
Total Recurrent Expenditure (a)	4,516.29	4,478.382	11.2	4,945.97	7.8
Surplus on Recurrent Budget	128.327	203.292		102.613	
Less Capital Transfer	129.4	204.049		102.289	
Published (Deficit)/Surplus on C.R.F.	(1.073)	(0.758) (b)		0.234	

(a) Excludes the following capital transactions which are expended by the Treasurer:—

	1984-85 Est. \$	Actual \$	1985-86 Est. \$
Amount credited to the Special Projects Fund	24.4	43.9	49.624
• Contribution to SMCWP	90.0	140.0	51.676
• Special Capital Assistance to Local Authorities	15.0	20.149	0.989
	129.4	204.049	102.289

(b) Published surplus of \$166,000 after previous accumulated surplus of \$923,000 is added.

Mr WARBURTON: In fact, with the higher than expected revenue and the slashing of services expenditure, the consolidated revenue account ended up with a surplus of \$75m more than anticipated.

I wonder what people associated with the sugar industry will say about the facts I shall outline in a moment, and I wonder what the other people who are legitimately calling for more nurses, more ambulance officers and more prison officers will say. That \$75m additional surplus took the actual surplus of the recurrent Budget from \$129m to \$204m. Of course, the Government had to be rid of that \$75m quickly because it had to have a balanced Consolidated Revenue Fund; otherwise, one could imagine the reaction from the sugar industry and, no doubt, teachers, nurses and police as well, when it became known that the Consolidated Revenue Fund had \$75m sitting round, surplus to recurrent requirements. Cane-growers, teachers, nurses, police and everyone else who wanted a dollar would be legitimately squatting on the Premier and Treasurer's doorstep. So—this is an example of the Government's trickery and deceit—just before the end of the financial year, the expected income was stashed away into the Trust and Special Funds and, lo and behold, the Budget was magically balanced.

Even a slight deficit of \$758,000 was produced from the hat from which, when the previous accumulated surplus of \$923,000 was applied, a small surplus of \$166,000 resulted. Magical! Houdini could not have done better!

The actual recurrent surplus of \$204m was switched across to capital works and the surplus moneys are safely tucked away in obscure trust and special funds so that the Premier does not have the problem of coping with irate cane-growers, teachers and nurses. That is the trickery and the deceit.

The Premier insists on saying that the Government is broke and cannot provide assistance—he did it again this morning—when in fact it is in an extremely comfortable financial position; not because of any stroke of financial genius, but because it purposefully denies Queenslanders the standard of services they deserve and should be getting. The problem has arisen because the Government is cutting services to the bone and transferring money from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the building of monuments for this Government and its Ministers.

It is a nice trick if one can get away with it, and the Government has got away with it for years because it has refused to publish the recurrent Budget.

But now the Opposition has again let the cat out of the bag and the true situation is known by members, and will be known—I assure Government members—far and wide. The recurrent Budget surplus this year is estimated to be \$102.6m. It comprises \$51.6m for the so-called Special Major Capital Works Program; \$49.6m for the Special Projects Fund, and almost \$1m carry-over of special capital assistance to local authorities. That represents \$102m which this Government is robbing—and I put that one right on the Premier—from State services; that is, \$102m robbed from the education of our children, the health of our families and the protection of our society.

After being caught out last year, the Government has, for the first time, been forced to admit to this robbing Peter to pay Paul which has been going on for years.

Let me quote the admission from the Budget document titled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*—

“In 1985/86, \$101 million—”

I calculate it at \$102.6m, but let us not quibble about that—

“will be channelled from Consolidated Revenue into the Special Projects Fund and the Special Major Capital Works Program to supplement funds available from other sources

With the provision of this total supplementation of \$101m in 1985/86 the State will have channelled over \$1,022 million into capital works from the Consolidated Revenue Fund since the inception of the Special Projects Fund in 1976/77.”

No wonder Queensland services are in a crisis!

Money provided by the Commonwealth for recurrent purposes—money which normally should be used and was intended to be used to fund services for Queenslanders—has been deliberately siphoned off to capital works. This siphoning off, says Treasury—

“ . . . has only been made possible by the containment of growth in recurrent expenditure in recent years, by rationalisation of services and by stringent budgetary controls exercised by the Treasury Department”

In other words, the National Party Government squeezed the people until their eyes popped.

This manipulation of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, first exposed by me last year, is the basis of the fraud of the Special Major Capital Works Program. Members will recall last year's Budget speech by the Premier, in which he said—

“I must stress that this \$600 million Special Major Capital Works Program is over and above what the Government would normally be doing.”

It was stressed that this program was additional, special and above normal and the report gave a figure of \$348.1m as the so-called normal program. The Opposition challenged the validity of this claim, saying it was ridiculous to attempt to equate \$348.1m with normal. Interestingly, this year there is no mention of a normal capital works program and no figure is nominated for it.

The Queensland Government failed to prove at the time that the Special Major Capital Works Program was over and above normal, and when the co-ordinated plan of works was released in December, that document disproved, completely and absolutely, the Government's Budget claims. I have a copy of that co-ordinated plan of works.

The document clearly showed that even with the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program and the electrification of coal-carrying railways (the price of which, according to the Premier and Treasurer, consistently fluctuates between \$600m and \$800m) the total capital works program was less in 1984-85 than in the previous year, and it was even less than the year before that.

This year in the capital works document it is made clear that hospitals boards, the Main Roads Department and the Queensland Water Resources Commission are raising funds for the Special Major Capital Works Program under their normal programs. Suddenly, above normal has now reverted to partly normal. As the Auditor-General's report this year tells us, this is to spread certain costs over future generations.

Last year, the Opposition made clear that there was nothing special or above normal about this so-called capital works program. We argued that there was nothing abnormal in funding arrangements with the usual combination of on-Budget and off-Budget financing being used. This year's Budget papers and the co-ordinated plan of works proved us correct on the funding arrangements.

Last year, we said that the Special Major Capital Works Program was simply based on a rearrangement—a glossy package of selected capital works planned for the next three years—and we are proved right again on that point.

I want to emphasise that the figures quoted by the Premier and Treasurer in his Budget speech represent totally unreliable information. A comparison of the Capital Works Program for Government departments in 1984-85 with the amount actually spent highlights the huge discrepancy between what the Government says it will do and what it in fact does.

The Co-ordinator General's schedule of capital works estimated that the various State Government departments would spend \$1,504m for the year 1984-85. But information on spending by departments provided in this year's Budget says that amount was underspent by \$212m.

On top of this, spending on capital works by the electricity industry was \$40m less in 1984-85 than estimated in last year's State Budget. In other words, there was a total underspending of \$252m last financial year by Government departments and the State's electricity authorities. How accurate, then, are the estimates contained in this year's State Budget for capital works spending by departments and electricity authorities?

There was a \$252m shortfall last financial year. The question has to be asked: How much will it be in 1985-86? I suggest that the estimates of spending on capital works in the current financial year are so unreliable that they should be ignored completely. The Budget presents a confusing picture, to say the least, of the Government's spending on capital works.

The supporting Budget documents on capital works provide details of the program for 1985-86 under one list of areas in the contents of the book and a totally different set of areas in its appendix. Who is to really know precisely how much the Government spent on what it calls the Special Major Capital Works Program in 1984-85?

On 22 August, in his speech to the Parliament on the Appropriation Bill, the Premier and Treasurer said that total expenditure for the 1984-85 year under the program was \$140.7m. Of this, \$45.7m had been spent on hospitals.

In his weekly propaganda offering, *Personally Speaking*, of Sunday, 1 September, the Premier and Treasurer again repeated this assertion, saying spending under the program had topped the \$140m mark. But in his Budget speech only one week ago, the Premier and Treasurer announced that expenditure under the program in 1984-85 had totalled only \$94m. They are his statements, not mine.

The confusion deepens when one consults this year's Budget papers. The document on the Special Major Capital Works Program presents an entirely different account of spending to that outlined in the Estimates.

Page 103 of the Estimates sets out five areas of spending as follows: education, \$18.1m; water resources, \$22.5m; Crown employee housing, \$5.5m; public buildings and other special works, \$35.8m; and roads and other works, \$13m—a total spending of \$94.96m.

The capital works Budget paper has an entirely different set of spending figures: education, \$17.2m; water resources, \$12.6m; Crown employee housing, \$3.5m; hospitals, \$43.2m; roads, \$9.8m; and public buildings, etc., \$7.7m—a total of \$94m.

How much really was spent last financial year under this fraudulent program? Was it \$140m, \$94m or \$95m? Where was it really spent?

The figures behind this so-called Special Major Capital Works Program were rubbery from the start. They are getting more and more rubbery as the program progresses.

Speaking of rubbery figures—I ask the Government to make up its mind once and for all about how much the central Queensland coal rail lines electrification program will really cost.

Mr McPhie: When are you going to finish your rubbery speech?

Mr WARBURTON: I ask the honourable member to hear me out.

In last year's State Budget, the figure was put at \$600m. On 20 March this year, in the Premier and Treasurer's economic statement to the Parliament, it had risen to \$800m. A few weeks ago, in the Premier's second-reading speech on the Appropriation Bill, the figure fell back to \$700m. In the Premier's pre-Budget publicity, the figure rose once more to \$800m; but, in the Budget speech, it finished up at \$700m. I cannot find a better example of inconsistency from a Premier and Treasurer than that.

For the first time, an appendix purporting to show the total departmental capital works expenditure appears in the Budget papers. This table seems to have been thrown together from some distance and not with a great deal of accuracy. It seems to be a list of information available to date.

Let me point out some glaring inconsistencies in that table. A comparison of the list of capital works in the Budget document entitled *The State Capital Works Programs* with the list in the Co-ordinator-General's schedule of works indicates that there appears to be little agreement on what is a department and what is not.

The Queensland Electricity Commission is listed as a department in the Budget papers and included in the total. In the Co-ordinator-General's plan of works, it is listed as a statutory authority and excluded from the departmental total.

The Budget document seems to have misplaced the Capital Works Program for welfare services, stock routes, the Government Printing Office and the Board of Advanced Education. Were they just forgotten about, or are they listed in other capital works and services? We are told that other capital works and services consist mainly of projects funded entirely by the Commonwealth, such as universities and CAEs. That explanation does not help anybody very much at all. It is impossible to really know what that table means and what it shows.

If that expenditure is compared with more accurate information in the Co-ordinated Plan of Works, and maximum allowances are made for the categories that are either deliberately or accidentally omitted, one discovers that there was underspending on the departmental Capital Works Program of at least \$212m last year. Clearly, the appendix in the capital works Budget papers is not the total Capital Works Program.

We must wait for the Co-ordinator-General's schedule of works, which will be distributed later in the financial year, before we can judge whether capital works have increased, decreased or remained stable. Apparently it does not make much difference anyway, for consistent gross underspending of the capital works Budget is the norm in Queensland.

Further proof that the Capital Works Program as listed is not the total program, if further proof is needed, is given by Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7. It lists the special purpose grants for capital purposes at \$485.2m, whereas the Queensland Budget paper capital works appendix lists it as \$433.7m, or about \$52m less. Perhaps whoever is to respond, whether it be the Premier and Treasurer or the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, can tell the Chamber where that \$52m has suddenly disappeared to. In summary, the capital works appendix is next to useless. Again I suggest the Government take a look at the Budget papers of other States to see how it is done.

Let me now turn to the proposed Queensland Industry Development Corporation. As it is a direct pinch from Labor policy, it is, of course, an excellent idea in principle. However, a number of questions about its operation are left unanswered. Perhaps whoever responds will give me the information that is necessary. The most important guarantee the Government needs to give is that the loans and grants made by the corporation will be open to public scrutiny. There can be no secrecy provisions. If public funds are to be used as they are intended, the public has the right to know the full details about loans made. Invention and innovation are one thing; but if the loans are not open to proper scrutiny, on the Premier's past record, every loony idea and crazy proposal will be funded by the development corporation.

I want to pass now to State Government taxes, fees and charges. Probably one of the most hollow claims in the Premier's Budget speech—and in the very extravagant publicity that followed, which, incidentally, was produced at tax-payers' expense—was about how no new taxes had been introduced. What a big deal! Why would any Government want to introduce new taxes when it has no earthly reason to do so?

The Premier's "no new taxes" boast is the National Party State Government's favourite red herring. It is calculated to divert attention from what I have described as the Government's hidden budget—the charges which are on the increase week-in, week-out, year-in, year-out. Within two days of the 1984 State Budget, hundreds of increases in Government fees and charges appeared in the *Government Gazette*. Two days after the Premier and Treasurer delivered his 1984 Budget speech, those increased fees and charges appeared in the *Government Gazette*, yet the Premier or any other member on the Government side did not utter one word about the fact that those increases were coming.

This year they did rate a mention—one sentence in the Premier's hour-long speech—a mention no doubt prompted by the stinging criticism of the Government's deceit and dishonesty last year. The State Government has built quite a reputation for being reticent on the question of Government fees and charges, even though they constitute a significant part of its revenue-raising operations. It is all part of the charade to try to hoodwink people into believing it is an anti-tax Government.

In his Budget speech the Premier made special reference to an accompanying publication entitled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*. However, when one consults this document, one sees that there is absolutely no reference to the matter of Government departments' fees and charges.

Instead, where does one find notification of increases in fees and charges? As usual, they are hidden away in the weekly *Government Gazette*. That is very well away from the hands of members of the public, who are not very much concerned with purchasing a document of that kind. The information appears there only because this Government is required by law to publish it. In the full-page newspaper advertisements, paid for by the tax-payers, on the Budget there is certainly no mention of the increases or that Government fees and charges will rise across the board—some in line with inflation, others by much greater amounts.

Obviously the Government does not consider that the public is entitled to be informed about this very important matter. It is dishonest for the Premier to suggest, as he often does, that the increases are automatic each year and in line with the rate of inflation. These rises in Government fees and charges represent a conscious decision by the Government, with Ministers of the Cabinet submitting the increases for their respective departments for Executive Council approval.

The public is kept in the dark—apart from being informed about those increases which the Government has no option but to acknowledge, such as electricity tariffs, third-party insurance charges and passenger rail fares.

Surely it is not asking too much for precise details to be given about these rises which play such an important role in the Government's revenue-raising and which have such a dramatic effect on the family purse. Surely it is not too much to ask that they receive specific mention in the Budget papers and that we are told what is in the pipeline. The Opposition acknowledges that, at times, certain rises in Government fees and charges are appropriate to keep pace with cost increases. But the Government should be more open and honest about the way in which these increases are approved and implemented.

The National Party State Government is more intent on sneaking these increases through the back door than in telling the public about them and attempting to justify their necessity. It has made no effort in this Chamber to justify the increases in third-party insurance premiums. The people of Queensland did not receive one justification for those increases. I call on the Premier and Treasurer to outline publicly the scope

and scale of increases in fees and charges being considered by various Government departments over the next 12 months. For Heaven's sake, be open and honest with the public for a change. That is the message that I give the Government today.

I emphasise that there is no provision for the automatic increase of Government fees and charges as suggested by the Premier and Treasurer. Provision exists, but it is not as he suggests.

I repeat that the State Government takes a deliberate political decision every time fees and charges are increased, but it then hides them away in a little-known, scarcely read gazette, hoping that they will not be noticed.

Government fees and charges are just as real and tangible as other forms of State taxes. The Opposition condemns the National Party Government's taxation-by-stealth policies. A prime example of its activity in this regard is reflected in electricity tariffs. Part and parcel of these tariffs approved by the Government is what amounts to a savage electricity tax.

The National Party State Government is taxing Queensland families and small business more than \$225m this financial year to fund its badly planned power-generation industry. The tax takes the form of a capital works levy to help finance power industry development. That levy is not imposed on big industrial users of electricity. It is the domestic consumers, including pensioners, and the small businesses of Queensland who foot the bill.

This capital works tax extracted by the Government translates to a 20 per cent tax on ordinary household power bills. Yet the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) continues to deny that Queensland imposes taxes on electricity. A State Labor Government would not only immediately restructure the present system of tariffs to halt the spiralling price of electricity but would also urgently implement a pensioner rebate scheme as already operates in all other States of Australia. It is worth noting that Brisbane had the highest relative contribution of State and local government charges to the increase in the Consumer Price Index between the June quarter this year and the same quarter in 1984.

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that Brisbane had a 14 per cent contribution by way of State and local government charges to the increase in the CPI over this period. This was the highest of any State capital in Australia and 65 per cent higher than the Australian average.

The State and local government charges canvassed were Government-owned dwelling rents, water and sewerage rates, council property rates and charges, electricity prices, motor vehicle registration fees and third-party insurance premiums, driver's licence fees and urban bus and rail fares. It is with good reason that the Opposition says that the National Party in Queensland runs a high-charge, low-service Government. I have proved that today.

The level of spending on services by the Queensland National Party Government is the lowest in Australia, and, as the latest Bureau of Statistics figures on the cost of living show, Brisbane residents contributed more than anyone else through State and local government charges towards the Consumer Price Index increases over the last 12 months.

I turn now to State Government services. Those services have been pared to the bone because of the shoving over of moneys from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to build monuments for Ministers in this State.

The National Party State Government is guilty of criminal neglect for its failure to fund this State's essential services adequately. The people of Queensland are paying with their lives for this Government's stingy, penny-pinching approach towards the funding of vital services. I can think of no more serious accusation to level against any

Government. People are dying in Queensland for no reason other than the National Party State Government's refusal to fund essential and emergency services properly.

Today honourable members were forced to listen to the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) explain how his hospital board had compiled a report for him in relation to a very serious matter. I only hope that the Minister for Health and each member of the National Party read at the week-end of the case of Nicholas Bowkett, an 11-year-old Queensland boy who died in the Royal Children's Hospital in Brisbane in March this year.

If the State Government refuses to listen to the facts and figures on how it has failed to provide adequate nurses or properly care for Queensland's hospital patients, perhaps it will listen to the plea from Nicholas Bowkett's mother. The account she gives of her son's illness, hospitalisation and death surely cannot be ignored even by the National Party Government. Nicholas Bowkett's mother believes that a contributing factor to her son's death was gross understaffing and the consequent overworking of medical staff at all levels in the Queensland public hospitals system. She said—

"A lack of staff inevitably leads to incompetence, things which should be picked up are missed simply because everybody is trying to do ten (10) things at once. This is no reflection on the competence or dedication of the medical staff who cared for Nicholas.

It is a reflection of the incompetence of a hospital system which overworks its employees to the extent where standards of patient care and mistakes are made."

I do not understand why that statement should cause the Minister to reflect today on the integrity of that good woman. She made a simple statement which in effect fired barbs at the hospital system. In no way was she critical of the dedicated people who looked after her son.

How many similar cases to that of Nicholas Bowkett have there been in Queensland hospitals? How many similar cases will there be in the future? How many people have died and how many people will die as an indirect if not a direct result of the Queensland Government's deliberate, conscious policy not to provide adequate standards of patient care?

The Queensland Minister for Health does have something behind him. He is famous for one thing as a Health Minister in this country and that is that he is the only Health Minister who has ever successfully caused the honourable nursing profession to go on strike over lack of patient care. He will go down in history as the only Minister to do so.

How many people have suffered and how many people will continue to suffer for the same reason? It is happening in Queensland hospitals. It is happening on the roads.

The Government cannot plead ignorance to what is occurring. The Australian Medical Association says that the Queensland public hospital system is nearing a patient care crisis. The Queensland Nurses Union says that a critical shortage of staff has resulted in substandard patient care, and the position is deteriorating. If Government members do not believe me, they should talk to a few of the people in the nursing profession, who will tell them exactly what the position is at the moment. But the best the Minister for Health can do is bury his head in the sand and say that the crisis is a figment of people's imaginations.

This Budget provides for an additional 270 hospital staff when at least 1 000 extra nurses alone are required. The additional 270 staff are in every category of hospital employees, not just nurses.

When will the Queensland Government face up to its responsibilities and put health care towards the top of its priority list instead of where it is now, near the bottom? The latest Commonwealth Grants Commission report shows that the Queensland Government spent \$289 per head of population on health services—the lowest level in Australia.

The State Government might appear blind to the enormous problems within our State's emergency and essential services, but in reality it is fully aware of what is taking place, and refuses point blank to provide a remedy.

Early this year, the State's major emergency services—police, ambulance, fire brigades and nurses—issued a detailed report on the state of emergency services within Queensland's essential services. The report was in the form of a submission presented to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) for consideration prior to the 1985-86 State Budget. I wonder how many, if any, members of the Queensland Cabinet and the National Party back bench have read that report. The contents of the State Budget suggest they either have not bothered to read it or have dismissed it as an irrelevance.

It is a measure of how badly the standard of government in Queensland, under the National Party, has declined that the State's emergency services should be forced to band together in an attempt to convince the Government of the urgent need to provide additional staff, equipment and resources. I wonder what will be said by people in those emergency services when they read what has been said here today—that in its Consolidated Revenue Fund the Government had \$204m which it should have been using to provide more services for the people by employing additional nurses, police and ambulancemen, but instead deviously transferred to the building of monuments to Government Ministers. It is a further measure of how badly the standard of government in Queensland has declined when the urgent requests of essential services are brushed aside—when they are ignored—and when this National Party Government is now seen to have siphoned off \$204m from moneys meant to provide those very services for Queenslanders.

The provision of an additional 104 police officers will have a negligible effect on the serious understaffing problems in the Queensland Police Force. The Police Commissioner, Mr Lewis, has stated publicly and reported to the State Government that an additional 460 police officers are required now. That is the minimum number of additional police needed, as established by Police Department surveys. Mr Lewis is able to say precisely where each of those 460 officers is required and precisely what duties each would be engaged in. The Queensland Police Union estimates that an additional 600 officers are needed to bring the Queensland Police Force up to strength. However, at the same time as the State Government siphons \$204m from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the best it can do is to employ 104 police officers—less than a quarter of the number which the Police Commissioner says is required; less than a quarter of the number which the Minister for Police (Mr Glasson) also acknowledges is needed urgently.

When will the State Government wake up that there are some things that cannot be done on the cheap? 104 additional police are simply not sufficient. This can only be regarded as a cosmetic increase. It will do virtually nothing to relieve the current understaffing. As a result of the Government's action, neither the public nor members of the police force itself are being served.

Lately there has been a rapid increase in the number of police officers seeking to retire from the force on medical grounds. In the three years to June 1984, eight members of the force retired as medically unfit. I understand that, in the following 12 months alone, to June this year, nearly 30 officers retired on medical grounds. The exact number will be revealed when the Police Department's annual report is tabled in the Parliament later in this session. I understand also that more than 100 members of the force have applied for retirement on medical grounds. The facts are that, as more and more officers leave the force, the strains, demands and pressures on serving police become greater. Once again, the public is paying the price for the Government's failure to provide an adequate police strength and sufficient resources. That is the point that must be made.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: Honourable members on the Government side do not like to hear about that, and that is why they interrupt. The Police Traffic Branch has stated

unequivocally that people are dying on Queensland's roads because there are not enough police to mount an effective highway patrol. If Government members want to say something, they should say it now. They should come out and say, "Queensland has an effective highway patrol and people are not dying on the roads because of a lack of it." Police themselves describe the existing Highway Patrol as a joke. I find it disgusting that the Police Department should have to resort to cardboard cut-outs of Highway Patrol vehicles as a substitute for a real police presence. That is an indication of the way in which the Government is going; it is resorting to cardboard cut-outs of Highway Patrol vehicles.

Cardboard cut-outs of police will do nothing to curb Queensland's rampant crime rate. Cardboard cut-outs of police will not stop the house-burglar, the car thief, the school vandal, the white-collar crook, the drug-pusher and the child-molester. The Government might as well place cardboard cut-outs of Mr T all over the place and then tell us, "See, we're one jump ahead of those criminals."

The announcement in the Budget of an additional 134 prison officers—about half the number requested by the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz)—will do very little to relieve the enormous pressures on Queensland's prisons system. The Government is unwilling to provide the basic bricks and mortar and human resources to run Queensland's gaols. Severe overcrowding and inadequate staffing has led to serious management problems which have become self-evident in spite of constant statements by the Minister in charge of prisons that Queensland has the best prisons system in Australia.

I understand that on a morning media program, the Minister made reference to certain people in the community being deviates. I think that the Minister will live to regret that comment. When the Opposition's shadow Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Fouras) follows me in this debate, I hope that he will make reference to that remark. I believe that later Mr Fouras will be making a definite statement on the National Party Government's mishandling of the State's prisons system.

Queensland's ambulance service is already forced to rely on charity to carry out its work. This Budget does nothing to alter that position. It allocates \$20m to the State's Ambulance Brigades for 1985-86, when two years ago it cost the service almost double that amount to run its operations.

This life-saving service is expected to operate efficiently and effectively with a minimum of staff, a minimum of vehicles and a minimum of equipment. No funds are provided for training programs or for two-man crews for emergency cases outside of Brisbane and the larger provincial cities. Ambulance officers are merely requesting adequate training, proper staffing and sufficient resources. What is the Government's response? "If that's what you want, find the money for it yourselves. We're not going to give it." So our professional ambulance officers continue to run street stalls and chook raffles to make ends meet, and, to cap it all, the Government has lifted the third-party insurance charge on each ambulance to a massive \$606 a year.

The Budget provides 24 additional staff for Queensland's fire brigades—again, less than a quarter of the additional staff so obviously required. The State's fire brigades not only urgently require more staff; they also require better equipment. However, as with the other essential and emergency services, they are met with the stock "can't do" response from the State Government.

Let me now turn briefly to education. Education funding provides yet another example of the State Government's wholesale neglect of vital services. The Budget provides for an additional 1 087 teachers—half of the number required to fulfil its promises on class-size reductions. However, a significant number of these positions will have no effect on presently overcrowded class-rooms. For instance, 135 of the additional 234 special education teachers are already working in Endeavour Foundation centres.

They have been transferred onto the Education Department's pay-roll now that it has taken over responsibility for that area of education. True to form, the Government deceitfully seeks to convey the impression that those 135 positions represent additional teachers.

On countless occasions members have heard pious statements from Ministers and members of the National Party Government about how our children and our youth are this State's greatest resource.

Yet, when it comes to the Budget, the Government demonstrates it does not believe in putting its money where its mouth is.

The Queensland Government spends the least of any State in the areas of primary, secondary and technical and further education.

The Premier is so hopelessly out of touch with the woefully inadequate standard of State Government services in Queensland that, in his Budget, he speaks with pride about his Government's commitment to maintaining and sustaining services at present levels. That is nothing to crow about. Those services are abysmal.

It is not as if the State Government is broke and simply does not have the funds to upgrade its services to the Queensland community.

As I have already outlined, last financial year the Government had a recurrent account surplus that topped \$200m.

Commonwealth moneys provided to Queensland for spending in areas such as education, health and welfare are diverted from those important social services to be either spent on capital works or stashed away in the Treasurer's cash balances.

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: The Minister for Works and Housing will have plenty of time to respond. His Government has been found out, and I do not blame him for trying to interject. The Government has been found out for the deceitful way in which it has endeavoured to manage the economic and financial affairs of this State. The Government did not have the guts to show the figures in the State Budget documents, which are a group of glossy no-comment books. It is up to the Opposition—this is the second occasion in a row—to show the Assembly and the people exactly the way in which this Government is diverting money away from good causes. It has pared to the bone the services that are due to the people of this State. The Government has been found out, and that is why the Minister reacted in the way he did.

The Premier engages in unparalleled hypocrisy when he accuses the other States of promoting policies of social perversion. It is the National Party Government of Queensland that has the most twisted and perverted sense of priorities of any State Government of Australia when it comes to social services.

I now turn to Commonwealth/State funding arrangements. Let me now refer to the baseless assertion in the Budget papers, which is nothing new for this Government—we hear it every day in this Chamber—that Queensland has been discriminated against by Canberra to the tune of \$362m. Let me put that claim under the scrutiny that it deserves.

Firstly, the Queensland Government claims that Queensland and the other States were discriminated against in the area of general revenue funding.

But it was the Queensland Premier who endorsed the view that public sector expenditures had to be reined in to encourage the private sector to play a greater role without facing undue upward pressure on interest rates.

The Premier agreed and endorsed that restraint at the Premiers Conference, but now he comes out and condemns that restraint because it applies to Queensland as well. He says, "Have restraint everywhere else, but do not have it here in this State."

In these Budget papers we have a repeat performance of these wild claims by the Government—claims which quickly go to water when they face close scrutiny.

The claim of under-funding amounts to little more than an attack on the integrity of the Grants Commission. The claims that the recommendations of the commission were based on a hasty review and that Queensland has been denied an adequate opportunity to discuss and debate the issues are ludicrous. Perhaps the fault lies more with the Government than with the Grants Commission.

We know that Queensland's submission was a rushed job, completed at 4 o'clock in the morning on the last day for submissions. We now know that complete sections, such as the one relating to country water supply and sewerage, were omitted. Again it may be a case of Queensland's inadequately proving its so-called case.

Let me remind members that the Grants Commission's basic task is to determine an appropriate set of relativities based on the principles that the resulting State's powers would enable each State to provide a comparable level of Government services without having to impose any higher levels of taxation.

The commission determined that for every dollar Victoria receives, Queensland should receive \$1.41. In the division of general revenue funds, Queensland received \$816.12 per person, whereas New South Wales received \$648.93 and Victoria \$631.93, with the average of all the States being \$734.43. So Queensland received \$82 more per person than the six-State average and a huge \$184 more per person than Victoria received. That does not sound like being hard done by!

The next complaint of Queensland concerns the amount that it receives in the identified health grants. I have no idea why Queensland is whinging about this one.

Because Queensland is estimated to have the fastest-growing population, over the next two years it will receive the highest increase in identified health grants of any State. Identified health grants are distributed according to relativities, and I can only suggest that this is another case of the Government's crying wolf whenever it gets a chance.

Next up is the well-worn claim of discrimination under the Medicare arrangements. It should be noted that this is the only time that the Queensland Government uses a per capita comparison. It uses other types of comparisons for other matters, but in this instance it uses a per capita comparison.

Queensland pointedly chooses to ignore per capita comparisons under the general revenue arrangements and the identified health grants, because Queensland does very much better than the national average. Under Medicare, Queensland does receive less per capita, largely because Queensland, which has its free hospital system in place, has less costs to incur under the change-over to Medicare.

A Government Member: Garbage!

Mr WARBURTON: The honourable member says that it is garbage. The fact is that it is the truth. The garbage comes from the Government side. I am only trying to analyse the facts.

Remember that the Medicare funding arrangements are temporary and are designed primarily to compensate States for the change-over costs from a fee-based system to a free public hospital system.

It should also be noted that the costs to Queensland of operating its so-called free hospital system are not reflected in the Medicare arrangements—they are reflected in Queensland's share of the financial assistance grant and the identified health grants, on which Queensland, quite frankly, does very well indeed. In other words, the costs of running Queensland's free hospital system are compensated not under the Medicare arrangements, but in the general revenue grant and the identified health grant. That is where Government members get it wrong.

To assert, as the Government tries to do, that the Medicare arrangements discriminate against Queensland's free hospital system is patently false and is done purely for political purposes to brainwash people with the claim that Canberra discriminates against Queensland. Fortunately, the Federal Government does not operate on the vicious and vindictive principles adopted by the State Government.

An analysis of the figures shows that, on those programs that do not require any Queensland contribution, Queensland does not do too badly at all. With 16 per cent of the population of Australia, Queensland gets 21 per cent of the total funds provided for roads. It also receives 21 per cent of the funds allocated for the Australian Land Transport Program. Queensland receives 22 per cent of the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program funding. It receives 38 per cent of rural adjustment grants, 49 per cent of funds for the antibrucellosis and antituberculosis campaign, 23 per cent of funds for agricultural research and almost half of the funds allocated to the water resources program.

The antibrucellosis and antituberculosis campaign provides an excellent example of the deceit and deception of the Queensland Government. I seek a response from the Government about the full page advertisements—paid for by the public—promoting the Budget, which were published in the Sunday papers. The Premier and Treasurer would not front the media and defend his Budget on the day that it was delivered. However, the Government spent thousands and thousands of dollars of public money to promote the Budget. In the full page advertisements that appeared in the Sunday papers, it was claimed that the Government would spend \$21.4m on the eradication of brucellosis and tuberculosis in the Queensland cattle industry. That appears in the advertisement for everyone to see. What was not said by the Premier was that \$15.1m of that amount came from the Commonwealth Government under a Commonwealth program. That illustrates the deceit of this Government, and is typical of the way in which it goes about its business. It does not provide a break-down of Commonwealth funding and claims these Commonwealth programs as its own. Another example of this practice can be found in the funding for roadworks.

In summary—the Queensland Government does not tell half the story about Commonwealth funding arrangements. I am sure that all honourable members are well aware of the way in which the Government consistently endeavours to hoodwink the people of Queensland into believing that many of the things taking place in this State are the result of finance that is provided by the Queensland Government. It twists the facts round, turns them upside down and distorts them to a huge degree purely for political purposes. It does this to cover up its incompetence and, wherever possible, to shift the blame to Canberra.

A good example of this can be found in the Budget, which is conspicuously silent on some of the most salient points on road-funding. The Federal Government presently provides about 65 per cent of the total amount of money spent by the Main Roads Department on Queensland roads. I am not saying that it should not; but, for Heaven's sake, the Government should be honest about it. I will watch carefully what is said at the opening of the new road from Burpengary to the Caloundra turn-off which, because it is very near completion, will happen shortly. That road was fully paid for by the Commonwealth Government, so I will be very interested to hear the attitude expressed by the Minister for Main Roads and other members of the Government at the opening of that road.

The 65 per cent that is given to this State compares with an average of 42 per cent for all States. This year, Federal allocations to Queensland for roads total \$257.6m—\$187.6m for national highways capital works, \$41.6m for maintenance programs and \$28.4m for local authority roadworks. The truth is that no other State has performed as badly as Queensland in matching the Federal road effort.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: The problem with members of the National Party is that they do not want to hear the truth.

Mrs Chapman: We would like the truth.

Mr WARBURTON: Well, listen to this.

Four years ago the Queensland Government was able to match Federal funding dollar for dollar. Presently the Hawke Federal Government provides \$1.80 for every Queensland dollar.

In summary—in order to contribute to private sector recovery, the Queensland Government agreed to the change in the general revenue-funding formula. Honourable members opposite should remember that. Through the Premier, this Government agreed to it. Claims that the independent and non-political Grants Commission duded Queensland of \$362m are baseless. That is a political stunt by the Premier.

The claim that Queensland, which is to receive the fastest-growing proportion of identified health grants, has been short-changed under this program is ludicrous. The Queensland Government's incompetence and its failure to prove its case are the reasons for Queensland's low per capita share of the temporary Medicare arrangements. The Queensland Government's refusal to participate in many programs and its refusal to match the Commonwealth on funding arrangements are the reasons for the State's low level of per capita funding in specific purpose payments.

One of the most disturbing features of this State Budget is the way it leaves Queensland's sugar industry in the lurch. The Premier used his Budget speech to announce, though not in so many words, that the State Government will not contribute one cent towards the direct price support assistance so desperately required by growers. But, in the next breath, the Premier claimed that Queensland is prepared to accept its share of the responsibility for the financing of the best possible adjustment scheme for the industry.

Apparently the National Party State Government's version of accepting its share of responsibility for financing the best possible adjustment scheme for the industry is to limit itself to offering a few million dollars worth of loans. I repeat the word, "loans" I find it deplorable that the National Party Government has chosen to turn its back on our State's stricken sugar industry. At a time when the industry most requires the State Government's tangible and practical support, it is receiving nothing more than a few cheap gestures of token assistance. An example of this is the Premier's announcement in the Budget that the State Government would make available immediately up to \$20m in loans. The Premier expects that \$10m of this amount will be contributed by the Federal Government.

I ask again what our friends in the sugar industry will say when they hear about the \$204m that was underspent from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, when the Premier can stand up publicly and in this place and say that the State Government does not have the money to help the sugar industry, that it is a Federal Government responsibility.

Mr Stoneman: And so it is.

Mr WARBURTON: It is our industry. We cannot turn our backs on it. Honourable members should be prepared to do something about it in this Assembly.

It is worth noting that while the Premier and Treasurer is speeding up notice of carry-on assistance, he is deliberately impeding progress on other more vital aspects of assistance to the industry, including price support mechanisms and industry restructuring.

The Premier and Treasurer flew off at a tangent when a constructive, co-operative effort between the Federal and State Governments and all sections of the industry is required urgently.

The only point that I make is that if the Queensland Government really wanted to help the industry, there is no doubt that it has the money available to make a substantial contribution towards financing the best possible adjustment scheme. The Government cannot run away from that.

Also highlighted in the Premier and Treasurer's Budget speech and post-Budget publicity was the National Party State Government's so-called commitment to Queensland's small business sector. The Government has provided the Small Business Development Corporation with \$1.4m in 1985-86, which, it says, will allow the corporation to double its staff and continue the expansion of its activities. When one looks closely at the Small Business Development Corporation and its activities, it is hard to find any tangible benefits accruing to the small business sector as a result of its operations.

The corporation is little more than a front organisation for the National Party. Its refusal to act in the interests of small business proprietors has become increasingly evident. The corporation has been totally ineffective in advancing the views of small business in less crucial issues such as deregulated trading hours, the proliferation of major shopping complexes and deficient retail shop lease legislation. I hope that the corporation will use all its additional staff allocation to redirect the emphasis of its operations towards the service and assistance that small businesses require most. For instance, I hope that this year the corporation employs a number of qualified legal staff to provide a comprehensive legal service, which is needed urgently. I hope that the corporation represents more forcefully to the State Government the needs and problems of the small business sector.

I find it regrettable that today I have had to respond to such a deficient and deceitful document as the State Budget. Personally, I would much prefer to be supportive of a Government that is acting honestly and in the best interests of the people that it purports to represent.

The way that this National Party State Government plays politics with the lives of the people of Queensland is disgusting. It adds up to rotten politics by a rotten Government.

As I said earlier, Queensland has a State Government that is more intent on building monuments to itself and its Ministers than providing basic and essential services to the Queensland community. I have proved that today. The National Party State Government pursues a very deliberate policy of looking after itself at the expense of the people of Queensland. Queensland has a State Government that places its own self-serving interests streets ahead of its fundamental responsibility to dispense honest and effective government.

The Queensland Government operates on the principle that there is a heck of a lot more political mileage in a National Party Cabinet Minister's opening a new grandstand at the local racecourse than in approving the appointment of two additional nurses who are desperately required at the local hospital. That is the rottenness of the Government, and that is the rotten way in which it operates.

It goes without saying that the Labor Party would rid Queensland of that deplorable style of government. Contrary to the extravagant publicity surrounding this year's State Budget, it is nothing to get excited about; rather it is a cause for grave concern. It demonstrates beyond doubt just how bereft of purpose and bankrupt of expertise this National Party State Government is when it comes to properly managing the affairs of Queensland.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (2.50 p.m.): Having listened to the diatribe of doom and gloom from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton), I believe that he ought to be christened Mr Wet Blanket as well as Mr Invisible.

I have great pleasure in supporting the Premier and Treasurer in his presentation of the Budget. It is significant that the State has again brought down a balanced Budget. That is something that has not occurred in the other States or in the Commonwealth.

Government is no different from business; sound business principles must be employed, otherwise a State will go down the tube, so to speak. Deficit budgeting is a mechanism for doing just that. The Federal Government, by its huge deficit budgeting, is simply mortgaging the future well-being of the people of this nation. Deficit budgeting has been and can be used in the short term in an endeavour to overcome pressing

economic problems. However, if it is used for an extended period, the country will start going down the financial tube.

The Federal Government was pleased to announce a reduction in the Budget deficit this year. I am sure that all honourable members were pleased to note that it has endeavoured to reduce the deficit. However, as the Premier and Treasurer has said, it has been done at the expense of the States, not by trimming Federal Government expenditure.

Queensland has continued to live within its means. That is evidenced by the balanced Budget that has been presented and by the very high credit rating Queensland enjoys with the Eurodollar and Swiss money markets. The ability to raise overseas loan moneys at the most favourable interest rates means substantial cost savings to the State and its people.

Last year, the Queensland Government budgeted for an estimated accumulated deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$149,657. However, that deficit turned out to be an accumulated surplus of \$166,102 because receipts during that year were \$37,056,000 more than estimated in the 1984 Budget. That enabled the Government to inject an additional \$36.89m into the State's economy.

Queensland has enjoyed a reasonably good year. However, there are areas of major concern, and I will highlight a few of them. One matter of major concern is the continued discrimination against this State by the Commonwealth. It is no use the Opposition's claiming that Queensland is getting more funds from Canberra under the socialists than it got from the Fraser Government. Queensland is entitled to its fair share of increased revenue. It simply has not been receiving its proportional share. Over the past two years, payments from all Commonwealth sources increased by 14.5 per cent, which is less than the inflationary trend. In that time the Commonwealth increased its own spending by 29.4 per cent, and at the same time it received almost a 32 per cent increase in tax collections. Of course, this year's Commonwealth Budget included an increase in payments to this State from all sources of 5.3 per cent, whereas it budgeted to increase its own expenditure by almost 12 per cent. Towards the end of my speech I will deal with Government spending.

The increase in payments to Queensland of 5.3 per cent will not match the inflationary trend, over which the Commonwealth has control. It is significant that State grants are no longer a percentage of tax collections but are, as the Premier and Treasurer indicated, any figure that the Commonwealth desires to nominate. That change has resulted in a loss of approximately \$137.6m to Queensland this year. That is as a result of the report of the Grants Commission. The change in interstate relativities has resulted in an estimated loss of \$134.7m of the State's total tax pool.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that Queensland would have the fastest proportional increase in identified health grants. It is obvious that, because of its low base, Queensland would require a greater proportional increase than the other States. Identified health grants have been reduced by \$8m as a result of a change from the growth factor from tax collections to the Consumer Price Index. All States have suffered a loss, but Queensland has fared worst of all.

Under Medicare, Queensland will receive an estimated \$73.4m. It is being short-changed under Medicare funding—a fact that the Opposition cannot deny. This morning's press reported the Leader of the Opposition as condemning the Queensland hospital system and calling for a greater allocation of funds. Considering the cut-back in Medicare funding and identified health grants, what a hypocritical statement that is. It is about time the Leader of the Opposition brought pressure to bear on his colleague the Federal Minister for Health (Dr Blewett) instead of sticking up for him. It is time he stuck up for Queensland for a change.

The Opposition health spokesman, the honourable member for Townsville (Mr McElligott), supports discrimination against the sick and infirm of Queensland. It is

nothing short of a scandal. The honourable member ought to hide himself in a bush. The figures show conclusively that, on a population basis, Queensland's share of the Medicare levy, which all tax-payers pay, is \$155m. Queensland is being short-changed by \$82m. On a per capita basis, Queensland receives \$29, New South Wales, \$67, Victoria, \$63, Western Australia, \$63, Tasmania, \$75, and South Australia, \$81. The total identified health grants and Medicare funds paid to Queensland will be less this year than they were last year. Queensland is the only State to suffer a decrease. The interstate comparison is: Tasmania, \$243, South Australia, \$220, Western Australia, \$190, New South Wales, \$168, Victoria, \$154, and Queensland, \$72. There is no disputing those figures relating to the payments by the Federal Government for the Queensland hospital system and health care.

As the Premier and Treasurer indicated—

“... conscious decisions by the Commonwealth will short-change Queensland by over \$362 million for 1985-86.

This shortfall of \$362 million is quite apart from the long-standing Commonwealth underfunding of Queensland in the areas of specific purpose payments for Education, Housing and Roads, which will cost Queensland about \$160 million in 1985-86.”

I reiterate that the Commonwealth Government is discriminating against Queensland. I repeat, for the benefit of all honourable members, a statement made by Senator Gareth Evans. There is no doubt in my mind that the Commonwealth is implementing the plan that he had in mind when he referred to the section of the Commonwealth Constitution that deals with grants of money for the States. He said that that was the ideal vehicle by which a central Government in Canberra could bring to heel a State Government of a different political persuasion. That, in a nutshell, accounts for the Commonwealth's action.

Other areas of concern to Queensland are reduced international markets and prices for exports, notably sugar and coal, and the shaky future facing the grain industry. Coupled with the steady influx of people to Queensland, those factors have a marked influence on unemployment and the economy in general. However, in my opinion, the State is well positioned and can look forward to an improvement in its economy and in employment. That contention is supported by Queensland's recording the highest annual increase in retail sales of 9.7 per cent to 30 June, compared with the Australian average of 7.1 per cent; a population growth of 1.5 per cent compared with the Australian average of 1.2 per cent; and the lowest average annual inflation rate of 5.9 per cent compared with 6.7 per cent for the rest of Australia.

I wish to quote from some of *The Labour Force, Queensland* statistics which show that, without doubt, the State Government's employment policies are working and which also make a mockery of Mr Warburton's claims that the Queensland Government's Special Major Capital Works Program is a sham.

The Special Major Capital Works Program was announced in the Budget presented in September 1984. It must be remembered that the lead time needed to establish the projects would take the benefits, in terms of jobs, well into the 1985 period. However, it is clear that the State Government's initiatives and private enterprise confidence in Queensland's economy have pegged back unemployment.

The strong employment indicators are as follows: in terms of employment growth for the 12-month period from 1984 to 1985, 39 400 jobs were created, which represented a growth of 3.9 per cent in contrast to the national growth rate of 2.8 per cent. Of all the jobs created in Australia over the past year, 21 per cent were created in Queensland, and it must be remembered that Queensland has only 16 per cent of the nation's population.

For August 1985, Queensland was the only State to create jobs; 4 200 were created. During that time, Australia's other States followed the traditional August trend and

recorded a negative rate of employment opportunity growth. The unemployment level for the year from August 1984 to August 1985 dropped by approximately 5 per cent.

These are some of the facts and figures that relate to the economy. Of course, Queenslanders also pay less State and local government taxes than people who live in other States, with the exception of Tasmania. Tasmanians pay \$563.71, compared with \$617.18 in Queensland, \$650.97 in South Australia, \$716.89 in Western Australia, \$876.68 in New South Wales, and \$876.84 in Victoria.

In addition to that, Queensland's export level has risen by approximately 20 per cent on the figures produced for 1983-84. As I indicated previously, job vacancies have increased by 17.5 per cent. Further indicators of growth are that mineral production has increased by 21.6 per cent, housing commencements have risen by 21 per cent for the March quarter of 1985, notwithstanding a State population of 16 per cent of the nation, new home approvals have increased by 4.9 per cent, and the value of all types of buildings approved has increased by 46.7 per cent.

The statistics that I have quoted are not indicators of a shaky economy; rather, they show quite conclusively that the Queensland economy is in reasonably good shape and is well positioned to take advantage of any upturn in the Australian economy.

The Queensland Government has presented a positive approach to the financial administration of this State. Criticism of the Government has been selective and motivated by political views. Foremost among those critics has been the Leader of the Opposition, who has been unable to understand the facts and figures that have been presented to him. The Leader of the Opposition has failed to read the explanatory notes that accompany the financial estimates, and has therefore displayed his economic ineptitude. Beyond any shadow of doubt, he has proved his incompetence, and, by so doing, his criticism of the Budget must be regarded with suspicion, to say the least.

During the Leader of the Opposition's speech, one minute he was claiming that the State was broke and that people needed money for this or that; in the next breath, he was talking about the \$204m surplus. I wish that he would make up his mind and determine which way he is going.

Recently, honourable members had to listen to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) talk about phantom projects in Queensland. Let me say this: it is true that quite a number of projects planned by private enterprise and supported by the Queensland Government did not get off the ground. That happened for very good reasons. The simple fact is that the Australian economy was faltering, and it must be remembered that Queensland is not insulated against the economic ills that presently exist in Australia. Is it a crime for this Government to adopt a positive attitude and attempt to encourage the establishment of industry in this State? Is that what the Opposition is suggesting?

It is unfortunate that economic circumstances changed for the worse and prevented those businesses from being established. The Opposition claims that the Government is trying to talk up the economy. It is a lot better to be optimistic and look to the future than to act like the pessimistic Jonahs on the Opposition benches. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had had the opportunity to put his money where his mouth is, he might know a bit about what it takes to set oneself up in private enterprise and how economic circumstances can affect such an attempt.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: I suggest that I have done a little bit more than the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

In an attempt to be a little more positive, I turn to what has been achieved in Queensland. The list of achievements is extremely impressive, particularly when one considers that \$1.2 billion has been spent on the Tarong Power Station, with all the employment that that has created; \$600m on mainline electrification; \$400m to open the Curragh mine; \$277m on the Burdekin Falls Dam, which will irrigate approximately

45 000 ha and open up about 500 new farms; \$250m on the Dalrymple Bay coal-handling terminal at Hay Point; \$250m on the Wivenhoe Power Station hydroelectricity project; \$200m on the riverside centre; \$180m on the Abbot Point coal export facility; and \$120m was spent last year on the Jackson pipeline. In addition, \$12m was spent on the higher education college of tourism and hospitality at South Brisbane. For the 1985 year a record billion-dollar-plus worth of projects are under way. So it is about time that more Opposition members became a little more positive instead of knocking and screaming all the time. All they are trying to do is talk down the economy, and they know it.

Furthermore, the Queensland Government has provided about \$31m to the sugar industry and has added a further \$20m in the Budget. Members just heard the Leader of the Opposition condemning that provision. That additional amount brings the Government's contribution to \$51m, in contrast to the miserable \$10m that has been given by the Federal Government over the same period. The Federal Government saw fit to assist BHP without imposing any conditions on that assistance or asking the States whether they wished to contribute to that assistance. About \$358m was provided for the ailing steel industry and \$150m to the car industry in South Australia. But the Federal Government has made only a token gesture to the great sugar industry. Prior to the 1983 Federal election, Mr Hawke and Mr Kerin travelled up and down the sugar areas of the State promising assistance by way of industry loans and/or underwriting of the 1982 crop, but in spite of the massive revenue the Federal Government gains from all sections of the sugar industry through taxes, excise and other charges, it expects this State to contribute 50 per cent of the cost of a price support scheme. Actions speak louder than words. Opposition members in this House, like their colleagues in Canberra, are long on rhetoric but pretty short on action.

Mr Randell: Mr Hawke will find out what the sugar farmers think of him when he has the Cabinet meeting in Cairns next week. They are up there waiting for him.

Mr NEAL: I bet that they are.

I now turn to some specific areas of the Budget. Education, the largest single item, has enjoyed an increase of \$102.2m, or 9 per cent on last year's Budget, bringing the total allocation to \$1,174.8m, an enhancement over and above the inflationary trend which allows gains in real money terms.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr NEAL: The member for Brisbane Central says that that is not enough. Honourable members heard the Leader of the Opposition say that nothing was enough in any direction, that the Government was broke and that it was complaining about not getting enough money from Canberra.

Under the Education Vote, 1 087 additional teachers will be employed and about \$8.5m is allocated to employ temporary teachers to cater for reduced class sizes and anticipated increased enrolments. An additional 135 teachers will be engaged in TAFE colleges. The sum of \$5m is to be spent on the computer education program that is already in place.

One of the problems associated with that program was that, if a school was eligible to get five computers, it received those five computers, but it did not receive some of the necessary support equipment. Perhaps it would have been better if the schools had been provided with four computers and the necessary support equipment.

One measure that is pleasing is the increase, in funding to community kindergartens, from 59 per cent to 80 per cent of approved staff cost. This fills in the gap left by the withdrawal of Federal Government funding. It is another example of the Federal Government coming in, paying money into a particular area and then pulling out and leaving the State to pick up the tab.

Remote area tuition allowances and per capita grants to independent schools have been increased. The remote area tuition allowances will be \$945 (primary) and \$1,261 (secondary) for students at schools with the highest fees; \$473 to \$944 (primary) and \$632 to \$1,260 (secondary) for students at schools with modest fees; and \$472 (primary) maximum and \$631 (secondary) maximum for students in schools with low fees (based on actual tuition fees payable).

Per capita grants for primary and secondary students in non-Government schools will increase as follows: primary from \$384 to \$411 per annum and secondary from \$621 to \$666 per annum. The increases will be effective from the third term of 1985.

The remote area hostel allowance of \$369 for each eligible student will be available in 1986 for students boarding at student hostels.

Remote area travel allowances apply to all eligible isolated students. The amount of the assistance varies according to the location of the home and the distance travelled to the boarding facility. In 1986, assistance to students will range from \$53 to \$475.

All those measures will be of tremendous benefit to those people who, of necessity, have to send their children away to enable them to receive an education.

The school transport service will benefit by an increase of 6.3 per cent in the rates payable.

It is pleasing to note that \$120,000 has been allocated for the purchase of replacement radio transceivers for the School of the Air centres in Mount Isa, Charleville and Cairns. The School of the Air plays a very important role in the education of children in those remote areas.

I wish to raise a number of needs in my electorate. Recently, approval was given for \$338,000 to be spent on a manual arts block at the St George High School. That building, when completed, will enable high school students to carry out all their studies at the school. At present, manual arts students have to travel a considerable distance to and from the primary school in which the old manual arts block is located. The people of the area are extremely pleased with the project. However, a need still exists for tuck-shop facilities. I do not know whether consideration has been given to the inclusion of those facilities in the building, but I would like the relevant Minister to have a look at that matter.

The Miles High School is in a similar situation to that once faced by the St George High School. It requires the addition of manual arts and home economics blocks. Each day the students have to walk to the primary school to undertake study in those subjects. Much time is lost each week and, in addition, students are put at risk in the traffic. Although the provision of those blocks at the Miles High School has not received consideration in this year's Estimates, I hope that it will be included next year.

Overcrowding will be alleviated at the Tara Primary School with the erection of the new two-storey teaching block to cost \$419,000. Because of the subdivision of large areas of land into hobby farms, the Tara Primary School has experienced a significant increase in enrolments. The new building will overcome those problems.

I ask that consideration be given to the provision of a married teacher's residence at the Beardmore Primary School. Tenders were called for the work. I believe that none were acceptable and that they will be re-called. The teacher at the Beardmore Primary School presently lives at Westmar and has to drive about 20 km to the school. During wet weather, he is unable to get to the Beardmore Primary School and, as a result, children lose a number of school days.

The problems that I have outlined represent some of the more pressing needs in my electorate. I am hopeful that those projects can be included in the forthcoming program under the \$100m allocated over and above the capital works program that has been earmarked to meet the need for providing educational facilities, of which \$64.4m is to be spent this year.

Turning now to health services—I am pleased that the new hospital at Dirranbandi, which will cost \$2.2m, is under way. This project is clear evidence of the Government's concern for the well-being of people in such remote areas. The Miles hospital is also to undergo renovation and reorganisation of facilities to the value of approximately \$800,000.

It is pleasing to see in the Budget the increase by 104 officers in police strength. A need exists for a greater number of police, but unfortunately, the Budget must cater for a variety of needs. It is not always possible to give to specific areas the amount of money that one would hope for. The allocation of \$3.9m for further extensions of the police computer system will greatly increase the police force's efficiency, as will the \$1.1m for communication equipment to include a three-phase radio communications network.

A need exists in my electorate for the construction of a married policeman's residence in the town of Tara and for the shifting of the office of the clerk of the court and the court-room out of the Tara police station into a separate, new building. A clerk of the court should be appointed. The three police officers and the civilian clerk all work in overcrowded conditions in the one cramped, closed-in veranda area of the police residence. I hope that the Minister for Police (Mr Glasson) and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) will give consideration to the almost impossible situation at Tara, because it is not conducive to encouraging police officers to remain in the town.

The nation is facing one of the greatest crises in the history of primary industry. Not only is the sugar industry in major trouble, but primary industry in general is at the crossroads. Together with mining, it creates almost 75 per cent of our export-earnings and affects the lives and aspirations of all Australians. Rural production costs have increased disproportionately to all other production costs in Australia. Farmers and graziers are producing more but are retaining less of the community's income. These are the reasons why children of families who have run successful rural enterprises for several generations find that better work prospects exist elsewhere and leave the land. Primary industry has not been receiving its balanced share of the nation's resources.

It was pleasing to note that \$21.4m was allocated in the Budget for the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication campaign. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) crowed about the fact that Queensland receives 43 per cent of the total funding allocated by the Federal Government under that scheme. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, who is not present in the Chamber, that, because Queensland has approximately 50 per cent of the total number of cattle in Australia, why should it not receive such a high percentage of the Federal Government's funding? It is only reasonable that it should do so, because this is the State that has the cattle. It is nothing for the Leader of the Opposition to crow about, and I hope that I have set him straight.

In the Budget, \$20m was allocated to the sugar industry, and \$360,000 was provided for research into food irradiation techniques.

Because of the agreement that has been reached to curtail speeches, I do not have time to cover a number of other issues that I would otherwise have dealt with. The Premier and Treasurer indicated that, during the current session of Parliament, the Government will introduce legislation to establish a new financing body called the Queensland Industry Development Corporation. The Agricultural Bank, the Rural Reconstruction Board, the Industries Assistance Board and other rural-financing schemes, which provide finance and support to Queensland industry in general and the rural sector in particular, will be amalgamated with the new corporation. I assume that existing loans under those schemes will remain because the contracts have already been signed. I know that people are concerned about that.

In conclusion—the Premier and Treasurer has presented a responsible Budget that has increased overall spending by 7.26 per cent, which is basically in line with inflation. That increase is less than the Federal Government's increase in spending by 12 per cent,

which is in excess of the inflation rate. The Premier has not brought down an inflationary Budget.

The Budget will continue the Government's program of development and at the same time stimulate the private sector. It places an accent on employment and will not fuel the fires of inflation. I am pleased to support the Budget. The Leader of the Opposition, in being critical of the Premier and Treasurer, alleged that the Premier wants everyone other than the State Government to make cut-backs, but the 7.6 per cent increase in the State Budget is much less than the Commonwealth Government's increase in expenditure of 12 per cent.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (4.20 p.m.): I take pleasure in joining this Budget debate. Before I get to the major topic of my speech, which will be a definitive statement on prisons and the way this Government is handling the Prisons Department, I shall refer to comments made this morning on an Australian Broadcasting Corporation program by the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) that single mothers are deviants. That is part of a rather sick campaign by the Government. At the week-end, in *Personally Speaking*, the Premier said that the southern States continue their population decline because of policies which promote social perversion.

Now, more than ever, the National Party Government is sick and twisted. Now, more than ever, it is exhibiting its extreme, reactionary, right-wing views, which would be absolutely abhorrent to any democratically thinking person in the society. Fancy the Premier and Treasurer speaking about social perversion; he has perverted the industrial processes of this State. Fancy his speaking about social perversion when he has, with his gerrymanders, perverted the democratic processes of this State. Fancy his speaking about social perversion when he has perverted the Budget by having \$204m transferred from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Trust and Special Funds.

Let me return to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz), the same Minister who stood in this Chamber and tried to say that the member for Mackay (Mr Casey) ought to be thrown out of this Chamber because he did not stand up for the playing of *God Save The Queen*. By his outlandish and reactionary statements, he was trying to gain favour with the Premier. That is appalling. When he described all single parents as deviants, he slandered them all. That is a shocking slur on single parents. He was given every opportunity to retract that reactionary statement, but he made it three times. On three occasions he said that single parents are deviants.

Yesterday the public witnessed a propaganda exercise by Lady Flo and Mr Muntz, on behalf of the National Party, in declaring next year as the Year of the Parent. The Government intends to spend \$200,000 on that exercise in 1986, which is the year for international peace. The Government will not have a bar of international peace, but it will promote the Year of the Parent. In doing that, it is following on from the Year of the Family, which was held in 1984. That was nothing more than a cynical propaganda exercise designed so that party hacks—particularly National Party back-benchers representing metropolitan electorates—could be given promotions and allowed to front up before the public eye.

I wonder whether the Minister for Welfare Services (Mr Muntz) will ensure that single parents are included in the 1986 Year of the Parent activities. Perhaps he does not consider them to be parents at all. I strongly believe that Mr Muntz should not pass moral judgment on single parents. If anybody is acting as a deviant, it is the National Party Government. If any deviant acts have been done concerning single parents, they have been done by members of the Government. In any society, any Government that does not attempt to minimise and mitigate social disadvantage has no right to be called truly democratic. On that basis, sitting on the Treasury benches in this Chamber is the most undemocratic Government in the Commonwealth.

I wonder whether, in the Year of the Parent, the problems of parents, particularly single parents, in getting a roof over their children's heads will be highlighted. This Government refuses to match full Federal funds for bond and rent relief. This Government

is letting go millions of dollars and not helping families to get a roof over their heads. The necessary prerequisite for people to be good parents and the necessary prerequisite for people in life is to have a roof over their heads, yet the Minister says that single parents are deviants. I wonder whether, in the 1986 Year of the Parent, the National Party's publicity machine will tell the people why the State Government took away the \$54 a year that supporting mothers received for sending their children to attend Years 8, 9 and 10 at secondary school level.

In all other States, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria, single parents receive more than \$200 a week on a means-tested basis to send their children to school in Years 8, 9 and 10. The Governments in those States know that the cost of sending a child to high school is very high. In fact, the cost is in excess of \$300. The Governments in those States help single parents so that their children receive equality of opportunity. However, the Queensland Government, because of its misguided, reactionary and red-necked attitude towards single parents, punishes the children of single parents. It is now obvious why it discontinued the annual allowance for high school students from poor families. Again I wonder whether next year, the Year of the Parent, the National Party Government will tell single mothers and other persons why it spends less on health, why it spends less on education, why it spends less on family welfare and why it spends less on the aged.

I dissociate myself from what has happened and state strongly that the Opposition finds abhorrent the statements made by the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz). The statements that he has made have been the most disgraceful statements that I have heard from a Minister who has held office under the Crown.

I wish to refer to prisons and to the inability of the Government to look after prisons properly. The Premier and Treasurer said that one of the four major objectives of his Budget was to maintain essential services. In a brilliant speech, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) showed how that objective and the other three objectives were fraudulent, farcical and a hoax. The statements made by the Premier and Treasurer were disgraceful. The Queensland Government is transferring \$204m from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Trust and Special Funds. As the Leader of the Opposition said, it is a stingy, penny-pinching attitude towards the funding of essential services.

Nowhere is that more evident than in the Government's funding of prison services. Over the past two years, the number of convicted persons admitted to Queensland prisons has increased dramatically, but nothing has been done in the State Budget to relieve the overcrowding that has placed enormous pressures on prison staff and prisoners themselves.

The last new prison was built in Woodford in 1973, and prison facilities and staff have not kept pace with the increase in prison populations. The number of prisoners in all Queensland gaols at 30 June 1974 stood at 1 401. At 30 June 1983, it was 1 773; at 30 June 1984, it was 1 888; and at 30 June 1985, it was 1 999. That is an increase of 598, or about 43 per cent, without any new facilities being built by the Queensland Government.

When one looks at the changes in sentencing patterns over the last two years, one finds cause for serious concern. Overcrowded conditions have occurred because of a major shift in sentencing patterns. Put simply—more people have been sent to prison for longer periods. The only category that has shown a decline in the past two years is persons sentenced to less than six months. The number of prisoners in all other categories—that is, those in excess of six months—has increased significantly.

The trend to longer sentences is likely to accelerate. Recently the Court of Criminal Appeal set a new scale of suggested penalties for house-breakers. The old sentencing "tariff" for burglary—house-breaking at night—was around three years, rising to five years for multiple offences. In a recent written judgement, Mr Justice Connolly said that other judges agreed that the present scale was too low and failed to reflect the seriousness

of the offences. Justice Connolly went on to say that the general level of sentencing for burglary should be in the order of five years, with substantial increases when there is a bad criminal history. He said also that the house-breaking "tariff" usually had been a year to 18 months, rising to three years in multiple cases, and that this would also be increased to maintain relativity with burglary offences.

When the forthcoming legislation dealing with drug offenders is introduced, penalties of life imprisonment will be imposed. That means that Queensland courts will drastically increase penalties for house-breakers and drug offenders, accelerating the trend to longer sentencing patterns.

The 1983-84 annual report of the Comptroller-General of Prisons stated—

"Changes in sentencing patterns have an immediate effect upon prisoner population. When length of sentences increase, there is an escalation in the prisoner population as more prisoners are on hand for a longer period.

Both interstate and overseas experience has shown that when these patterns occur, then, unless sufficient accommodation and suitable programs are available, severe prisoner management problems develop."

I emphasise the last statement in that report. The contents of the report have been known for at least two years to the Minister in charge of prisons (Mr Muntz). He stands condemned for his failure to take any meaningful steps to overcome the problem. He must have been aware of it for nearly two years, because his own department was ringing the warning bells.

Undoubtedly, too few cells and not enough warders spell trouble for Queensland's prison system. That same message was being given to the Minister. Why did he not listen? Why has he not acted?

Townsville's Stuart prison had a high of 414 inmates in the 1983-84 year and currently has 452—a degree of overcrowding which is a potential time bomb. The position in Stuart prison is a classic case of a prison not being "at capacity", as the Minister euphemistically likes to say, but severely overcrowded.

Similarly, overcrowding in the Brisbane Prison Complex is so severe that currently 13 inmates are sleeping on the library floor. Mattresses are put on the library floor, and those inmates sleep on them every night.

Prisons Department staff numbers were 1 135 in 1983, 1 134 in 1984 and 1 139 as at 30 June 1985. That is an increase of 0.4 per cent, whereas prison numbers have increased from 1 773 to 1 999—an increase of 11.3 per cent in the same period.

The announcement in the Budget of an additional 134 prison officers is in the classic mould of too little too late. In fact, it is less than half what the Minister responsible for prisons wanted. It is obvious that these prison officers will be brought on stream very slowly. The Government has allocated an additional \$500,000. If those officers were to be employed almost immediately, the Budget allocation required would be in excess of \$2m.

Staffing is not, however, the only area in which this Government is not doing its job. In November 1982, the Offenders Probation and Parole Act was amended to allow community service as an alternative to the non-payment of fines. The percentage of fine-defaulters in prison was 36 per cent in 1981-82 and declined to 34 per cent in 1983-84 and 27.3 per cent in 1984-85. Although the percentage has declined, the number of fine-defaulters has not.

It is unfortunate that fine option orders are not being offered by some magistrates and, in many cases, because of lack of understanding and low literacy levels, are not fully understood by people before the courts, and consequently are not accepted. A person opting for community service must do so at the time he or she enters a plea and before the magistrate imposes the fine. The only people who appear to be benefiting from this worthwhile reform are "smarties" who would have, and in some cases could

have, paid the fine and would not have gone to gaol anyway. They are the ones who are opting out.

It seems absurd to imprison an offender for an offence which the court has decided warrants only the payment of a fine. It is particularly paradoxical where the legislature has not made the offence punishable by imprisonment.

On economic grounds the imprisonment of fine-defaulters is ridiculous. Imprisonment extinguishes a fine. So not only is revenue lost, but it also costs about \$85 a day to keep a person in prison to cancel a fine at the rate of \$10 per day. What shocking and negative economics!

Default imprisonment is clearly discriminatory. It is inevitable that the poor and the disadvantaged are imprisoned rather than those with ample means. It is appalling and reprehensible that 27.3 per cent of all admissions to Queensland gaols in 1984-85 were for failure to pay fines. These people are in prison because of their financial situation rather than for the crime they committed.

The extension of the community service order scheme to include fine-defaulters is designed to keep less-dangerous people out of prison. I want the Offenders Probation and Parole Act to be further amended to allow fine option orders to be taken up at the time that fine-defaulters are picked up by the police to be taken to prison. Currently, offenders have to indicate that they want that option before sentence is given, and they are not doing so. An offer at such a time will undoubtedly have more impact and is more likely to be accepted. Surely the Government does not want to clutter up this State's prisons by having people placed in them because of their financial situation, not because of the crime that they committed.

A study which will soon be published by the Australian Institute of Criminology will reveal some startling statistics. It will reveal that in Queensland 23.7 per cent of remandees—that is, persons who are in prison awaiting trial—are acquitted when they finally face the court. The next highest corresponding figure for a State is 3.8 per cent. In other words, almost one in every four persons on remand in Queensland prisons is innocent, whereas the ratio in other States is less than one in 25. That bears emphasis. It is absolutely scandalous that almost one in four people on remand in Queensland prisons is acquitted by a court, when the corresponding figure for the next highest State is less than one in 25.

On 30 June 1985, Queensland prisons contained 165 remandees. Statistically, about 40 of those inmates will be acquitted by a court. Sometimes a person is on remand in gaol for three, four or even five months. That is scandalous. The remand study outcome will show that remandees acquitted were charged with offences across the board, not offences in any particular category.

It appears that, in Queensland, more cases are taken to court with insufficient evidence and that bail is refused to a substantial proportion on the basis of lack of employment or lack of a fixed address. It is scandalous that, although our gaols are severely overcrowded, nearly one in four remandees in gaol is innocent and is costing the tax-payer approximately \$85 a day whilst awaiting a hearing which will result in acquittal.

I challenge the Government to give an explanation of that scandal. I challenge the Minister for Police (Mr Glasson) and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper) to explain why suffering should be inflicted on so many remandees who are subsequently said to be innocent. The study, when published, will cause severe embarrassment to the National Party Government. It is scandalous that it should have allowed the practice to continue.

Another reform which would help reduce the overcrowding in our prisons is to change the scales of remissions being offered. The scales of remissions are more favourable in States such as Victoria and New South Wales than they are in Queensland. The Queensland scales have not been changed since 1959.

The level of remissions for male prisoners with no previous convictions in Queensland is one-quarter of the head sentence. The level is as little as one-sixth for prisoners with previous convictions. In New South Wales, on the other hand, remissions of up to one-third of the sentence are taken off the non-parole period as well as from the head sentence—a move which is a positive early-release program. It is a move that I strongly advocate. The Victorian remission scale allows reductions of up to one-third. In other words, if a prisoner serving three years in Victoria behaves himself, he will be released after two years without parole.

If the Queensland Government is unwilling to offer more favourable remission scales to improve discipline and/or on humanitarian grounds, it should do so on the basis of hard-nosed economic realities. People cluttering up our prisons at a cost of \$20,000 a year each should be offered remissions as an incentive to behave themselves, to enhance discipline.

A further cause of overcrowding in Queensland gaols is the inability of the Parole Board to hear parole applications. One way of overcoming the serious back-log would be to institute a policy of automatic paroles for prisoners with head sentences of two years or less at the completion of half their term, unless a longer non-parole period was recommended or the prison authorities could prove that such a parole would endanger either the inmate or society.

A properly funded parole service would still keep a high level of supervision and should mean positive control. When a person is paroled, he is not allowed to run loose. Discipline, supervision and control are implied. Moreover, it costs a mere \$700 to police a parolee for a year, whereas the annual cost of keeping a person in gaol for one year is in excess of \$20,000. Once more, I make the charge that that is a positive measure that would stop overcrowding in our gaols.

The secrecy provisions in the Queensland parole system are a constant source of irritation to inmates of our prison system. Since the New South Wales Probation and Parole Act of 1983 came into operation on 27 February 1984, prisoners have been able to avail themselves of legal representation before the Parole Board. Section 27 of the New South Wales Act requires the board to serve, on any prisoner refused parole, a notice advising him or her of the date of a further meeting of the board, at which time his or her case would be reviewed. At the review hearing the prisoner is entitled to be legally represented.

The New South Wales legislation is designed to help reduce the prison population. Prisoners who could appear before the board are those sentenced to a term of imprisonment of more than three years and given a non-parole period. Prior to the expiration of the non-parole period, the Parole Board is required to consider whether the prisoner should be released on parole. The constant parroting of the Minister in charge of prisons that Queensland has the best prison system in Australia is a very sick joke. The Minister still thinks more in terms of punishment than in terms of rehabilitation.

The education program in each Queensland prison consists of correspondence courses, prison classes and training in prison workshops. Overall, the level of education services in Queensland prisons is very low. In fact, it is the lowest of any State in the Commonwealth. The predominant education need in Queensland prisons is in the areas of basic literacy and numeracy. Surely, some kind of remedial education in basic literacy and numeracy would help prisoners to stay out of gaol. That is something that I think should be done as a matter of urgency.

In contrast to the situation interstate and overseas, there are no full-time education officers in the Queensland prison system. Rehabilitation in other prison systems involves not only education but also employment training. Brisbane prison is typical of the lack of a genuine commitment to workable employment training within the Queensland system. At Brisbane gaol, only one prisoner in four is engaged in some form of work, whereas the other three-quarters of the prison population is idle. That is not the way that men should serve their time or the way in which they should be disciplined.

Prisoners should learn something while they are in prison. There is also no sport or any organised recreational program.

The Brisbane women's prison is just as bad. The 52 women there have no jobs to do other than general cleaning duties.

Prisons should not be holiday homes, but they should offer inmates a chance to learn new skills, to improve their education and to emerge from prison better equipped to be citizens who have paid the price for their crimes and who can contribute to society.

The Queensland Government is living in the Dark Ages. It still believes in making life in prison a misery. What the National Party forgets—particularly Mr Muntz—is that its penny-pinching is also making life miserable for prison officers and their families. Prison officers are constantly at risk because of understaffing. They are very concerned about their own security. Because of that, prison officers have cut back on certain programs and have done away with concessions. That provides fuel to light the fire that will incite prisoners to riot. There are many hotheads in the prison system, and Queensland has had plenty of examples of riots recently.

The poor state of Queensland prisons has gained a reputation in other states, not only amongst prison authorities but also amongst inmates.

It is ironic that interstate transfers marginally favour Queensland. The Victorian Prison Department has reported that eight prisoners in Queensland gaols have applied for transfer to Victoria under interstate prisoner transfer provisions for welfare reasons, whereas no Victorian prisoners have applied for a transfer to Queensland. It is interesting to note that the prisoners are voting with their feet and have indicated that they prefer to go south. The prisoners know, because the grape-vine is pretty good. Unlike southerners settling in Queensland, southern prisoners of Queensland origin are reluctant to apply for transfers.

As I have said, the solution to Queensland's overcrowded prisons demands forward-thinking policies, such as I have stated. I will reiterate what they are: the reform of the fine option system; a fairer approach to bail; and the adoption of early release programs and easier parole provisions.

I challenge the Minister to a public debate on this pressing problem, at any venue and at any time he chooses. If the Minister thinks he is right, let him come out and debate the prisons issues that I have brought before the Parliament.

The Prisons Act and Regulations have not been reviewed since 1959. On 4 October 1978, I asked a question concerning a review of the Prisons Act and Regulations, and was told action was being taken to update them. On 29 November 1979, a similar question was asked by me and the answer was that they would be reviewed in the next session of Parliament.

On 29 April 1980—as you will notice, Mr Menzel, I have been very consistent—I asked a further question and was given the answer that—

“Legislation will be introduced during the spring session of Parliament.”

This was followed by questions on 9 September 1981 and again on 20 October 1982, with the final answer, as recorded in *Hansard*, being—

“The Government is working on the legislation and that in due course it will come before the House.”

This must be the longest gestation period of any reform in parliamentary history. Surely action is long overdue. The inability of this hill-billy National Party Government to bring in an updated Prisons Act and Regulations is indicative of its lack of policies. It is no wonder that, with the constant chopping and changing on policy, the morale within the Prisons Department is zero.

Moreover, two or three senior appointments over recent years have not helped. As a former public servant, I know how disturbing it is when senior appointments are made

from outside the department, particularly when the positions are filled by people with no background or expertise in the field of the appointment. That has contributed to the low morale in the public service. When that is added to a most inept Minister responsible for prisons, it is no wonder that the Queensland prison administration is totally lacking in direction.

The National Party Government itself should be behind bars for its criminal neglect of the State's prison system. As I said before, gaols are not meant to be holiday homes; but the bread and water mentality of the State Government is compounding the problems of staff shortages, accommodation shortages and the lack of education and rehabilitation programs.

The list of problems that the recent Budget did not address goes on and on. It begins with poor administration. That was indicated in the Longland report. There is overcrowding in Queensland's gaols. At Brisbane gaol, prisoners are sleeping in the library. Stuart gaol has 50 more prisoners than its official capacity. Prison staff have been banned from working overtime so that they cannot do their job properly. They then take concessions from prisoners, and that is lighting the fuse of problems in the State's gaols. Because of a shortage of prison officers, contact visits for the families of inmates have been cancelled. I heard that a mother was refused a contact visit by her five-year-old daughter because of staff shortages, and that is absolutely appalling.

Police watch houses are being used as gaols; yet when I first raised that matter, the Minister responsible for prisons gave me a classic reply. He said he would move a couple of demountables to Brisbane gaol. What a joke! For eight years I have been trying to get rid of a couple of demountable classrooms at a school in my electorate and have finally succeeded. I will offer them to the Minister. The suggestion was just ludicrous. People are being kept on remand in watch houses for days and weeks without changes of clothing, proper exercise or family visits. Convicted prisoners have been callously removed from police watch houses in Brisbane to the gaol at Rockhampton, hundreds of kilometres from their families. The Minister said that he was quite sure that the families would not care about that.

Queensland is the only State in Australia that does not provide subsidised transport to prison farms. Queensland has two great prison farms at Numinbah Valley and Palen Creek, but it is impossible for poor people to travel to them to visit their loved ones. Such visits should be part of rehabilitation programs.

Cost-cutting programs prevent routine maintenance, including pest control, being carried out at prisons. For example, Etna Creek and Stuart prisons are lice infested because the Government cannot find the money to employ pest exterminators. As I said earlier, because of staff shortages, long-standing concessions have been removed from prisoners. A number of former prisoners told me recently that drugs are sold in Brisbane gaol—that they are freely available.

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr FOURAS: I will take up the point made by the member for Fassifern about Queensland's prison system being the best in Australia, because the Minister continues to tell bigger and bigger lies about the state of Queensland's gaols. Almost daily he is proved to be wrong. Very recently, two prisoners convicted of very serious crimes—a murderer and a rapist—escaped from Woodford prison; but when they were recaptured, they were returned to the prison from which they escaped. What a joke! At the same time as they were being returned, another prisoner went over the fence.

Again the Minister responsible for prisons has told damned lies by saying that Queensland has the best prison system in the world. The Opposition will not let him get away with his cruel, incompetent and deceitful administration of Queensland's prison system. The Minister has shown himself to be totally out of touch with what is happening in his own department, and totally out of touch with the realities of the prison system.

He asked for twice the number of additional prison officers allocated in the State Budget. He received only half the number he asked for, because he is not able to deliver.

How much longer can he claim that Queensland has the best prison system in the world when, day by day, it is decaying? How much longer will he refuse to face the facts? How much longer will prison officers and inmates suffer at the hands of an uncaring, unrealistic and deceitful Government?

The Opposition does not seek to take the side of prisoners. We simply seek a humane and productive prison system. Ignoring the problems will not make them disappear.

In this Budget, the State Government set as one of its four major objectives the maintenance of essential services. That is a farce. The Government transferred \$204m from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Trust and Special Funds. If it was not stingy, uncaring and penny-pinching, that money could have been used to fund the employment of more prison officers and better programs for prisoners. The Government stands condemned.

I challenge the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) to a debate, in any forum or in any place that he chooses, about his maladministration. I know that when the facts are given to the people of Queensland they will move a vote of no confidence in the reactionary, red-necked Minister in charge of prisons.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.51 p.m.): I wish to make some points that I think are relevant. This debate gives members an opportunity to examine the accounts of the State critically. I am pleased that, on this occasion, the Auditor-General's report has been provided in good time to enable members to examine the accounts in some detail with the assistance of his commentary.

I again draw attention to the fact that we are getting the Budget in a rather strange form. The Budget speech deals only with expenditure. It has been traditional for all Governments to produce not only the expenditure story but also the revenue story. There is no shame in telling the Parliament how the revenue is raised. It is true that that information can be obtained by looking at the Budget papers. It is proper for the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen), in his speech to the Parliament, to explain the way in which revenue is being raised.

It is true that no new forms of tax have been introduced. It is also true that, in the last 12 months, taxes have been increased, and increased substantially; so much so that, although the Government could once justifiably claim that Queensland was the lowest-taxed State in Australia, now it has crept up to a position that is about third from the top.

Some taxes have been increased in a rather unusual way. The Financial Administration and Audit Act provides that the increased costs of providing services have to be covered by increased charges. There is no problem in explaining that; that is acceptable. But when the increases are above the increases in the Consumer Price Index, those increases have to be interpreted as taxes.

Between the last two Budgets, charges have increased on 123 occasions. That is a fairly substantial number of occasions on which to increase charges. Of course, a multitude of individual charges have been increased. During the last 12 months, approximately 1 000 charges have been increased. What is remarkable is that some of the charges have been increased twice in that period. During the last 12 months, 40 charges or groups of charges have been increased twice. Some of them are now the highest in Australia for the alleged services provided.

There are surpluses in some of the accounts, which clearly indicates that the increases in the charges were not warranted simply to cover the increased costs of providing the services. That is all revealed in the Auditor-General's report.

It is worthy of note that a number of those charges have been used in the Budget as a form of cross-subsidisation. That is a matter of some concern to those people who have studied the Budget papers. A number of charges in Queensland are now the highest in Australia. Of course, one of those charges is motor registration fees. Although they are not the highest in Australia, they are getting very close to being the highest.

I realise that a number of these fees and charges go into trust accounts. For instance, motor vehicle registration fees do not go into consolidated revenue but into a trust account and are used for the building of roads in this State, and that money is sorely needed. Nevertheless, I think that that should be pointed out.

I cannot see any need for the Treasurer not to mention these matters in the Budget speech. There is no shame. If it is necessary to raise the revenue, it is reasonable to explain where that revenue is raised. That will help this debate and save a considerable amount of research in looking through the Budget papers. In presenting only half the Budget in the Budget speech, the Premier and Treasurer has given the impression that all Governments do is spend money, and that money must be raised.

It is true that the Budget is balanced. However, I remind some Government members that States cannot do anything else but balance their Budgets. Some Government members seem to make a virtue of this balanced Budget story. States do not have printing presses and cannot print money. It is true that the States can issue Treasury notes in certain circumstances to cover long-term payments, among other things. However, States cannot have deficits, so this alleged virtue of having a balanced Budget is simply a matter of notional figures.

When the Labor Party was in office in this State, it always had a balanced Budget. However, it used to put IOUs in all the trust accounts and steal money from those accounts to make the Budget look good. The IOUs had to be redeemed in the following year. In recent years, the Labor Government in New South Wales has done exactly the same thing. The IOUs that are placed in the trust accounts must be paid back out of consolidated revenue. Recently in New South Wales, some people have been paid out of more than one account. For example, judges have been paid out of the railways account because there was not enough money in the judges appropriation to pay them. To get by, the New South Wales Government has had to cheat and fiddle with the system as much as possible.

If Government members wish to boast about the Budget, instead of talking about it as a balanced Budget, they should say that it is a responsibly managed Budget in the sense that lots of IOUs are not lying round in the trust accounts to make the Budget look good. The accounts can be examined in the papers produced by the Auditor-General. I would like to hear a little less virtue being attached to balanced Budgets, because the States have no option but to balance their Budgets. All States balance their Budgets some way or other and all the figures come out right.

It is true that, some years ago, this State had about a \$7m deficit. That was not long after the coalition Government took office from the Labor Party. It was the policy of coalition Governments from 1957 onwards to redeem all of the IOUs that were lying round in the trust accounts. As a result of that policy, consolidated revenue bore a heavy load. Although it meant a fairly lean year or two for the incoming Government, those accounts were put in order and the money was recovered. So, let us hear no more talk about the virtue of balanced Budgets. Perhaps honourable members can talk more about responsibility in the management of accounts so that IOUs are not found floating round.

That is the way in which the Labor administration of the Brisbane City Council managed its affairs—by putting its hand in the trust accounts to make the accounts look good. To the credit of this Government and the coalition Governments since 1957, no attempt has been made to make the accounts look good. The pluses and minuses are there to be seen in the consolidated revenue figures. There is no cheating, double-counting or pretending that the money is there when, in fact, IOUs are in the trust accounts.

Mr Veivers: It is only how they use them.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Well, it is how it is managed. That is the virtue of the Budget. In that respect the Government has many points in its favour. However, some things ought to be criticised, and I hope that this criticism is taken on board with a view to correcting some of the anomalies that appear.

Although the Government is proud of its surplus of \$323,000, let me assure the Chamber that that figure could have been any figure. Having been a Treasurer of this State and having produced three Budgets, I can tell honourable members that that figure could have been \$500,000, \$200,000, \$600,000 or any other figure that one might choose. There are ways in which these things can be refined in a fine-tuning process.

I do say, however, that the simple operation of looking after the accounts of this State is extremely well done by Treasury officials. The supervision is very, very fine. The Auditor-General's responsibility is taken very seriously and the reports that he makes to the Parliament are very revealing. Perhaps Queensland has the best set of figures of any Parliament of Australia. Those figures are produced by the Auditor-General under the Financial Administration and Audit Act. The way in which the figures and the material are presented to this Parliament is the envy of other States. It is the most modern piece of legislation in Australia. Right throughout the nation, those professionally interested in the public service have acclaimed the legislation. It provides one of the best methods of supervision of accounts in the nation. No member of Parliament can complain about the quality of the information provided to this Parliament or about the way in which the accounts are kept.

Unfortunately, the story of Queensland being a low-tax State is rapidly losing credibility. As I said earlier, Queenslanders are now the third-highest taxed in the nation. Many of the individual taxes and charges are in fact the highest in the nation. As these come to hand and are published in the *Government Gazette*, this Parliament should be more critical of them. I am pleased that the Budget contains no new taxes. In a moment I wish to deal with that and, in particular, with stamp duty.

Unemployment in Queensland remains the highest in Australia. Although there have been reductions in the levels of unemployment—the latest figures are for August—the forecasts for the immediate future are not very bright. Some of the provincial cities, particularly those dependent upon the sugar industry, face a fairly substantial rise in unemployment.

Let me deal with some State Government taxes. Firstly, I will discuss stamp duty. Honourable members might be interested to learn that, as levied, the current stamp duty is neither efficient nor equitable and that the burden of State taxes and charges falls disproportionately on small business in this State. In the last year or so, the additional burden of stamp duty in this State nearly strangled prospects for economic recovery for small business.

I will give some figures from the Estimates that cover the period from 1979-80 to 1985-86. In that period, stamp duty Estimates increased from \$160m to \$363m—more than double in seven years. The increase per year expressed as a percentage on the previous year is most revealing. In 1980-81, the increase was 36.6 per cent over the previous year. In 1981-82, the increase in stamp duty was 24 per cent over the previous year. The next year, stamp duty decreased by 0.1 per cent. In 1983-84, the increase in stamp duty over the previous year was 23.2 per cent. In the following year—that is, last year—the increase was 5 per cent, and in the Estimates for this current financial year, the increase over last year's figure is 3.6 per cent.

However, as a percentage of the total revenue of this State, stamp duty is now very dominant. It has gone from 32 per cent to 36 per cent of the total revenue of the State. In fact, in recent times it has skyrocketed. As a percentage increase of all State tax revenues over the previous year, last year the increase was 7.5 per cent and this year's Estimates show an increase of 7.2 per cent.

As the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal) said, that is not unreasonable in view of the increased costs. An increase of 7.2 per cent is quite reasonable and would be accepted. However, when one looks at the details, one finds that, in 1984-85, the increase in revenue from stamp duty was less than the increase in tax revenue generally, but \$32m of the \$66m increase in tax revenue came from pay-roll tax. That story will be repeated this year in the Estimates. The bulk of the \$58m increase—\$35m—will come from pay-roll tax. While stamp duty has played a very significant role in the revenues of the State, and is now over one-third of the revenue of the State, last financial year it overran the Budget estimate by \$19.5m. I repeat that last financial year stamp duty overran the Budget by \$19.5m. It was well above the estimate. It is already a very high figure and made even higher by that extraordinary increase.

As the Premier and Treasurer is rather keen about single taxes, I suggest that he apply the flat-tax principles to stamp duty. It would produce a rather interesting result. The burden of stamp duty levied in this State is placed on small transactions. However, people who conduct large transactions are not paying anything like the amount that they should be paying.

Mr Innes: Like Castlemaine's transfer in Canberra.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member is correct. The transfer of all the Castlemaine shares was carried out in the south. Millions of dollars in revenue were lost to this State in the transfer of those shares to Bond. He wanted to dodge stamp duty because in Queensland it is one of the highest in Australia.

An Honourable Member: \$8m or something, wasn't it?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It was of that order.

The application of the flat-tax principle to stamp duty is an excellent opportunity for the Premier and Treasurer to put into practice what he is preaching. I have a great deal of support for the single tax principle. If that principle were applied to stamp duty, the revenue would be neutral and would reduce the burden considerably on the small business people of this State. The burden could then be shifted onto those persons who should be paying more stamp duty, if stamp duty is recognised as a source of revenue, which we agree that universally it should be. That would take away the burden from small business.

It is rather critical that, from 1979-1980 to the present time, revenue from stamp duty increased by 227 per cent. That compares with an increase in revenue from all taxes of only 203 per cent over the same period. The average annual increase in stamp duty in that period was 15.4 per cent. The average increase in all State taxes in that period was 12 per cent.

By any standard, an increasing reliance has been placed on stamp duty in the raising of revenue. Coupled with the growth in pay-roll tax, with which I will deal in a moment as a separate issue, stamp duty has thwarted developments in this State and been particularly burdensome to small businesses.

There is room for a review of the system of imposing stamp duty. I suggest very strongly that a single rate taxation principle be applied to it. It comes out in a very interesting manner.

By imposing a tax on commercial transactions, the Government is making it more expensive for Queenslanders to conduct business. This is not to suggest that the system should be changed overnight, because these adjustments can be made too quickly and instability caused in the community. There should be some program for a review of stamp duty based on a single tax principle to shift the burden and to reduce it considerably for the smaller operators in this State. For them, stamp duty is an incredible burden. One need talk only to real estate operators in this State to discover the enormous amount

of stamp duty that people are paying on transactions involving homes. When small-businessmen negotiate with banks for overdrafts and enter into leases, a high rate of stamp duty is imposed on those transactions. The stamp duty imposed on shopping centre leases is very high. It is about the highest in Australia. All these small businesses are paying this enormous amount of stamp duty, which can be shifted in the system with the same amount still being collected.

I strongly recommend to the Premier and Treasurer that he make note of that and make a commitment to review the system now, because of his advocacy of the single tax principle. I am sure that all small businesses in this State would welcome such a move. The insurance industry faces an enormous burden in paying stamp duty.

I turn to pay-roll tax. Again, pay-roll tax has overrun the Budget. Last year the threshold was lifted to \$270,000. I forecast then that it would overrun the Budget estimate. It has overrun the estimate by \$5m. This year \$5m more has been collected in pay-roll tax. Yet, in the last financial year, the growth of business and the economy have not been as flash as one would have hoped. In fact there has hardly been an increase in employment in this State. Only about 8 000 additional people are employed year to year. I know that if wrong months are compared, a figure of 20 000 can be found. However, if one compares like with like, there is only an increase of approximately 8 000 in employment.

The pay-roll tax has come from those people who, the previous financial year, were not paying pay-roll tax but who, last financial year, without increasing the number of employees, had to pay pay-roll tax. I warned that that would occur because, last year, the pay-roll tax threshold was not raised beyond the level of the CPI rise. I said then that the Budget estimate would be overrun by a considerable amount. I believe I said about \$7m. In fact I was wrong; it was only \$5m.

This year the pay-roll tax threshold has been raised to \$300,000. That looks impressive but, when one takes into account that it was not accounted for in the previous financial year, by only raising it that small amount, one finds that Queensland is still lagging behind concerning the progression of pay-roll tax exemptions.

It is true, and all Queenslanders can be proud of it—I am particularly proud because I am the person who broke the agreement with the States—that Queensland has the most generous pay-roll tax system in Australia. However, if the Government really wants to help small businesses in the community, it should raise the pay-roll tax threshold to \$600,000 without any hesitation at all. Notionally, that would result in approximately a \$9m loss on the Budget estimate. However, much of that loss will be recovered because those businesses that want to employ more people because they are expanding will put money back into the tax system by paying more pay-roll tax. There would be no great loss to the revenue of the State in putting the threshold up to \$600,000.

Last year the pay-roll tax threshold could easily have been raised to \$500,000. No loss of revenue at all would have been sustained, because the Budget estimate was overrun by \$5m. I forecast now, even though unemployment will be high, that this financial year, on the figures for pay-roll tax as published in the Budget papers, there will again be an overrun on the Budget estimate. Although it may not be as high as \$5m, I forecast that the result will be close to a \$5m overrun.

The fat is in the system to allow a generous threshold to small businesses in the community. The information I have from all sources indicates quite clearly that a threshold of \$600,000 for pay-roll tax, if it were implemented between now and Christmas, would immediately result in at least another 8 000 new jobs in this State. Small businesses that want to employ more people are inhibited from doing so because of the structure of the pay-roll tax system. It is a great burden to those small businesses. It is an antisocial tax. As I said before, it is just as antisocial as the hearth taxes and the window taxes that were abolished years ago because they were antisocial. Among the big payers of pay-roll tax—and, incidentally, the total amount of pay-roll tax collected last year was \$437m—is the Railway Department. Last year the Railway Department paid \$24m in

pay-roll tax. What an absurdity! That money is collected from the customers of the Railway Department and handed over to consolidated revenue.

The greatest absurdity of all is the Education Department. Last year, it paid \$35.7m in pay-roll tax. Where did that money come from? From consolidated revenue! The Budget provides money for the Education Department, from which \$35.7m has to be returned in pay-roll tax. I could list a string of Government enterprises paying pay-roll tax. Of the total amount of pay-roll tax collected, 80 per cent is paid by 20 per cent of employers, the majority of whom are Government enterprises and statutory authorities. The Brisbane City Council pays \$3.5m in pay-roll tax. The University of Queensland pays \$5m in pay-roll tax. Those bodies, with the exception of the railways, are being subsidised by taxes. It is like robbing Peter to pay Paul. While that is happening, the small business people in the community are prohibited from creating employment because the level of pay-roll tax on them is burdensome. Therefore, I again appeal to the Government to review its pay-roll tax policy.

In the last 20 years, the growth in service industries in Queensland has resulted in a 50 per cent increase in employment in those industries. The forecast is that employment opportunities in this State's service industries will increase by leaps and bounds. That is why so many entrepreneurs are investing in Queensland. They are here because of the growth in service industries, not because of new manufacturing industries, high-tech industries or capital-intensive industries. Service industries are where people work and where cash flows. They are the industries of the twenty-first century. Queensland is where service industries will happen. It is in the hospitality industry in tourist areas where people will be employed.

Under our laws, where people are employed the Government imposes a tax. How disgraceful it is in a State that claims to encourage employment that a tax is imposed on those wishing to employ others. It is time that the State adopted an entirely fresh approach. In 1976, when I broke the gentlemen's agreement with the other States that was hog-tying Queensland to a very low threshold limit of approximately \$30,000, the plan was to progressively abolish pay-roll tax. That is what I hope we can do. If we do it the right way by progressively increasing the threshold, in five years' time the State could abolish pay-roll tax without any sacrifice whatever to the revenue of our consolidated revenue accounts. So much business would develop—so many new avenues would open—that stamp duty would make up 50 per cent of the State's revenue instead of the present 30 per cent. There would be so many transactions, so much wealth in the State and so many people wanting to make purchases which attracted stamp duty that the State would be more than compensated for the loss of pay-roll tax.

Mr VEIVERS (Ashgrove) (5.19 p.m.): It is always a very interesting exercise to follow the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) or any other member of the Liberal Party. We listen intently to their very pious statements. I concede that some of the issues raised by the member for Nundah come within the ambit of Labor thinking and make sense. However, the Liberals are past masters at deception. When the chips are really down, they tend to have 20c each way. When the Premier cracks the whip and wants the support of Sir William and the Liberals, that support is forthcoming. The Liberals are desperately trying to return to the Government benches, as Sir William has admitted.

I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Nundah say that over the last 12 months, many increases in charges have been imposed in Queensland. He also admitted that there were increases in taxes. So much for the Premier and Treasurer's deception and the National Party's claim that Queensland is a low-tax State! That is a lot of hog-wash.

Mr FitzGerald: Give us some proof. Give us one example.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member for Lockyer wants proof. What about motor vehicle registration fees and electricity charges? Those two areas are subject to a direct input and influence on the part of the National Party Government.

The honourable member is a person who lives in the country. What about the price of milk, which is Government-controlled in this State? The cost of milk for families is much greater in Queensland than it is anywhere else in Australia. So much for the hypocrisy of Government members who claim Queensland is a low-tax State!

I now wish to speak about a new idea or a new concept—or a new toy to play with, if one likes—that the National Party has dreamed up as the supposed salvation of Australia, according to Sir Joh. The idea I refer to will put Queensland back into the Stone Age. It is the National Party's proposal for a flat rate of taxation. I wish to expose the scheme for what it really is—a sham. I put to honourable members that it is merely a con trick that will be presented to all Australian citizens, including Queenslanders.

Today I wish to talk about the propaganda stunt, the fiscal fraud being peddled by the Premier and Treasurer and his supporters concerning flat-rate taxation. It is important to raise it in this debate on the State Budget, as the Premier and Treasurer of this State desires to impose a flat tax on all Australians.

He accepts that Queensland is part of this nation when matters of taxation are concerned, yet he conveniently tries to isolate us on other matters. He believes that his bizarre taxation philosophy should be imposed not only upon Queenslanders but upon every other Australian as well.

The Premier and Treasurer's argument is based on mathematical simplicity. He is reportedly advocating exemption for welfare recipients, the introduction of a \$1,150 rebate to compensate for the loss of the tax-free threshold, and a single rate of tax of 25 per cent on taxable income. The Premier and Treasurer is on record as supporting that.

Queenslanders should not be fooled by the simplicity of his argument. Do not be fooled that a single-rate tax system will improve the lot of low income earners. Do not be misled by his suggestion that this type of system will strike at the root cause of avoidance and evasion. And, most importantly, do not believe that such a system will provide incentive and rewards for those in our community who want to work harder. It will not do any of those things.

Mrs Chapman: Why not?

Mr VEIVERS: If the honourable member listens, she might understand what this is all about.

The advocates of such a system are not interested in fairness, they are not interested in having an equitable and just taxation system; their motives are based on self-interest, self-protection, and the generation of large fortunes for those already on high incomes and those who are very wealthy. A flat-rate tax of 25 per cent will widen the gap between the rich and the poor. It will create further division between the haves and the have-nots in this country.

Let us look at why the Premier and Treasurer is so interested in flat-rate tax.

Mrs Chapman: Tell us why.

Mr VEIVERS: I will tell the honourable member very shortly.

The Premier and Treasurer is paid a gross salary of \$88,251, and is required to pay tax totalling \$43,345.16 per year, or \$833.56 per week. His wife, Senator Bjelke-Petersen, is paid a parliamentary salary of \$42,889. She is liable for \$16,127.96 in tax each year, or \$310.15 a week but—and here is the sting—under a 25 per cent flat-rate tax scale, the Premier would pay only \$22,062.75 in tax, and his wife would pay only \$10,722.25. Between them the Bjelke-Petersens would save themselves \$26,688.12 in tax every year. It is no wonder both of them want to introduce a scheme under which the rich get richer, and the poor get poorer.

Government Members interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: They are the facts.

Let me now make some comparisons relative to the Premier's proposal. I will deal with someone on \$20,000 a year—less than one-quarter the salary of the Premier. Such a person with a dependent spouse and children now pays an annual tax bill of \$3,608.26. But under the Premier's flat-rate scheme—even with his suggested rebate level of \$1,150—the same wage-earner would pay \$4,712.50 in tax. That is an additional \$1,104.24 every year.

Mrs Chapman: Garbage!

Mr VEIVERS: It is not garbage. I know that the honourable member is very short on mathematical ability, but these are just straight mathematical calculations.

Now let me look at a person earning \$10,000 a year—less than one-quarter of Senator Bjelke-Petersen's salary. On an income of \$10,000, a person with a dependent spouse and children now pays \$511.51 in tax. Under a 25 per cent flat-rate scheme, he or she would pay \$2,212.50. That is an additional \$1,701 each year. The whole flat-rate tax scheme is an attack on family incomes.

Mr Palaszcuk interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I notice that quite a few Government members are nodding their heads because they know that hundreds of thousands of people in this country receive that level of income. The only people to benefit would be single people earning more than \$25,000 a year.

Apart from that scandalous situation, the Premier argues that if high income earners were left with 75 per cent of their extra earnings, they would work harder. I bet that he is going to work harder to get this issue accepted, because he stands to gain so much out of it himself. The net gain, in real money terms, is that the Premier and his wife would be \$513.24 better off every week. That is cash in hand.

Another question that definitely must be asked is: Who is going to pay for the Premier's jaunting around Australia, which he says he intends doing, in support of a flat-rate tax? He admitted that last night, and again today. Will the Premier pay the bill himself? Will the National Party foot the bill? Surely the Queensland tax-payer should not be asked to pay for such a blatant political exercise.

The advocates of flat-rate tax have not explained the basis of their argument, that is, that high income earners reduce their effort, and, therefore, the nation's productivity, because of existing tax rates. The basis of their argument is that there will be increased productivity, more employment and greater investment opportunities. Is that right?

An Opposition Member: They are agreeing.

Mr VEIVERS: Government members are nodding, so they are agreeing.

Let me make some other points. The vast majority of high income earners are employees. By reducing their effort, they do not change their marginal tax rate. That is the first point.

Let us have a look at small-business proprietors. They do not reduce their efforts or the number of hours that they keep their businesses or shops open because they may pay higher marginal tax rates. They rely on their customers and the services provided to maintain their businesses. For example, no shop-keeper will close his shop one day a week because he may go into a higher marginal tax rate. He will not do that.

What about farmers and other primary producers? Let us think about them. By and large, primary producers do not keep their efforts down because they may go into a higher tax bracket. So many variables and uncertainties in the interplay between market forces and production prevent farmers being concerned about pushing themselves into a higher tax bracket. Is a farmer not going to plant a crop because the prospects are

good for a bumper season? Of course he is not. If the rain comes at the right time and the market looks good, he will get right into it and plant the biggest crop that he can so that he can clean up. He is not worried about moving into a higher tax bracket.

The retired wealthy are not going to increase productivity because of a flat-rate tax system. Certainly not! The only people I can think of who would be encouraged to work harder would be professional consultants—self-employed people. From time to time, one hears the comment from them, “What is the point of working harder? I am only working for the taxation department.” Those people alone, who are only a small proportion of high-income earners, would increase their efforts as a result of the introduction of a flat-rate tax.

Let me get back to the fairness argument. There seems to be two reasons why flat-rate tax is unjust. The first is simply that the poor would pay more tax, the middle-income groups would pay more tax and the wealthy would pay less tax.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: Government members are very sensitive about this issue; it is stinging them very hard. The logic of their argument is not right.

As I said, the poor would pay more tax, the middle-income groups would pay more tax and the wealthy would pay less tax. That is why flat-rate tax is unjust. Between them, the poor and the middle-income groups make up the vast majority of society. Only greed would dictate that they should bear a greater burden for the nation's upkeep so that the burden of the wealthy might be lessened.

In 1982-83, a total of 77 per cent of tax-payers had taxable incomes of less than \$20,000. Today, with inflation taken into account, approximately 75 per cent of people would be in that category. In other words, three out of every four people would be worse off under a flat-rate tax system. It is as simple as that. There is the inescapable proof. Government members cannot deny those figures.

Mr Henderson: Rubbish!

Mr VEIVERS: I ask the member for Mount Gravatt: How can that be rubbish? Three out of four people in this country earn less than \$20,000 a year.

A flat rate of 25 per cent or more would have to be levied for the Government, irrespective of its political persuasion, to raise the same amount of revenue as it does under the existing taxation structure. The vast majority of people would be worse off or, as I prefer to say, would have to shoulder a greater burden of taxation than those who are well off.

A major point that has been overlooked in this debate about a flat-rate tax system is that, once a tax-free threshold is introduced of, say, \$5,000, a two-tiered tax structure is put in place. It is not a one-rate tax system. Under this proposal, the present multitiered structure will be replaced by a two-tiered one and, because of the percentage level—approximately 25 per cent—three out of four people will shoulder the burden of income tax revenue in this country.

The Premier and Treasurer wants a society in which the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. He wants a society in which extremes of wealth and poverty are created——

Mr ELLIOTT: I rise to a point of order. I wish to table a document, which is a report of the speech made yesterday by Mr Stone.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr VEIVERS: I will come to Mr Stone in a moment.

The Premier wants a society in which extremes of wealth and poverty are created, maintained and encouraged. Do we want a divided society, a society of tension and

greed, in which the wealthy and powerful determine how the nation's resources and wealth should be shared?

History has proved time and time again that, when large masses of people are discriminated against, they will eventually rise up in revolt to cause chaos in the order of society. Discrimination can be political and economic, and is frequently a combination of both. One has only to look at the tragic situation in South Africa today to understand that the results of three decades of economic and political discrimination against the republic's coloured majority population is resulting in bloodshed and untold misery. One of Australia's most conservative Prime Ministers has admitted that, if extreme political and economic discrimination is practised, it will result in trouble. That will happen under a flat-rate tax system.

Government Members interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I thought that Government members supported Fraser. Now they want to disown him.

A flat-rate tax system would sow the seeds of massive economic polarisation in our society, which would inevitably lead to trouble. The flat-rate taxation argument assumes that a dollar means exactly the same thing to a poor person as it does to a wealthy person.

Mr Cahill: That's a novelty.

Mr VEIVERS: I do not know what a dollar means to the honourable member for Aspley, but it may mean something different to someone else.

Mrs Chapman: You said that they meant the same.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member was not listening.

Mrs Chapman: You said that they meant the same—the same to poor people and to wealthy people.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member for Pine Rivers was not listening.

The flat-rate tax argument assumes that a dollar means precisely the same thing to a poor person as it does to a wealthy person. It assumes, for example, that, to a struggling, deserted woman with a couple of young children to keep, a dollar means the same thing as it does to a wealthy couple who have all of life's necessities and many of its luxuries. Common sense tells us that that is false. A level of income is needed to meet the necessities of life; more is needed for families and less for singles.

Whether families are rich or poor, the necessities of life have to be met first. By definition, however, the poor are unlikely to have any left over for luxuries, while the wealthy, such as the Bjelke-Petersens and the John Stones, are able to indulge themselves.

Mr Davis: Are you talking about the flat-head tax?

Mr VEIVERS: That is about what it is.

What about Mr John Stone? On television last night and in the press, he was purported to be one of the advocates of a flat rate of tax. By the way, he has admitted that he is not a politician. He may be able to add up one and one and make two but I will take him on any time he wants—as a politician. He wants to take this country back to the "Stone" age. Mr John Stone has admitted that he has never been a supporter of the Labor Party or of its philosophies. Over the last few years, who has been responsible for the monetary Treasury policy in Australia with a Government of his liking? None other than Mr Stone! He has admitted that the taxation system in this country is a mess. He has admitted it and I admit it, and the Labor Party admits that there are problems. However, whose responsibility has that been? Mr Stone! Mr John Stone has been right in the position to do something about it, but he has done absolutely nothing.

Even with a Government of his own persuasion in power, he has not put up his proposals. Why did he not put up this proposal? Because the Premier has now whispered in his ear, he thinks it is a good exercise in political propaganda. So much for Mr John Stone of the "Stone" age.

Graduated income tax scales recognise the importance of the distinction between necessities and luxuries. Advocates of flat-rate taxes must assume in their arguments that there is no distinction to be made between necessities and luxuries and that a flat-rate tax on those who consume predominantly necessities and on those who consume predominantly luxuries is just. Common sense, again, tells us that this is not the case, whether the flat rate of tax is on income or consumption.

The present, graduated tax scales are, in principle, more just than a flat rate, precisely because the wealthy pay higher rates of tax on their higher incomes. In other words, by progressive rates of taxation, the burden of taxation, rather than the quantity of taxation paid, is made more or less equal between the rich, the middle income earners, and the poor.

Australians should be very wary of a scheme promoted by a millionaire Premier that will quite simply take from the poor and give to the rich. They should be suspicious of a man who, more than 20 years ago, established a reputation for using every trick in the book in his attempts to skirt round paying his fair share of tax. Ask the Australian Taxation Office. It is on record. The amount of nearly \$22,000 that the Premier would save under his flat rate proposals is the saving on his publicly disclosed salary only. What about all his other business ventures? Would he want to pay tax on profits from them? Who really knows what shady deals and what rorts the Premier is involved in?

Government Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I suggest to the honourable member for Ashgrove that he continue with his speech and stick to the subject-matter of his speech. I also call the Chamber to order.

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Booth, if you could keep the rabble on the Government side silent, I might be able to hear your rulings. I might add that I respect both you and your rulings.

I am reliably informed that the Premier and his wife have arranged their business affairs so that they pay almost no tax at all. The tax that they do contribute is taken from their respective parliamentary salaries. They pay that tax only because it cannot be avoided. It is about time that the people of Australia knew exactly where the Premier and Treasurer stands and whether he is fair dinkum.

Mr Prest: Of course he's not.

Mr VEIVERS: Exactly!

I challenge the Premier and Treasurer to table his income tax return and the returns——

Mr FitzGerald: Why don't you table yours?

Mr VEIVERS: If the Premier and Treasurer tables his tax return, I will table mine tomorrow.

I challenge the Premier and Treasurer to table his income tax return, and the returns for his web of family companies, so that people will know just what share of the tax burden he is shouldering at the moment. Let him put his cards on the table. Let the people of this nation see how much tax he is paying now, before he starts to use taxpayers' money to race round Australia pushing his flat-tax barrow that can only benefit him and his wealthy cronies.

Mr RANDELL (Mirani) (5.46 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support the Premier and Treasurer in the presentation of his Budget for 1985. Honourable members have just heard a shocking diatribe from the honourable member for Ashgrove. He referred to a flat tax. The only thing he knows is stonewalling, and I do not think that he was very good at that. Fancy the honourable member talking about something better!

One can look at the mess in Canberra. The Federal Government cannot even decide on a tax. It brings out its taxes in two sessions. Members of the Federal Government are still fighting now about it. Queensland does not know what the Federal Government is doing. I repeat: fancy the honourable member for Ashgrove talking about something better! How can anyone plan his future with the mess in Canberra? Retrospective taxes have been introduced. How can retired persons hold any hope for the future? A flat tax at least allows a person to plan for the future. A person knows what he will pay every year.

I listened to Opposition members. They criticised the Budget, expounded dream theories and came up with what they would do if they were in power and where they would go. I would like to know where they would find the money. Opposition members want more money for health, more money for education, more money for this and more money for that.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member would give more money in wealth tax to the Federal Government. Honourable members know what the honourable member for Bundaberg is like. I do not want any interjections from him, because I will tell him all about it. He wants a capital gains tax and a wealth tax. Opposition members should start to battle for Queensland.

I commend the Premier and Treasurer, his departmental officers and Ministers for bringing down a Budget that is recognised as being responsible and balanced. It is certainly something unique in Australia today, particularly when one looks at what Labor States and the Federal ALP Government have done with their Budgets.

Total outlays from the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget in 1985-86 are estimated at \$5,048.3m, and revenues are expected to be \$5,048.6m, leaving a small operating surplus of about \$300,000.

Mr Davis interjected. •

Mr RANDELL: Briefs are handed to the honourable member by the unions. They go up to him outside this Chamber and slip the brief to him. He comes into this Chamber and he keeps one eye on people outside, thinking, "Am I saying the right thing?" If the honourable member for Brisbane Central listens, he might learn something.

With the accumulated surplus of \$166,102 at the close of 1984-85, the accumulated surplus of the Consolidated Revenue Fund at the close of the 1985-86 financial year is expected to be \$489,379.

This Budget maintains that surplus, and it is all the more satisfying when one considers the difficult circumstances that Queensland is now experiencing with its exports, which are not back to normal levels, and in dealing in an oversupplied world market.

The Federal Government has a distinct dislike for Queensland and does everything it possibly can to disadvantage this State.

Mr Davis: That's not true.

Mr RANDELL: It is true, and the honourable member knows that it is true.

The Queensland Budget has been assisted by the great resources of this State and the very good, tried and true house-keeping methods of our administrators and the Premier and Treasurer. This will maintain Queensland's normal Capital Works Program

and keep a commitment to the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program. It will give a tremendous boost to education, water resources, roads, hospitals, Government buildings and housing. The Government's promises will be kept, despite the continued bias by our Federal counterparts.

Mr Davis: Do you know what price you are for the ministry stakes? You are 25 to 1.

Mr RANDELL: I think that honourable members would probably get a million to one for the honourable member, because he will never be a Minister.

The Federal Government has shown monetary bias to the tune of more than \$360m in the area of general revenue funding. Queensland should be getting its fair share of taxes returned to it.

Mr Milliner interjected.

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member for Everton should keep quiet. He is talking about a wealth tax. Government members know what Opposition members want. They do not want any money to be kept in Queensland; they want it all to be sent to Canberra. The honourable member will have a chance to speak later on.

The money that is taken from every member in this Chamber and everyone in the community in taxes and sent down to Canberra should in fairness be returned to the States. But, of course, as all honourable members know, fairness does not come into it. The system has been changed, and the reality is that the Commonwealth gives back to the States any figure it desires to nominate. The Federal Government is getting square with the Queensland Government and trying to grind it into the ground. However, the Queensland Government will survive. It will keep going on.

If the previous tax-sharing formula had remained in place, Queensland should have received an additional \$137m this financial year. I could mention many other areas in which Queensland is disadvantaged, but one of particular concern to all honourable members and of which most people are aware is that of Medicare.

I am sure that the people of Queensland are well aware of the Medicare debate or, should I say, debacle. The Commonwealth Budget documents show that Queensland is to receive an estimated \$73.4m in 1985-86 under the current Medicare arrangements.

Compared with Queensland's \$29 per capita, the other States receive per capita—

- for South Australia, \$81;
- for Tasmania, \$75;
- for Western Australia, \$63;
- for Victoria, \$63; and
- for New South Wales, \$67.

If Queensland were to receive only its population share of Medicare funds—and, after all, all Queenslanders pay their fair share of the Commonwealth levy which funds Medicare—the State would receive an additional \$82m in 1985-86. And Opposition members condemn the Government over Queensland's hospital system, its nurses and all the things that make a successful health system. If Queensland received that \$82m, it could do much more. It is certainly a credit to the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and officers of his department that the Government can go on as well as it is.

The best thing about this Budget is that it introduces no new taxes. That is something that is unique in Australia at the present time and shows the continuing strength of good planning and, as I mentioned before, Queensland's resources.

If I drew a parallel with taxes applied in other States, I could show that Queensland would have additional revenue of \$187m. If New South Wales rates were levied in

Queensland, Queensland would have an extra \$255m; if Victorian rates were levied it would have \$320m; if South Australian rates were levied it would have \$160m; if Western Australian rates were levied, it would have \$72m; if Tasmanian rates were levied, it would have \$128m, and if the average of all States were levied, it would have \$187m.

Queensland is known as the low-tax State. It provides the incentive to keep people in Queensland and to keep them working, and the Government aims to keep it that way.

Mr Davis: Highest-taxed, lowest-serviced State.

Mr RANDELL: That is not right. The honourable member for Brisbane Central knows that that is not right.

Mr Davis: Highest unemployment, highest rate of divorce, highest bankruptcies.

Mr RANDELL: I will give the honourable member for Brisbane Central some figures, but he will not be prepared to accept them. The honourable member for Brisbane Central is blind. He does not want to see. I could say something worse than that.

Mr Elliott: There are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr RANDELL: That is quite right. And the member for Brisbane Central is supposed to be an understudy of Steele Rudd!

This is all in complete contrast to the recent Federal Labor Budget. The alarming thing about that Budget is that honourable members have only heard half of it, and that is the good part! The bad news is yet to come, after the Hawke Ministry stops arguing about lurks and perks that might affect it and when the ACTU is satisfied and tells Mr Hawke and Mr Keating what it will accept in a taxation package. I often wonder who is running this country, who received a mandate at the polls!

The people of Australia accept firm and decisive leadership—not consensus, not summits, not discussions. Governments are elected on promises and they must fairly be expected to keep those promises in any decisions that are made.

Mr Davis: Like your Government?

Mr RANDELL: The Queensland Government keeps its promises.

But, of course, the Hawke Government has the sad and sorry history of broken promises. No wonder the people of Australia have lost faith, and no wonder Australia is in a sorry situation in respect to overseas debt!

I quote from a press article based on a statement by Professor Gruen, as follows—

“The warning on foreign debt, which could damage Labor’s reputation as an economic manager as much as the tax row came from part-time ALP adviser and head of Australian National University’s Centre for Economic Policy Research, Prof. Fred Gruen.”

I notice that the member for Brisbane Central is leaving the Chamber. He does not want to hear the truth. He cannot take the truth. I would like him to listen to this—

“Prof. Gruen told a Canberra meeting of economists that Australia’s overseas interest obligations and debt repayments had risen from \$7.3 million, or 8.3 per cent of gross domestic product, five years ago to \$52 million, or 33.6 per cent this year.

Overseas debt growth was rising so alarmingly IMF intervention was becoming more of an eventuality, he said.”

What right has the ACTU, or any other group, to sit in on budgetary discussions and insist on measures being changed at their whim and to suit the particular factions that abound in Canberra? It is no good saying they do not.

Ask the Deputy Premier (Mr Gunn) who sits round the table with Federal Ministers when a Queensland delegation goes to Canberra to discuss monetary policies and State and Federal relations. Of course, none other than representatives of the ACTU.

There was a time when the Budget was a closely guarded secret and woe betide anyone who leaked any aspect. If anyone did, he was asked to explain or to resign from the ministry. Now, however, there are more leaks than a lawn sprinkler has. They are contrived leaks to test public reaction. If the proposals leaked are badly received, panic in the tribe is created. Changes are made to suit. Gone are the days of leadership, decency and honour. The ALP itself does not know what it wants. It is hopelessly split and divided over the Budget.

I will refer to articles in leading newspapers. The first from the Mackay *Daily Mercury* reads—

“A number of senior ALP backbenchers last night said Treasurer Mr Paul Keating would face a torrid time in caucus this week following his failure to give a full briefing on the tax package.

One backbencher said Mr Keating had treated the committee ‘with hatred and contempt’.

‘This is probably the most important thing the Government has done since we won office,’ he said.

‘We were treated with hatred and contempt.’ ”

That reflects the deep division among members of the Federal ALP on economic policy. They are worried about where they are going. Little wonder they are.

Max Hawkins, in Canberra, wrote—

“Angry Federal Government MPs are threatening revolt in caucus tomorrow over Cabinet’s acceptance of the new tax reform package, in which income tax cuts are financed by a new capital gains tax and a crackdown on fringe benefits.

A significant number of MPs, mainly from the Left and Centre Left factions, believe the tax cuts proposed by Mr Keating over the next two years do not address problems for lower and middle income earners.”

It is a shame that the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) is not in the Chamber to hear these statements.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr RANDELL: I have another from Ian Pemberton. The member for South Brisbane is welcome to come and read the press extracts. I have a stack of them. Ian Pemberton said—

“Discussions between Mr Keating and backbenchers late last week headed off a looming revolt over the issue of including politicians’ allowances in a fringe benefits tax.”

They are concerned about their own hides. They want to tax the people, but they do not want to tax themselves. That is why the row is occurring in Canberra. They should be fair and do the decent thing.

Another article by Max Hawkins reads—

“The introduction of a tax on perks and fringe benefits continued to split the federal ministry today.

On the third day of discussions on tax reform, the plan for capital gains tax also remained a sore point.

The ministry sat for more than 18 hours over the weekend, thrashing out various parts of the package, and met again this morning, but without Mr Hawke”

He fled to New Guinea. He wanted no part of it. He wanted to be away so that, when he returned, he could say, “I didn’t have anything to do with it.”

Max Hawkins continues—

“The ministry is believed to have accepted that there should be a new capital gains tax, in spite of strong reservations by some ministers that it will create a political backlash.”

I ask honourable members to remember what I said earlier. A proposal is leaked to the public and, if it appears that public opinion is opposed to it, a decision will be made the other way. Putting it in plain language, members of the Federal Government have no guts to stand up for what they think.

Another newspaper article, under the bold headline “Tax fight on perks”, reads—

“The introduction of a tax on perks and fringe benefits continued to split the federal ministry today. As discussions on tax reform went into the third day, the plan for capital gains tax also remained a sore point.”

I emphasise that it was the third day that the ministry had been fighting it out. In years gone by, Treasurers would introduce their Budgets without that sort of thing. I could continue quoting from similar newspaper articles.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr RANDELL: Before the dinner recess, I was pointing out the difference between the Federal Budget and the State Budget. The last newspaper commentary I wish to quote was written by Mr Kevin Love, and it reads as follows—

“The full federal ministry will meet in Canberra today to finalise a tax package which could well decide the fate of the Hawke Government.

The 27 Ministers will compile a tax plan centred on significant relief for average wage earners reeling under rising home loan repayments and a wages drift into the top income tax brackets.

The government is also facing a tough test over a plan to meet the demands of angry backbenchers by compiling a special package to ease the impact of the fringe benefits tax on parliamentary allowances.”

That is the sort of thing that the Hawke Government is doing.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr RANDELL: I have not much time left, but I will deal with the honourable member for Brisbane Central later. He will have his turn, and if he keeps interrupting me, he will be sorry.

I would like to comment now upon the bias displayed by the Federal Government towards rural Australia, particularly in taxation. I would like all honourable members to listen to something that Mr Ian McLachlan, president of the National Farmers Federation, has had to say. He has been very neutral, and he has said—

“I have listened to Mr. Hawke promise action to reduce farm costs, and in particular, fuel costs. I’ve sat through the tax summit and seen the influence publicly exerted by the ACTU on that occasion. It is worth noting that on the day when business presented its views on business tax to the summit neither the Prime Minister nor the Treasurer, nor the ACTU, nor the Welfare groups, nor any of the Labor Premiers, were in the room. They were in fact out making deals which the Government will live to regret.”

There is no doubt in my mind that the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer were outside the room, because they were receiving their instructions and were being told what to do. That situation has obtained for a long time, and I can only sympathise with them. How difficult their job must be when they have to satisfy so many factions.

Mr Neal: It is an Australian Council of Trade Unions Government.

Mr RANDELL: That is what it is. The Australian Labor Party is made up of the Centre Left, Centre Right, Extreme Left, Extreme Right, Centre, Left, Old Guard and New Guard. The only thing it does not have is a mudguard. There are so many factions that it makes me dizzy to think of them and, judging by the Hawke Government's actions, I am not left to wonder why he is dizzy. The Hawke Government does not know what it is doing.

Can honourable members recall the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) addressing the farmers rally in Canberra? The Prime Minister gave an undertaking to the farmers who had gathered to protest about taxation in the following terms—

“I give you this undertaking that we will prepare a package . . which will significantly reduce the cost impact upon farmers.”

Opposition members should remember that, because what happened when the first half of the 1985 Federal Budget was presented? The Federal Government reduced the cost of fuel by 2c a litre, and that was the good part of the package deal. One wonders what may be expected from the second part of the deal.

The president of the National Farmers Federation had this to say—

“A cynical piece of double dealing—a sleight of hand aimed at short-changing the farmer—

the Government took more away from farmers in the May Mini Budget than it gave in the Budget paper in August.

The Government's package which includes a reduction of 2.5 cents in excise on diesel used on the farm, will reduce farm costs by \$25 million this financial year—about \$147 a farmer, but decisions since May will increase farmers' costs by \$51.5 million.

They are going to rebate the remainder of the fuel excise which I think is about a quarter of what they have taken away from us in tax and fuel over the last 12 months.

Until the rebate we were paying an overall tax on diesel of something like 18.8 cents. This and other charges make it almost impossible for us to compete with other agricultural countries which have a lesser rate of tax.

We are continually putting this to the government but we don't seem to be getting very far.”

Mr Pat Rowley, president of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation, had this to say—

“ . . farm costs have got (out) of hand by Government action in taxes etc. and to simply throw us the removal of 2.4 cents a litre excise on diesel fuel is not going to help very much in that area.”

The policies referred to by those gentlemen are the sorts of policy that people in rural areas are getting from the Federal Government.

Mr Davis: Was the Canberra rally the same rally after which all the farmers went to those houses of ill-fame?

Mr RANDELL: That is the sort of talk that I have begun to expect from people such as the honourable member for Brisbane Central. A comment such as that from a senior member of the Opposition indicates the callous disregard that the Australian Labor Party has for rural people. The honourable member for Brisbane Central is not worth listening to, so I will disregard him.

Earlier today, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition talking about the economy. He referred to cardboard cops; but I point out to him that in this Chamber one sees only a cardboard Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition makes a lot of noise about unemployment in Queensland, but he should get his facts and figures straight. He should be doing something positive for Queensland, instead of indulging in the tired old rhetoric of finding fault with everything this Government does. Why will he not attack one of the main causes of the past loss of jobs, that is, the failure of the Federal Government to give Queensland its fair share of reimbursement moneys to the States—a shortfall of more than \$360m? If the Queensland Government received that amount, which is its just entitlement, how many more police, nurses and teachers could it employ?

But, of course, the ALP Opposition never even fights for Queensland. Honourable members opposite seem to take a great delight in pulling this great State and people down. They are for ever critical; one never hears anything positive or constructive from them. Heaven help Queenslanders in the unlikely event of the ALP ever getting into power in this State! There is no doubt that the Queensland Government would soon be in the same mess in which the Opposition's Federal counterparts in Canberra find themselves today.

Mr Neal: Dictated to by Trades Hall.

Mr RANDELL: Exactly; just as happens to the Labor Party in Queensland. The same type of people give them briefs from which to speak.

Officially, Queensland still has the highest unemployment rate in Australia; but, allowing for the net gain of 13 000 in unemployment benefit transfers to Queensland from the other States over a three-year period, Queensland's unemployment rate would be down by 1 per cent to 8 per cent.

Queensland was one of two States to show a decline in unemployment. Queensland's decline of 0.3 per cent leads the way in fighting unemployment, showing that the Special Major Capital Works Program and private enterprise initiatives are working. Opposition members rubbish such statements; it is a pity they do not listen and learn.

It is significant that there was a drop in the August unemployment rate, because traditionally there is a substantial rise in the August figures. It is the sixth month in which the unemployment rate fell.

Between August 1984 and August 1985, employment in Queensland grew by 3.9 per cent, creating 39 000 jobs. Queensland's increase of 3.9 per cent was above the national increase of 2.8 per cent. In the 12-month period, Queensland created twice as many jobs as did New South Wales.

Mr Scott: You sound like a Queensland Minister droning on there.

Mr RANDELL: Did the honourable member wake up? He has been asleep. It is a pity that he did not get back to his electorate and look after his constituents.

The number employed rose by 4 200 from 1 041 200 in July to 1 045 400 in August. That was an increase of 0.4 per cent, which contrasts with the 0.4 per cent decrease nationally. Queensland had the distinction of being the only State to create jobs. All other States lost jobs, as is shown in the following table—

New South Wales	lost	10 700
Victoria	lost	9 300
South Australia	lost	11 300
Western Australia	lost	900
Tasmania	lost	3 000
Australia	lost	28 500

Queensland's labour force grew from 1 114 400 in August 1984 to 1 148 400 in August 1985—a rise of 34 000, or 3.1 per cent. The national increase was 2.1 per cent. The growth in Queensland's labour force was second only to that in Tasmania, which recorded an increase of 3.4 per cent. Those statistics for Queensland show that, without doubt, the State Government's employment policies are working.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr RANDELL: They are working in spite of what the Federal Government is doing to Queensland. Opposition members know that they are working. They should be prepared to admit that, but they will not do so because they want to save their seats.

The Special Major Capital Works Program was announced in the September 1984 Budget. The lead-time needed to get the projects up would take the benefits in terms of jobs well into 1985. It is clear that the State Government's initiatives and private enterprise confidence in the State's economy are pegging back unemployment.

The strong employment indicators are—

- (1) Employment growth in the past 12 months (August 1984 to August 1985)—39 400 jobs were created, or a growth of 3.9 per cent compared with the national growth of 2.8 per cent.
- (2) 21 per cent of all jobs created in Australia in the past year were in Queensland.
- (3) For the month of August 1985, Queensland was the only State to create jobs—4 200.

In Queensland, the unemployment level for the year August 1984 to August 1985 dropped by 5 per cent. The unemployment levels for the month of August dropped by 3 300 or 3.1 per cent, as opposed to a 1 per cent increase throughout Australia. Queensland and Victoria were the only States to record decreases. For the 12-month period ending August 1985, Queensland recorded a positive labour force growth of 3.1 per cent, as opposed to 2.1 per cent for the nation. Queensland, with a growth of 3.4 per cent, was the second-highest after Tasmania. For the one-month period, Queensland recorded a growth of 0.1 per cent—the same as Western Australia—although nationally there was a negative growth of 0.3 per cent.

I hope that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) and other Opposition members take note of these figures. We have to repeat them over and over. They do not seem to penetrate the thick skulls of Opposition members. If we keep repeating the figures, they might sink in. Opposition members will twist the figures to suit themselves. They will denigrate Queensland and make excuses for their Canberra masters. They should be supporting the Queensland Government in its fight to get just and fair treatment from Canberra. But that is probably too much to ask.

I turn now to some of the individual items in the Budget. One of the most important areas in our State and in our future is education. It is pleasing to see a Budget allocation for education of \$1,175m, which is an increase of 9.5 per cent on the previous year's allocation and the largest single allocation of all those to departments. That is how it should be, because education is so important.

The main features are an increase of 1 100 new teachers for State schools and TAFE colleges; the provision of a further \$5m for the computer education program; a new \$750,000 transport scheme for special education; and the maintenance of subsidy levels to community kindergartens to replace the withdrawn Federal Labor Government aid.

I hope that, instead of niggling, Opposition members are listening to what I am saying. The Queensland Government is providing the \$6.6m that the Federal Government has taken from the State.

Mr Davis: And rightly so.

Mr RANDELL: The honourable member for Brisbane Central says, "And rightly so." Queenslanders are paying their taxes to Canberra but they are not getting anything in return. It is a pity that the honourable member did not go to Canberra to join his colleagues in the Federal Government. With that sort of thinking, he is not wanted in Queensland.

The other main features of the education program are: an increase of \$2.69m for per capita grants for students in non-Government primary and secondary schools; the allocation of \$11.6m to build new and replacement primary schools; the provision of \$3.7m for remote area allowances; an additional \$530,000 for increases in the textbook allowance rate; \$170,000 for the establishment of a technology services unit; and a special allocation of \$120,000 for the purchase of radio transceivers for the School of the Air.

Despite the withdrawal of Federal Government funding, the State Government decided to maintain subsidy levels to community kindergartens, and that decision has been enthusiastically received by the parents who are using those facilities. My office has been inundated with telephone calls and letters thanking the Government for what it has done. The people have thanked the Queensland Government for its initiative and condemned the Federal Government for its heartless treatment. And so they should. We stand for people; Opposition members do not. They stand for the bureaucrats in Canberra. All that the members of the Labor Party want to do is take the money from Queensland to Canberra.

The decision to allocate \$3.7m to remote areas has been warmly welcomed by rural people. The honourable member for Brisbane Central would not know about that. He does not know where rural Australia is. Once he leaves George Street, he gets lost.

Mr Borbidge: He used to get lost when he was a taxi-driver.

Mr RANDELL: I believe that he used to be given a white cane to find his way around.

Rural people have been savagely hit by the Federal Government in other respects, too. It is important that rural children should have the same educational opportunities as other students throughout the State. They should not be regarded as second-class citizens, which is what the members of the ALP would like them to be.

The benefits in education are too numerous to mention, and I congratulate the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) on the good job that he is doing.

I believe that 550 submissions have been received on *Education 2000*. The Minister has appointed a review committee, embracing people from all areas of Queensland. That is contrary to the propaganda put out by the ALP and the Queensland Teachers Union. I await with interest the report of that committee.

The ALP continually criticises the Queensland education system. Even after steps are taken to review the system and to present a discussion paper, giving everyone the opportunity to participate, the ALP still criticises. I will never understand it.

I turn now to assistance to local authorities. A total of \$38.3m has been made available under the Budget to local authorities under various schemes of assistance. This allocation is in addition to the provision of \$29m in the Treasury Department's Loan Fund allocation. The Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme, which is administered by local authorities, will continue in 1985-86, with total assistance estimated at \$16.79m. That shows the Government's compassion for pensioners. ALP members would never show compassion for anyone.

I notice that the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) is in the Chamber. The Budget allocation for his department is \$241.7m, which is an increase of 10.8 per cent on last year's allocation. I pay tribute to the staff in the hospitals in my electorate. In recent years, major extensions have been added to the hospital at Sarina. At the small, modern hospital at Dysart, the staff are extremely proud and dedicated. The Minister has been out to see how good it is. I would like to see more use made of the health centre at Middlemount, and I hope that the Minister is listening to my request. It would be pleasing if more regional services were introduced into my electorate.

The Department of Lands has a Consolidated Revenue Fund vote of \$20,798,000. More money should be injected into the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme.

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (7.31 p.m.): As the member for Mirani remarked, it is pleasing to see the Minister for Health in the Chamber this evening. Recently it was interesting to read the media reports that the Minister had had enough of the Health portfolio and that he was looking for a change. I can assure the Minister that, after the next election, he will have a change because he will not be in the ministry; he will not even be a member of Parliament.

Mr Scott: He will be an engineer again.

Mr MILLINER: He may become an engineer again and go back to looking after retreads and tyres.

Mr Austin: Now is your opportunity to go on record. What price will you give me?

Mr MILLINER: What is that for?

Mr Austin: What price?

Mr MILLINER: I reckon that the Minister will be odds on to lose his seat in Parliament.

Mr Davis: 20 to 1.

Mr MILLINER: No, I reckon that he is odds on to go out of the Parliament.

With the recent and tragic passing of Mr Goleby, a vacancy has occurred in the ministry. It is interesting to watch the performance of the National Party back-benchers, because they are all jockeying for a position in Cabinet. That is good to see. Indeed, a couple of them are shining out and I confidently predict that the new Cabinet Minister will be the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman). I will be very pleased when she reaches those illustrious heights, because I am sure that the Opposition will get information from her.

I was interested to hear the contributions by National Party members to this Budget debate.

Mr Randell: What chance would you give any member on that side of being in the Cabinet in the next 25 years?

Mr MILLINER: Before his speech, I thought that the honourable member for Mirani was about 10 to 1 to get into Cabinet, but I think that he has blown out to about 500 to 1. Prior to the dinner recess, I suggested that he get a brief from the Minister. He did not accept my advice, and the longer he went on in his speech, the further he blew out in the betting. That is bad luck, but that is the way it goes.

Mr Scott: Look at Mr Neal laughing.

Mr MILLINER: The member for Balonne, during his contribution, stuck to the prepared brief and went very well, and I think that he shortened a couple of points. I suggest that National Party back-benchers get briefs from the Ministers or their staff and stick to them. As soon as they start to deviate, they get into trouble.

Mr Mackenroth: They could go outside and walk backwards.

Mr MILLINER: They could, because that is an excellent way to get into Cabinet.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Fouras): Order!

Mr MILLINER: I am being provoked, Mr Fouras, but I will return to discussing the Budget.

Mr Scott: You are going well on the Budget, too.

Mr MILLINER: I thank the honourable member for Cook.

The contributions made by National Party back-benchers were tales of woe about the Canberra Government. It is amazing how everything can be blamed on Canberra. I did some research in the library and looked at a few media reports. It is interesting to note that institutions such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development praise the Australian Government and its economic performance. A couple of years ago, the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) was named the international Treasurer of the year.

The Federal Labor Government is receiving international recognition for its management of the economy but, in this place, the National Party back-bench members are screaming and crying about what is happening in Canberra. It is about time that they woke up. The present Labor Government in Canberra is the best Federal Government that the nation has had for many years. It is making a major contribution to the economy of this nation.

Mr Davis: They should have been like the members of the National Farmers Federation and gone to the rally in Canberra.

Mr MILLINER: That is right. I am pleased that the matter of that rally has been raised, because that shows the contrast between a caring Government, such as the Federal Government, and the Queensland Government. It is the democratic right of people to be able to express their points of view. The Labor Party acknowledges that. What happens in Queensland? If a group of people want to express a point of view contrary to that of the Government, 400 or 500 police are waiting for them to bash them up or arrest them. In Canberra, the poor farmers assembled outside Parliament House. What did the police do? They stood back and allowed those farmers to make their point, as they should have been allowed to do. That contrasts the attitudes of the Federal Government and the Queensland Government.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr MILLINER: That is right. They did get up to some activities at night, but I will not go into that matter any further.

Mr Mackenroth: There were 54 private aircraft on the tarmac in Canberra.

Mr MILLINER: I am very sorry, but could I have the interjections one at a time, please? I accept what the member for Chatsworth said. All those poor farmers had to fly in. I was particularly concerned about the poor farmers from north Queensland who had to fly their private aircraft to the Cairns Airport and then board a commercial aircraft for the flight to Canberra so they could place a cow-pat on the stairs of Parliament House.

Mr Veivers: Mr Elliott was there.

Mr MILLINER: The member for Cunningham may have been there. That was his democratic right and I accept that he had the right to go there and express his point of view. I am pleased that he took advantage of that right. It is unfortunate that his Government is not as tolerant to people in Queensland who wish to express a point of view that is contrary to his.

Mr Davis: He signed the cow-pat.

Mr MILLINER: He might have signed the cow-pat.

Recently I was interested to read of some of the benefits that farmers receive. As a matter of fact, I thought it would not be a bad idea to buy a small block of land and become a primary producer. I wondered which industry I should enter. I thought there would be nothing wrong with buying a few cows and starting a dairy. However, I could not do that because I would have to go to the Milk Board and get a quota. I then thought I could buy a few chooks and sell a few eggs to the local shops, but I found I could not do that without going to the Egg Marketing Board. I thought I might grow a bit of wheat and sell some to a few of the bakeries. However, wheat has to go through the Wheat Board.

Mr Scott: Do you mean to say that all those industries have been socialised?

Mr MILLINER: I was just coming to that.

Mr Davis: What about sugar?

Mr MILLINER: A cane-grower has to go through the Sugar Board. Peanuts have to be marketed through the Peanut Marketing Board, barley through the Barley Board and cotton through the Cotton Board. After going through that process I sat back and I thought, "Gee, golly gosh, aren't I glad I live in a free enterprise State!"

My wife noticed that I had a great number of forms to fill out and she asked, "What are you doing?" I said, "I am applying for my drought relief." She said, "But it is raining." I said, "I'll put it down as flood relief." She inquired about the other forms I had and I told her that they were forms for subsidies on fertiliser, fuel and all the other farming needs. I had a stack of them. So life is not too bad on the land.

I will now return to the debate on the Budget.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr MILLINER: I am glad the honourable member for Cunningham interjected. He has reminded me that my wife asked me about a new car, so I told her that perhaps we should do as the honourable member for Cunningham did. He bought a brand new Mercedes Benz and tried to register it as a tractor.

Really, the State Budget is a non-event, as has been said many times. I was interested in the pious contribution made by the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox) about pay-roll tax and about Government departments having to pay pay-roll tax. He gave examples of those Government departments that do.

Mr Borbidge: You would almost forget that he was once Treasurer.

Mr MILLINER: That is what I was about to say. He was Treasurer of this State for a long period and a Minister for an even longer time. What did he do about it? Absolutely nothing!

Now he says, "Isn't it terrible that all these Government departments must pay pay-roll tax?" That clearly highlights the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party. It claims to be a separate party. It is trying to establish its own identity but, when it had the opportunity to do something, it did nothing. I suggest that, if the Liberal Party ever happens to return to a coalition, it still would not do anything about pay-roll tax. The members of the Liberal Party are frauds and are being seen to be frauds in the community.

All honourable members know that the Queensland economy is in trouble. Daily reports indicate clearly the position of the Queensland economy and where it is going. One of the only bright spots in the Queensland economy, which are rare, is in retail sales. I acknowledge that, in the June quarter, retail sales increased by 12.1 per cent compared with a national average of 10.1 per cent. Although there has been an increase

in retail sales, the other economic indicators show that, under the present National Party State Government, the Queensland economy is in trouble. One needs to look only at the private capital investment sector.

In the March 1985 quarter, activity in private capital investment is not going very well. The level of private capital investment in Queensland increased by approximately 18 per cent compared with a national increase of 24 per cent. An interstate comparison of private investment shows that, in the March quarter, New South Wales had a 17.5 per cent increase compared with an 8.8 per cent increase in Victoria, a drop of 3.4 per cent in Queensland, an increase of 29.3 per cent in Western Australia, an increase of 15.5 per cent in Tasmania and an Australian average increase of 11.1 per cent. Obviously, private investment is welcomed because it creates jobs.

Constantly the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and Ministers race overseas. On their return, they, particularly the Premier and Treasurer, tell honourable members how the Arabs and Middle East entrepreneurs will flood into Queensland and how massive development will take place. We are told that Arab sheikhs will be running everywhere with money pouring out of their pockets. However, they never arrive. That clearly demonstrates that the Premier does not promote Queensland and entice them to come to this State and invest their money.

In the June quarter, housing activity in Queensland dropped by 5 per cent to \$7.9m. In the March quarter, there was a further drop of 15.3 per cent to \$6.43m. However, the figures for Australia show an increase in housing activity. In the June quarter, the increase was 0.04 per cent. Nationally, in the March quarter, housing activity increased by 3.3 per cent. The housing sector is a very important sector in any economy. Because of the industries associated with the housing sector, a buoyant housing sector provides a buoyant economy. The housing sector is often regarded as a good economic indicator. It shows whether the state of the economy is favourable or not. Queensland is not enjoying the housing industry boom that is being experienced by other Australian States.

Recently the Premier and Treasurer embarked on a campaign against the organised labour of this State. Average weekly earnings show that the Premier is trying to create a slave State in which Queenslanders receive less for their labours than persons in other States. In New South Wales, a person in full-time employment receives \$407.70; in Victoria, \$397.50; in South Australia, \$385.90; in Western Australia, \$408; in Tasmania, \$391.80; in the Northern Territory, \$440.80; and in the Australian Capital Territory, \$444.30. The Australian average is \$400.10. However, in Queensland the rate is \$380.80, which is the lowest of any State or Territory.

Mr Borbidge: Cane-farmers are not earning very much at the moment, are they?

Mr MILLINER: They probably are not, but that is another story.

The reality is that average weekly earnings in Queensland are down. Under the policies being pursued by the Queensland Government, the future earnings of the people of this State will not be good. I predict that as a result of the campaign now being embarked upon by the State Government, under which it is considering abolishing penalty rates, a further decline will occur in the living standards of the workers of this State. That situation should not be tolerated. If the Government continues in that vein, people will leave Queensland to seek employment in other States. It only stands to reason that if a Queenslanders is working in an industry and receiving \$380 a week and a person engaged in an exactly similar industry, doing exactly similar work, in a State such as Western Australia receives \$440, there is a temptation to leave the State and seek the employment that will pay the highest wages. That is an obvious cause for concern. I hope that that problem is addressed and that the position is reversed.

Of course, the Budget did not announce any increases in charges or taxes, but as all honourable members know, throughout the year accountable officers do increase taxes and charges in line with the Consumer Price Index. It is interesting to note the devious way in which that occurs. Recently, an announcement was made by the Minister for

Transport (Mr Lane) that there would be an increase of about 6 per cent in rail fares and freight charges. However, again the poor old rail commuter was the one who was really slugged, because in many cases the proposed 6 per cent increase turned out to be as high as 30 per cent.

In my own area of Ferny Grove, the increases were in fact about 25 per cent. The Railway Department rounds the increases to the nearest 5c; so if the 6 per cent increase took the fare to 81c, the Railway Department obviously would take it to 85c. That has occurred consistently. Over the last few years, fares from Ferny Grove to Central Station have increased by 100 per cent.

Many people used public transport to travel to and from the recent Brisbane Exhibition. There was a drop in attendance at the Exhibition this year, and I believe that one of the reasons for that was the cost of the rail fares to and from the Exhibition. It was unbelievable. Because of the high fares being charged by the Railway Department, before he even reached the gates to the grounds, it cost a family man \$11 or \$12 in fares to take his wife and three children to the Exhibition and return to Ferny Grove.

Of course, recently there was another hike in third-party motor vehicle insurance. It has increased astronomically. That places a tremendous burden on the motoring public of this State. When one compares the position in Queensland with the position nationally, one finds that Queensland has the highest charges for motor vehicle registration of any State.

One of the other problems that this State is facing, along with the rest of the nation, is the high levels of unemployment. I am pleased to say that the Federal Government has at least tackled the problem of unemployment. It is interesting to note—and the National Party back-benchers have not even alluded to it—that the Federal Labor Government has created more than 400 000 jobs since it came to office, and it is well on target to create 500 000 jobs in its first three years in office. Of course, the National Party back-benchers will not acknowledge that fact.

However, Australia still has the problem of high unemployment. In particular, youth unemployment is very high. It is very unfortunate that so many young people are unemployed.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: They don't care.

Mr MILLINER: Of course they do not. They could not care less about the poor unfortunate unemployed.

I will give an example of what I mean. Recently, the young unemployed asked the Government for relief fare concessions to enable them to seek employment. What was the response from the State Minister for Transport (Mr Lane)? "That is a Federal responsibility. It has nothing to do with us." It is interesting that Queensland is the only State that will not help the young unemployed with fare concessions. Unemployed people in New South Wales and Victoria can travel on trains and buses at half fare. The South Australian Government provides free travel between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. from Monday to Friday and a 30c fare at most other times. For 60c, unemployed people in Western Australia have unlimited travel all day. The Australian Capital Territory has a special fare of 10c for unemployed people using buses after 9 a.m. It provides half-fare concessions for train travel. What happens in Queensland? The Government here washes its hands of the matter and says, "We are not interested in the young unemployed. We wash our hands of them. That is a Federal matter." It is not a Federal matter at all. It is the responsibility of the State Government, and it is about time it showed a bit of heart for the young unemployed and did something about providing fare concessions.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It would provide fare concessions for some of the sugar-farmers.

Mr MILLINER: It probably would, but it adopts a heartless approach to the young unemployed. We should not tolerate such an attitude as that adopted by the State

Minister for Transport, who has washed his hands of the matter and claimed that it is a Federal matter. The State Government should accept its responsibility to the young unemployed people of Queensland.

Young unemployed can become involved in the Community Youth Support Scheme. I am proud to say that I am associated with the scheme in the Enoggera region. The people employed under the scheme play a tremendous role in assisting the young unemployed to gain work skills and lift their self-esteem so that they may cope with the problem of being unemployed.

Recently, the State Government realised that there was an unemployment problem, particularly among the young, and instigated schemes of assistance. As I was involved in the CYSS, I was fascinated at the Government's approach. It ran round like a chook with its head cut off. It tried to get in on the coat-tails of the CYSS, since it was already established. I support that. Such programs need to have a vehicle by which to be implemented.

The CYSS is the perfect vehicle by which to establish training schemes for young unemployed people. The CYSS that I am involved in applied to the State Government for a grant to implement a program called "Career Paths Through Office Training". Our application was successful. The course was carefully designed by people involved in the teaching profession. The local CYSS office has co-operated fully with the project by selecting people who have been unemployed for some time—I think it is 12 months. Young girls are being given a complete course of office training. As well as being taught the skills of office work, they have the benefit of assistance from a psychologist and other professional people.

My very good friend and colleague the honourable member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) made an excellent contribution on the recently resurrected flat-tax proposal. I will not traverse the path he has already trodden; but I refer to the position of the former head of the Federal Treasury, Mr John Stone. Last night, when he was interviewed on television, he said that it was only in March this year that he looked at the proposal and found how wonderful it was. What an admission from a former head of the Treasury! At that time he advised the Government on taxation matters. One would have thought that, when the flat-tax proposal was put forward some time ago, Mr Stone would already have seriously considered it so as to advise the Government of the day about its worth. Yet last night Mr Stone admitted that he did not even bother to look at it; that he became a convert only in March this year.

The member for Ashgrove outlined the effects on the various income brackets. It is important to refer to a couple of the paragraphs from the statement the member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) wished to have tabled during the speech of the member for Ashgrove.

In his statement, Mr Stone said—

"Income earners between \$17,000 to \$23,300 would be a little worse off on average tax but better off on marginal rates above the income base."

He is freely admitting that people will be worse off. He went on to say—

"Taxpayers in the \$17,000 to \$23,300 bracket would be the 'temporary losers' under uniform taxation."

What a statement to make! Apparently, the great majority of tax-payers in Australia will be worse off under that scheme.

This morning, in answer to a question that I directed to the Premier and Treasurer, it was interesting to hear his views on the flat-earth—or, should I say, the flat-tax—policy. In the early stage of his answer, the Premier and Treasurer said that a single rate of tax ought to be imposed on all levels of income and should initially be set at 25 per cent. That means that the Premier and Treasurer wants to tax the pensioners, the unemployed—in fact, everybody. I am pleased that the Premier and Treasurer has put that on to the public record.

Compulsory reading for National Party back-benchers should be the very good article written by the financial editor of *The Courier-Mail*, Mr Brian Hale, under the title "Hale on Monday"

Mr Scott: Those of them who can read.

Mr MILLINER: I am sure that they will help each other out.

The article goes into a good deal of detail about the flat-earth—I am sorry; the flat-tax—policy.

Another aspect of the Budget that concerned me was the amount of money being spent on the Q-Net system. At the outset, I wish to make it clear that I am not in any way opposed to the benefit offered by Q-Net. What I am concerned about is that the Queensland Government is becoming involved in telecommunications. The Premier and Treasurer has been very critical of the system of government that results in a duplication of departments of education, health and various other departments. Despite the fact that the Premier and Treasurer has been very outspoken about duplication of departments, what do we find? The Queensland Government is duplicating a Federal responsibility by becoming involved in telecommunications.

Mr Borbidge: The Government is providing a service to the people of rural Queensland.

Mr MILLINER: I am not arguing about the service that is provided; that is OK. What I am arguing about is the duplication by the Queensland Government in the role that it is playing.

One of the questions that must be asked is whether there are any alternatives to Q-Net. Of course there are; Telecom provides a service that would be the same as that offered by the Q-Net system.

Mr Stoneman: You would not know what you are talking about.

Mr MILLINER: The honourable member for Burdekin is wrong, because I do know. The honourable member for Burdekin is, of course, a Minister for everything.

The present attitude of the Liberal Party's Federal leader (Mr Howard) about privatisation is well known. Several statements have been made about, for instance, selling off Telecom. It was interesting to hear news reports of a prominent financial expert in Victoria who indicated that of all the Government instrumentalities throughout Australia, only two would really be commercially viable and worth selling on the stock exchange. That view highlights the fact that Government instrumentalities exist to serve the people and do not exist for the purpose of making profits. Obviously, if the Federal Government wants to sell Telecom, someone will buy it to make a profit. Telecom provides very few services that make a profit—and it would be necessary to concentrate on what is known as the golden boomerang, the Sydney-Melbourne-Canberra network. It makes a substantial profit for Telecom, and that allows Telecom to provide other services to outback communities. I understand that the Queensland Government is Telecom's sixth-largest customer, and I am concerned that the telecommunications system that the Queensland Government is setting up will take revenue from Telecom, thus preventing it from providing many other services required by people living in remote areas.

I will use myself as an example of someone living in the metropolitan area. I am able to use all of the facilities provided by Telecom. However, we on this side of the Chamber are very concerned about our brothers in the country. Of course, everybody knows that the Australian Labor Party is concerned about outback Australia and that people living in isolated areas do receive the same services as are enjoyed by people living in the cities. The Queensland Government should do everything it possibly can to ensure that that state of affairs exists and that people living in isolated communities

are not disadvantaged by a loss of revenue to Telecom. I believe that Telecom could provide all the services that Q-Net will provide, and I suggest that it could provide those services for a lesser amount than could the Queensland Government.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (8.1 p.m.): I am delighted to take part in this debate tonight on the Financial Statement. First of all, I congratulate the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) on bringing down another balanced Budget, unlike the Opposition's colleagues in Canberra who do not seem to be terribly good at that sort of thing. Today Opposition members have been bleating and carrying on about various issues about which they are concerned, in particular the single-rate tax issue. It is interesting to note how people can quote from articles and other sources to suit their own purposes, and I will return to that subject later.

First of all, I want to touch on a few matters that are of importance to my area. I congratulate the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane), who regrettably is ill but happily is recovering, and his Cabinet colleagues on their efforts to improve the efficiency of the Railway Department. This has been the first Government in Australia to have the intestinal fortitude to appoint efficiency experts to conduct an inquiry into the Railway Department in an attempt to rationalise its operations. That was done much to the dismay of the old guard people in the department, those with views similar to those of my old friend from Gladstone (Mr Prest), who would be violently opposed to anything being done to improve the efficiency of the department. He and others like him want to see the status quo retained, with all the funny little knick-knacks and paddywhacks that have been developed over the years without any reference to Cabinet. But this Government has been able to effect a saving of almost \$23m almost immediately, and Queensland is now the first State, perhaps in the history of this nation, to be able to make a profit from its railway operations. The Minister deserves great credit.

Mr Borbidge: All the Labor Party can do is criticise us.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is the way its members operate. I suggest to the member for Surfers Paradise that that is why they have no chance of ever sitting on this side of the Chamber. Opposition members have been talking about the front runners for the next Cabinet appointment, and the people they have been mentioning certainly have a lot better chance of receiving such an appointment than they do.

I take a great deal of pride in the fact that the Government has been able to make a profit from the railways, particularly considering the cost of providing railway services in the city. I have nothing against the Government's subsidising the public to travel on electric trains in the city. It is essential that transport be provided every day to bring large masses of people from the suburbs into the city. As I say, I have nothing against that, and I do not suggest for one moment that the cost of doing that is unreasonable. When the cost of running cars is taken into account, one would have to agree that the cost of providing electric-train services is reasonable.

I take the opportunity to thank the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) for the support that he has given to a local issue in my area, and that is the construction of the Oakey Hospital. Stage 1 has been completed. Of course, it is principally a nursing home or an annex for senile people.

Mr De Lacy: They will never put nurses in it, though.

Mr ELLIOTT: There are plenty of nurses in the area. Many people come into the hospital on a part-time and full-time basis. In fact, the hospital is well staffed. It is an efficient facility and a magnificent complex. I congratulate both the Minister and his department on providing it.

The people in my area are appreciative of the commitment that has been made to stage 2 of the project. That will provide an acute-care section of 20 beds. It will be required to service the increasing population of Oakey, with its army aviation centre, and the Jondaryan and Rosalie shires. Many people do not realise that the patients at

the Oakey Hospital come from a wide area extending back to the Bunya Mountains. It is handier for those people to come to Oakey than to go to Kingaroy.

We are looking with interest to see the number of beds that are occupied in the hospital. In the past, Health Ministers have looked at the Oakey Hospital and said, "Your bed numbers are not good enough." The hospital was housed in an old war-time building. It was cold in winter and hot in summer. The facilities were not very good. Now, with this modern building, people are realising that it is convenient to put into the hospital a member of the family who might require hospitalisation for a short period with no major surgery or who might be recovering from surgery performed in one of the hospitals in the areas represented by my colleagues the honourable members for Toowoomba North and Toowoomba South. Those patients are able to convalesce in their own area, where it is much easier for their relatives to visit them.

The first commitment has been made to stage 2. The Minister for Health has committed \$100,000 for architects' plans and drawings, and the project can go to tender. As soon as work on the block in the Toowoomba Hospital is finished, we in my area are looking forward to receiving support for the completion of stage 2 of this much-needed facility.

I congratulate the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) for listening to all those Government back-benchers who realised the disaster that was created when the Federal Government withdrew its support for community kindergartens. Before that the Federal Government provided 66 per cent of the funding, the State Government provided 14 per cent and the community picked up the other 20 per cent. That was a satisfactory arrangement.

The action to withdraw this funding is typical not just of the present Federal Government but of previous Federal Governments, including those of other political persuasions. They are good at starting programs, getting kudos for those programs and then saying, "All right, you guys in the State can take them over."

Mrs Chapman: The Federal Government deserted its responsibilities.

Mr ELLIOTT: The member for Pine Rivers is being accurate when she says that the Federal Government has negated its responsibilities.

Mr Borbidge: They cut back our finance at the same time.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is very true. The Federal Government wants to be involved in education in a trendy way. Whose name must appear on every plaque on every new building?

Mr Borbidge: Susan Ryan's!

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right; Susan Ryan's name appears on every plaque. However, the Federal Government is not interested in anything that is not trendy. Anything that it can get away from or back off from, it will.

I congratulate the State Government on its contribution to education in this State. Government back-benchers were able to pass on to Cabinet, through the Minister for Education (Mr Powell), the feelings of the community and make Cabinet realise what a disaster it would be if the community kindergarten program fell away.

In today's society, and in towns in my electorate such as Oakey, Pittsworth and Toowoomba, many families are two-income families. I would like to see job-sharing opportunities develop so that people with small children can work in a part-time capacity and still look after their children. However, one must be realistic. Today, many people need additional income to pay off their houses or to save for particular projects.

Community kindergartens are important for two reasons. Firstly, in order to help people to go out to work, the kindergarten is a place at which they can leave their

children. Secondly, kindergartens do a lot of good for the children themselves. I put the first of my children through a community kindergarten in Oakey, and I think that the children get tremendous benefit from that experience. It gives them a start in life before they go to pre-school.

The community kindergarten program is worth while for the Government to pick up, and it has cost it \$6.6m. The State Government picks up 80 per cent of funding for the program, and the community must raise the other 20 per cent. I congratulate those members of the community who raise those funds and who made the Government realise what a disaster it would be if funding for community kindergartens were not continued.

No-one is more delighted than I am about the increased allocation in the Budget for the tourist industry. It is pleasing that the industry is now getting the recognition that it deserves. Approximately \$10m has been earmarked for the industry and will be spent on the establishment of further training centres. The magnificent complex that has been built in the electorate of the member for South Brisbane is a step in the right direction. In my three years as Minister for Tourism, I advocated such a development, as did the people who came before me.

The establishment of training centres in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and the Gold Coast will be of tremendous benefit to the tourist industry. The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) is interested in what happens in his electorate, and he should be pleased that a group of people in Cairns have started their own self-help program. In buying the Adobe Motel, the group will have an opportunity to learn from practical experience. They could not do better than that.

Training programs will ensure that the industry has a continuity of people coming through who are suitable, trained and understand the importance of the tourist industry. The attitude of some Australians to the people who work in the industry is regrettable. As my colleague the honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) would agree, the attitude of people overseas, particularly Americans, is completely different. The attitude of those who work in the tourist industry is that there is nothing servile about working in it. They whole-heartedly believe that it is an important industry. That it is a service industry does not mean in the slightest that those who work in it have to be servile. There is nothing servile about those young people who are working in Hawaii and other popular tourist centres.

Mr Yewdale: You want to reduce their income.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member speaks about reducing their income. Above all else, what I want to do is to create jobs throughout the length and breadth of this State. I do not want to see young people coming out of school and going straight on the dole. If a person is on the dole for any length of time, his incentive and initiative are destroyed.

Mr Yewdale: We have the worst unemployment in Australia.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is because of the honourable member's Federal colleagues in Canberra. One of the reasons for the high unemployment rate in Queensland is that this State has a much warmer climate than other States and, therefore, is a much more comfortable place to be. As well as that, the people of Australia know that the Queensland Government is creating many jobs, particularly in the tourist industry. Jobs are being created along the length of the State's coastline, on the islands and in the inland. Because young people know those jobs are being created, they are coming to this State, and that increases the number of people who are registered for unemployment benefits in Queensland. I do not knock that. In fact, I think it is a vote of confidence in the administration of this State. Even though many of them are not getting jobs, the young people are still coming to Queensland.

Mr Borbidge: 13 000 in the past three years.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right.

The program that I have just outlined will train many more of these people and make them much more employable.

An announcement has been made of the development of a tourist project near Port Douglas. Of course, that project was set in motion some time ago by me and the chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation (Sir Frank Moore). That sort of exercise will be tremendously beneficial to the tourist industry. The international flights that are now coming into Cairns and Townsville will ensure that a sufficient number of people will use the tourist facilities of north Queensland. When planning for the four resort projects commenced, many people had the funny idea that the tourist industry was developing too quickly and that the beds would not be filled. I know of a great deal of criticism, particularly from members of the Opposition who have a very negative attitude, of the Surfers Paradise area. They should not criticise the number of beds that are available on the Gold Coast. It is very important that they realise that without the infrastructure, the destination, the beds and the things of interest for people to do, there is no way of increasing the number of overseas travellers who come to this State.

Mr Borbidge: The Federal Government's aviation policies are locking out thousands.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right. Fortunately, the State Government has been able to chip away at some of them, and some charter flights are coming into Queensland. However, the surface has not even been scratched. A number of things have to be done.

Qantas must be allowed to use its wide-bodied jets. To my mind, a large part of the two-airline agreement must be done away with. More competition will mean that people will be able to fly at more realistic rates. To have empty aircraft flying from one side of this continent to the other is totally ridiculous. In this day and age, no company can afford that.

I am personally delighted to see that the Port Douglas project is going ahead. I look forward to the commencement of the other three resorts to be developed jointly by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and private enterprise. They will have a tremendous impact on Queensland's tourist industry.

I wish to mention pay-roll tax, particularly as it affects the tourist industry. As other members have said, it is a very, very negative tax. The National Party has the philosophy and the commitment to do away with pay-roll tax. I would like to see the exemption level increased.

It is one area that should be examined carefully, particularly as far as the tourist industry is concerned. Given the initiative, incentive and assistance from the State Government, a large number of entrepreneurs would employ many more young people in the areas in which they reside, and that is very important.

I am concerned about the impact that pay-roll tax is having on some of the major employers in my electorate. Compared with the size of companies in Brisbane and other cities, they are not large. However, in my electorate they are considered to be quite large.

Trailer-manufacturers, such as O'Phee Industries, have cracked the international market as well as the Australian market. O'Phee has a contract with the Beijing trailer company and will, first of all, manufacture trailers and then supervise, under licence, the manufacture of trailers in Beijing. Such companies are affected greatly by pay-roll tax policies. If the exemption level can be increased to a more meaningful amount, those companies would employ more persons. The same principle applies to agricultural machinery manufacturers such as Janke Brothers. Companies manufacturing machinery can be found in the electorates represented by the honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) and the honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth).

Mr McPhie: We have them in Toowoomba.

Mr ELLIOTT: As my colleague the honourable member for Toowoomba North said, Toowoomba has a number of machinery-manufacturing companies. One such company is Gessner Brothers. Companies build machinery on the industrial estates, which is the backbone of small industry in the Darling Downs area.

I turn now to primary industries. Although I am pleased that there is at least a Budget commitment of \$5.9m to combat soil erosion, it is only a drop in the ocean compared with what is needed to get on with the job. I suggest that the Government look very hard at an education program, or what might be termed a public relations program, to get people involved in no-till and minimum-till operations. Areas are coming under the plough in central and western Queensland at an increasing rate. It is not practical to expect the Queensland Government to put together enough soil conservation officers to form mechanical banks fast enough to control the erosion problem. At this stage it is most important to encourage people to adopt a no-till method of farming under which the stubble is left, the weeds in the standing stubble are killed and crops are planted through it.

Queensland has greater potential for protecting soil, particularly in the newly developed areas, by encouraging people to carry out those practices than by forming banks in areas that are subject to erosion. In areas of long, rolling slopes, banks can be useless rather than useful. In areas in which water accumulates, it is necessary to dissipate that water. Where possible, a no-till method of farming should be adopted. Under that system, strip-farming can be carried out so that water does not reach a speed at which it will cause erosion, cut gullies, and so on.

I come from one of the major grain-growing areas of the State. On behalf of the grain industry in my electorate, I express my appreciation for the Government's decision to forgo a proposed 6 per cent rise that was due to be implemented under the rail freight agreement between the grain industry and the State Government. Of course, that will be of great assistance. All honourable members must realise how significant the problems that confront the grain industry are. All honourable members know that the sugar industry is in trouble now. The grain industry has to look very closely at where it is going. It is important for the State Government to understand the problems facing the grain industry before the industry finds itself in a catastrophic and calamitous situation, which will develop if the industry is not assisted in some way. I was delighted, as were all sensible grain-growers, that the Government did forgo the rise which was due under the rail freight agreement with the grain industry. The Government is to be commended for its actions in that regard.

I turn to the matter of a single rate of tax. The honourable member for Everton (Mr Milliner) quoted very selectively in his speech. The low income earners, that is, those who are below the present tax threshold of \$4,595 a year; the people in the present 25c in the dollar tax bracket, that is, those earning from \$4,596 to \$12,500 a year; and the people in the 30c in the dollar tax bracket, that is, those earning up to \$17,000 a year, will not be adversely affected by the single tax rate as outlined.

For the benefit of my old cricketing friend on the other side of the Chamber—

Mr Borbidge: You would have to concede that John Stone would have known more about economics when he was in kindergarten than the honourable member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) knows.

Mr ELLIOTT: I do not like to be rude to the honourable member for Ashgrove. However, I do not believe that economics is really his strong point.

Mr Yewdale: It is not yours, either.

Mr ELLIOTT: No; but I have enough brains to realise that it is not my strong point.

Mr Yewdale interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: I do my own research. It is all my own work.

On Monday, I listened to Mr Stone with great interest. What is more, I took notes, and I inwardly digested what he had to say. It made a great deal of sense to me. One thousand people who wanted to listen to John Stone speak about the single tax rate could not get seats to attend that dinner and were actually turned away.

The honourable member for Ashgrove tried to make out that the disadvantaged people, the poor and the downtrodden, will be absolutely annihilated. Nothing could be further from the truth. I will not wear it that people earning more than \$17,000 a year are poverty stricken or downtrodden. Thousands of primary producers in my electorate, the electorate of the honourable member for Roma (Mr Cooper) and the electorate of the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal) are in fact making far less than that. Some have a capital contribution in excess of \$500,000 or \$1m in respect of the cost of their properties, yet many of them are flat out making \$10,000 a year in the present economic circumstances brought about by the Federal Labor Government.

It ill behoves any honourable member to stand up in this Chamber, as the honourable member for Ashgrove did, and try to make out that a single rate of taxation would adversely affect those people. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I am delighted to associate myself with the Budget. It is an outstanding success, and I congratulate all those involved.

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (8.29 p.m.): I have pleasure in taking part in the debate. However, I do not take pleasure in listening to Government speakers, especially when they get into the very watery area of a single rate of tax, because they do not know anything about it. I noticed recently that the media called on the old Country Party people to provide the equivalent of a Bob Hawke from the bush. There are certainly no Bob Hawkes from the bush on the Government side of the Chamber. Many Government members know nothing about farming and even less about economics. They enter Parliament because they are not successful in their own fields. They have to do something so the party organisation says, "Go into the House and represent us. You're pretty hopeless, but get in there. At least you will get a decent rate of pay." They could not earn that amount if they had to earn their living in the country. They are a hopeless mob of farmers and a worse lot of politicians. It is scandalous that the good people of the country are represented by the likes of National Party members here.

The first public remarks that I made about the Budget were carried in *The Cairns Post*. I said then, "There is little joy in this Budget for the people of north Queensland." I stand by that statement. My own view of the Budget has been totally endorsed by the perceptive members from far-north Queensland who will speak in the debate, as well as by other perceptive members from this side. There is not only little for the people of Cook but also very little for the people of the rest of Queensland. We must all sup from the same spare dish that is this Budget. It is a shame that it has been foisted on the people of Queensland.

Unfortunately, I was unable to be present to listen to the very erudite speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton). I was told that it was remarkable. I am quite certain that it was. I know that it will be outweighed, not in importance, but for space on page one of tomorrow's newspapers by what is happening in Canberra, which is most important for the country and most important for the country people who sit opposite.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out not only the weaknesses of the Budget but also the State's weak financial position. The true financial position of Queensland is not set out in the Budget papers. In so many ways, the Budget is a cooked-up document, which is a sad state of affairs.

Mr Wilson: They not only gerrymander the electorates; they also gerrymander the Budget.

Mr SCOTT: That is so. I will read with great pleasure the speech by the Leader of the Opposition.

A number of interesting speeches will be made from this side of the Chamber. This afternoon an extremely good speech was made by the member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras). His speech reflects a measure of the capacities on this side. It is my job to talk about the way in which the Budget affects people living in Cook. From that I will extrapolate the effect of the Budget on far-north Queensland. The effect on that region is negative. I make those comments in my capacity as Opposition spokesperson on northern development.

I touch on a number of aspects of development in far-north Queensland, particularly in my electorate. I refer in particular to education, health, Aboriginal affairs, roads and other important facets. The Government is barely keeping pace with the educational needs of the Cook electorate. It is with a great degree of sorrow that I say that. I am pleased that the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) has entered the Chamber.

I would want to be the last member to talk in the Chamber about what I have achieved, but it has only been as a result of my incessant and constructive nagging that improvements have been made in education in the Cook electorate. I compliment the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) for listening to me. It is a shame that he is not in the Chamber.

Government Members interjected.

Mr SCOTT: He is there? I take that back. I did not know the Minister was in the Chamber; and I was using such words of praise. That demonstrates the level of integrity on this side.

I am pleased about the construction of a new hospital in Cooktown, a new high school in Cooktown, a new high school on Thursday Island, which was opened last Friday, and some other new buildings.

An Honourable Member: It's because you're a good member.

Mr SCOTT: He is not a bad Minister, but he is to retire. He will be lost to the Parliament. He is one of the relatively few competent administrators in the Government.

Improvements have been achieved in my electorate, but only as a result of constant nagging. If the Government had its way, it would ignore all remote areas in our State. Government members should not stick their chests out too far on the basis of the achievements of the Minister for Works and Housing. If they did, they would finish up with curvature of the spine because they have no political chests. I said that there is a new high school on Thursday Island. However, the old one was largely demolished in a fire in 1979. It took almost six years of constructive nagging to have that school erected.

The only way to stir this sluggish Government from its apathy and get some action out of it is by constantly reminding it of its obligations, using the media and other methods such as endlessly writing letters. It has taken years of battling, not only by me but also by residents of the area and members of the p. and c. associations in the various towns, to get the new school at Cooktown and the redevelopment of the school at Dimbulah.

After many years of urging, the Department of Education has taken over the Torres Strait islands schools from the Department of Community Services, which was formerly the Department of Aboriginal and Island Advancement. The Department of Community Services has no role to play in conducting education or health facilities. In fact, as I will point out later, it does not even have a role in the conduct of Aboriginal affairs. Although

the battle over the schools is only half won, the move by the Department of Education is a plus. I know that the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) is reeling under the effects of information he has received about the extent of the upgrading that is required for those schools. The Minister has only begun what must ultimately be a major task.

The new school in the Torres Strait area is being provided by the Federal Government, and that is a highly commendable move. However, it is not really the role of the Federal Government to provide schools. It is doing so because of the urgent needs that exist and because of the poor performance of the Queensland Government. The Minister for Education has the task before him and, unfortunately, I do not think he is adequate for the task. He has not the capacity to do that job. It was obvious that the Minister held off for as long as he could before moving in to take over the schools in the Torres Strait area.

In the Cook electorate, much needs to be done in the field of education. New schools are needed at Horn Island, Rossville and Fossilbrook. Extra facilities are also needed at Normanton and at numerous other centres in my electorate. About four years ago, a battle was waged to have a school constructed at Rossville, or for at least the provision of a school bus. In the result, the Government opted for the softer decision and provided a school bus. That meant that, for four years, the children from Rossville have rumbled over the very bad roads in that area to attend the State school at Cooktown.

It is time for a change. It is time that a school was built in Rossville, because the area has a big future in mining. I am informed that the Shell Company of Australia will carry out a major mining enterprise and that its proving work is almost completed. Apparently, the possibility of minerals exploitation is quite strong in that area. It is obvious that a school will be required there, but all that I have had from the Government is an undertaking that it will examine the prospect of buying land on which to erect a school.

On Horn Island, much the same situation exists. A large number of children have to be transported by bus or boat to Thursday Island to attend school. That is simply not good enough, because in the Torres Strait area, a formal education is very important. The type of education presently being offered is certainly not good enough today. The Queensland Government is not keeping up with the work that it should be doing.

A technical and further education college is urgently needed in the Thursday Island area for the continuing education of young Aboriginal and Islander people who live in the Torres Strait region or in the northern Peninsula area. Because the prospects of employment in that area are so minimal, it is essential that an opportunity to attain skills be provided for the young people of that region by the construction of a TAFE college.

At present, the closest TAFE college is in Cairns, and many Aboriginal and Islander children travel to Cairns to attend that college. They suffer because they have to be taken away from their families and are placed under all sorts of pressures. It is therefore very difficult for them to obtain a satisfactory level of tertiary education.

I could direct the whole of this speech to any area of the entire Cook electorate—Dimbulah and beyond, Cooktown, Chillagoe, the Gulf area, Weipa, the Torres Strait and the Aboriginal communities. Having mentioned those localities, I now turn my attention to the subject of roads— if they can be called roads in that area.

It was interesting to note that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) recently travelled extensively in that area. I was very pleased to see him do that, and at a more opportune time I will enlighten honourable members about the saga of the Minister's chair. Apparently, a chair was constructed by residents of the electorate of Cook and was taken to the remote parts of the State, simply to make sure that the Minister was comfortable. The idea, of course, was to put the Minister in a sweet humour so that he might provide more for the Peninsula region.

The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing travelled to Cooktown via the Cape Tribulation Road. It is interesting to note that he did not promise his colleague the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni) any funds or resources in respect of the Cape Tribulation Road. Apparently, the road will remain what it was apparently designed to be—that is, a four-wheel-drive road.

When he got to the more important area round Bloomfield and on to Cooktown, he could see the need for the road, and I believe that he has given an undertaking to the shire administrator (Mr Gampe) to do something about the road from Bloomfield to Cooktown. From there the Minister flew to Thursday Island, and it was very nice to see him there. He then came back to Weipa, then to Aurukun and then south to Coen to meet the Federal Minister. It was very good to see Mr Morris taking the time and trouble to travel up there, because he is not in a position to provide funding directly. All the funding from the Federal Government for main roads goes through the State Government, and that is where the maladministration takes place. That is from where the money is directed into the electorates in the south-east part of the State, where the needs are not as great or as urgent as they are in the far north. The Minister then blamed Mr Morris and said that it was the Federal Minister who was not providing the funds.

I have a lot of issues on which I should spend time in this speech, but 30 minutes is not long enough. There are a number of Aboriginal affairs matters about which I want to speak. There is one that is particularly important and on which I will spend some time. It relates to the continuing role of the Under Secretary of the Department of Community Services (Mr P. J. Killoran).

I would be delinquent in my duty if I did not mention the continuing and unbelievable saga of the under secretary of the department. There is no doubt that if a person is a politically protected species in this State, he has it made; whether he is a favoured private citizen or an untouchable public servant. Mr Killoran is just that and much more, a protected and senior public servant. I will not spend much time on this most distasteful subject, but these things have to be said.

I do not need to remind members that Killoran was an unsuccessful National Party candidate who, on losing in Cook, returned to high office and was then promoted to a higher office. Of course, he stood in Cook at the 1983 State election and, on losing, was promoted, when he returned to the department, from director to under secretary. That man was aided and abetted in his campaign by two things: he unmercifully used tax-payers' money to campaign, and was never called to account for his use of public facilities, and he also had the services of a lowly female departmental officer, whom he promoted well beyond her capacity during the election campaign because they both flexed on and off in their jobs while they were campaigning.

I documented the way Killoran used Government facilities during the election campaign, and I wrote to the Public Service Board, only to be told that there was not enough evidence for it to act. After using that woman during the election campaign, he then developed a liaison with her which has brought shame to all the people connected with Aboriginal affairs in Queensland. Pat Killoran—incidentally, a practising Catholic—then proceeded to use his position to conduct a prolonged affair with that woman, flying regularly to Cairns at departmental and tax-payers' expense. I have previously mentioned this subject in this Chamber, and I asked the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter) a question about it. His frank reply clearly demonstrated the frequency of those visits. Of course, nothing was done at that time. Those visits and that liaison are still continuing.

Not very long ago, according to the Queensland press, certain indiscretions committed by senior Government Ministers were brought to the Premier's attention in a certain manner. If those indiscretions occurred, they at least occurred at the expense of the Ministers concerned, and the only harm, if any, was to the persons concerned.

Mr Killoran's philanderings are being carried out at the tax-payers' expense and are damaging the Department of Community Services and the feelings of Aboriginal and

Islander people. The Premier knows these things but will do nothing, because Killoran is a protected species. Those two employees, Killoran and the female officer, travel in departmental vehicles and on the Government boat Melbidir. On his cabin door is screwed a plate bearing the title "Under Secretary". It embarrasses everyone who has dealings with him. DCS staff, Aboriginal and Islander people and even the management of the department are embarrassed. The management of Comalco is also embarrassed because, by virtue of his office, Killoran is an executive member of the Weipa Aboriginal Society.

That society comprises a number of people. Some come from Comalco. Some come from the Department of Community Services and the Federal Aboriginal Affairs Department. Others are Weipa South people. The society is charged with the responsibility of spending money for the betterment of Aboriginal people in the community of Weipa South.

Comalco provides accommodation in its lodge, which is used by Comalco executives when they are travelling to Weipa on company business. It is also given freely by the company to the executives of the Weipa Aboriginal Society. Pat Killoran happily moves in there with his so-called secretary who is not entitled to that accommodation. The company is either not game or it is too well mannered to protest about it. Unfortunately, I believe that it is the former. It is not prepared to take on a senior public servant of that department, even though Comalco officers know that that man is derelict in his duty and is not looking after the affairs of the Aboriginal people when he travels up there and attends WAS meetings. He is looking after his own affairs, and that is a scandalous state of affairs.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr SCOTT: We all pay taxes to support this philandering.

This so-called secretary to the under secretary comports herself at meetings as though she were an executive of the Weipa Aboriginal Society. There is a big difference between an executive of that society and an ordinary member of it, which a lot of people are and which I understand she is.

I can use only one word for the behaviour of this man, who is one of the most senior public servants in Queensland. It is absolutely disgusting behaviour, and it is condoned by Government members. It shames all of them. People who go to that area know all about it.

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr Casey: The member for Pine Rivers is trying to defend him.

Mr SCOTT: Yes, the member for Pine Rivers is trying to defend him. I notice that other Government members are silent, and I can only admire their stand in that regard.

I will use an analogy that I have used previously. If I said in this Chamber that the Commissioner of Police or the Director-General of Education arrived in Cairns, was met on his own by a junior departmental female on her own, and they then spirited themselves away to various centres and stayed at hotels, there would be a scandal that would rattle the press in Australia. The under secretary and his secretary have also stayed at the Four Winds on Thursday Island, which is accommodation provided by the Department of Community Services for senior Government officials who go to that area to do the business of the Government, but certainly not to go philandering up there. As I say, if I said that the Commissioner of Police or the Director-General of Education did that, there would be a scandal that would rattle the press in Australia. It would go right round Australia that that was happening. Because it is only Aboriginal affairs, no-one cares about it. The press will not take the matter on. In spite of the fact that I have raised the matter in this Chamber on numerous occasions, it has never been mentioned in the press.

Mrs Chapman: You must follow on behind those people.

Mr SCOTT: Does the honourable member for Pine Rivers agree that it is going on?

Mr Cooper: Where is your evidence?

Mr SCOTT: I ask the honourable member to read my speeches.

Government Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I ask the Committee to come to order and I ask the honourable member to continue with his speech.

Mr SCOTT: Thank you, Mr Randell, but I really do not need your protection. Government members are either closing their eyes to it or they are condoning it. People in the far north of Queensland know that it is going on.

Mr Cooper: What proof have you?

Mr SCOTT: I have the proof obtained through my eyes and the eyes of hundreds of people who tell me these things. The honourable member for Roma is making a fool of himself by laughing about it. It is not a laughing matter. He will be known as one of those people who simply laughed about it.

Mr Casey: The Year of the Family!

Mr SCOTT: Yes, Government members can well say that it is the Year of the Family.

The sad part about the matter is that Aboriginal and Islander affairs get a very low priority from this Government. I note that no members of the Minister's committee are laughing at this matter. That public servant is making a fool of their Minister. Of course, they have their eyes on the Minister's job. They hope that, in the redistribution of portfolios that is supposed to take place, they will get his job. They do not care whether the Minister is crucified by the actions of Pat Killoran; but I care. The people in the Torres Strait and the Peninsula communities care about the fact that they are being made fools of. How can the Aboriginal and Islander people have dealings with a Minister who condones that sort of behaviour? How can they have dealings with a senior public servant—the permanent head of the department—who carries on in that manner? They are totally disgusted.

The man whom the Premier has chosen as Minister publicly admits that he cannot control his under secretary. Sadly, a former member for Cook has been brought into the argument between the under secretary and the Minister. Claims have been made that correspondence written to the Minister is not being answered; and I can vouch for that. I call Mr Katter the nine-month Minister because that is about as long as it takes to get a reply from him on very serious subjects. I have to ring his private secretary to try to get answers. I certainly would not ring the under secretary's office. The members of the Aboriginal Advisory Council know that they cannot get replies from the Minister because, in their case, the replies are held up by the under secretary, which is embarrassing to the department.

A former member for Cook, who now lives in far-north Queensland, spoke in the press in defence of the Minister about the difficulty of getting replies to important correspondence. It is a very sad state of affairs when a Minister will use a person in that way because he does not have the courage to do it himself or because he does not have the clout in Cabinet to get things done. The Aboriginal and Islander communities have a great many needs.

The Minister and the under secretary are supposed to administer the Department of Community Services. However, those two men do not speak to each other, and that is a dreadful situation. How can the department be administered? It is no wonder that it is in disarray.

I make it quite clear that the department has a number of capable administrators below the under secretary. I have great respect for most of the public servants in this State because they are capable and hard-working administrators, and I say that without equivocation. I know that Government members are not as kind to public servants. I have heard them criticise public servants in this place on very uncertain grounds—because they do not like Government departments—but, because they are in government, they must deal with them. Public servants in many departments are doing a great job. A large number of executive officers in the Department of Community Services are doing a very good job trying to administer the department in most difficult circumstances. The department also has many good workers.

The public servants and the Aboriginal and Islander people, whose well-being is at the mercy of the department, are all suffering because of maladministration by the Minister and the under secretary.

The rift between the Minister and Killoran is well known and it is publicly known. The Premier must be aware of that, but he does not care. Because of the Minister's inability to get rid of this running sore in his department, he has little credibility. He also has little credibility in his capacity as Minister for Northern Development, and that is an unfortunate state of affairs because, although that department is small, it is important in Queensland. That role has never been developed by the Government.

Queensland has a Queen Street Government, and that is not intended to be a pun. It is a sad state of affairs. When Government members belonged to the Country Party, there was some substance to the claim that they represented all people in Queensland, but that has long gone by the board. There is nothing national about the National Party in Queensland; it is very much a party of vested interests. In fact, I call it the real estate party.

Mr De Lacy: National socialists.

Mr SCOTT: They certainly would like to be national socialists, but that term is too complicated for them.

Interesting economic concepts such as Douglas credit are beyond the capacity of Government members.

Mr Katter is hopeless as the Minister for Northern Development and hopeless as the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs. He makes all the rash promises under the sun, knowing that he cannot honour them. I notice the puzzled looks on the faces of Government members as to whether that is the case. A Minister of the Crown should have integrity. He should not be able to make rash promises in the electorate.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr SCOTT: I am not surprised at that because it starts with the Premier. Perhaps he does not want men of integrity round him.

Not too many Government Ministers go round stumping the country and making promises, because they know that the Government will not keep them. As a result of that, the Ministers restrict themselves. Quite often they say, "No, we cannot do anything in that regard."

I have so much to say about Aboriginal affairs and the needs of that area. Apart from the outer islands, there would not be 13 communities in Queensland with the same population as the outer island communities that are denied basic facilities such as electricity and water, but that is certainly the case in the Torres Strait. If that is not a

broken promise by Mr Katter, it is an unfulfilled promise. The Minister said that he would provide a solar electricity system for Coconut Island. The people up there have given up waiting for it. He said that well over a year ago—in fact, it might have been one of his first promises when he became a Minister in 1983. He promised that he would find out how to install a solar electricity system on Coconut Island and on a number of other islands up there. The people are still waiting, just as they are still waiting for water supplies. Over so many years very little has been done about domestic water supplies. As a result, what has happened—the Federal Government has filled the bill. This year five communities will be provided with a totally adequate water supply.

I liken the Government to a collective Long John Silver with its wicked looking parrot sitting on its shoulder and constantly squawking, "Ask the Federal Government. Ask the Federal Government. Ask the Federal Government." That is what happens. This is the "Long John Silver" Government of Australia. All it can say is "Ask the Federal Government." But does it give the Federal Government any credit? No, of course not!

Government Members interjected.

Mr SCOTT: It is sad that Government members laugh at that, because that is what it is like up in my area.

Government Members: We are laughing at you.

Mr SCOTT: They are laughing at their own Government. I know what they are laughing at. That is a sad state of affairs.

A Government Member: You are a galah.

Mr SCOTT: I do not think Long John Silver's parrot was a galah, but if it was related to Government members, it might have been.

Mr Casey: They are just as devious though, aren't they?

Mr SCOTT: Yes, they are.

If I remember correctly, Long John Silver was a pirate. Government members can draw their own conclusions.

In the time remaining I shall talk about the urgent need for housing. Even in Cairns there is an urgent enough need for community housing. The Minister for Works and Housing has been a little bit remiss in that regard. He is a little like the Minister for Police and the Minister for Health. They stand up publicly and say that so many policemen will be appointed in the State or so many nurses will be appointed in the State or, in Mr Wharton's case, so many Housing Commission houses will be built in this State. Unfortunately, they are not promises; those Ministers honestly believe that.

Mr Wharton: We do that.

Mr SCOTT: No, the Minister does not do it. That is the sad state of affairs. How many houses has the Minister built in my electorate?

Mr Wharton: Too many.

Mr SCOTT: I have in my hand a letter from the Minister for Works and Housing which epitomises the Minister's story. The Minister turns round and says that there is no demand up there, but do honourable members know why there is no demand?

Mr Stephan: You haven't got the people.

Mr SCOTT: No. I was waiting for an intelligent answer. The reason there is no demand is that people are not prepared to put their names down. If they put their names

down, they know they will have to wait for ever and ever. They are not prepared to do that, so they do not waste their time. As a result, the Minister says that there is no demand. In a very recent letter to me—in fact, it is dated 11 September—the Minister said—

“As you are aware rental construction programs are prepared on demand statistics recorded in Court Houses throughout Queensland. If there are no applicants, then the needs of the area cannot be considered in conjunction with those of other parts of the State.”

The Minister finished with the following punch line—

“There is also of course a funds limitation that restricts the amount of housing that can be provided.”

The Minister then had the temerity to suggest that I should encourage applicants to lodge applications for State rental housing so that the housing requirements of Thursday Island and Horn Island could be considered. Those needs are there. The Minister does not have to tell me that in a letter. The Minister went on to say that the commission holds no land on either Thursday Island or Horn Island and that that would be the first obstacle to be overcome.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! Under the agreement, the honourable member has run out of time.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (8.59 p.m.): In supporting the Budget, I wish to make a couple of comments in response to some of the arguments that have been put forward by the honourable member for Cook. With the utmost respect to the honourable member, I say that his contribution to this debate really did him very little credit indeed. I was interested to hear his closing remarks on housing. I should remind the honourable member that, if Queensland was funded for housing on the same per capita basis as every other State in the Commonwealth, 1 200 people would be removed from the waiting-list. It would be more appropriate for Opposition members to be a little more honest than they have been in this debate.

We heard the economic and political gurus of the socialist Left and their fellow-travellers level a great tirade of abuse against the very real achievements of the Queensland Government. During the debate we have witnessed massive manipulation of figures and a concerted and co-ordinated campaign to undermine the Queensland economy.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of the honourable member who is getting very excited, I say that at best his colleagues have handled the truth very carelessly in this debate. I ask honourable members opposite whether they support a capital gains tax, a petrol tax, a tobacco tax, death duties, a financial institutions tax and a pay-roll tax surcharge—all taxes that have been implemented or are being implemented by their colleagues in government in other Parliaments round Australia?

Mr Mackenroth: Do you support third-party insurance?

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member displays his ignorance. If he had half a brain he would recognise that third-party insurance is an insurance premium, not a Government charge. During my speech, I will deal with some of the ridiculous arguments that he and his colleagues have put forward. I will provide the honourable member with some figures, and he will not like my doing so. For the honourable member's convenience, I will be quite happy to quote figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Grants Commission. By the time that Government members have finished with the honourable member for Chatsworth, he will look a little more foolish than he usually does.

The State Budget is a considerable achievement for a number of reasons. It has confirmed Queensland's low-tax status and demonstrates the sound economic management that has been the hallmark of this Government. It is another reason why this State enjoys a credit-rating on the money markets of the world second to none. While the Government will continue to live within its means, services will be kept at a level consistent with the expectations of the community.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I can understand the sensitivity of the honourable member opposite. I suggest that if he listens very carefully—everyone knows that he sometimes has problems—he might even manage to learn something.

The Budget provides for incentive and growth, not by bureaucracy but by real people in real business situations—those in our community best able to generate employment and a genuine and lasting economic recovery. Unlike Labor Governments interstate, Queensland has not opted for massive expansion of the public service, increased regulation or punitive measures against business. The balanced Budget provides for a blueprint for Queensland's continued economic growth with revenue and expenditure each totalling \$5,048m.

It is again significant that no new taxes have been implemented and that pay-roll tax concessions of about \$16m have been introduced.

Mr Kruger: Do you believe in a flat tax or not?

Mr BORBIDGE: I support single-rate tax. It is a great pity that in this Parliament tonight we have seen a fine Australian, such as John Stone, denigrated by the likes of some honourable members opposite.

Mr Kruger interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! I have been very patient with the honourable member for Murrumbidgee. I ask him to cease his impassioned outbursts.

Mr BORBIDGE: This Budget must be seen in the light of the blatant and deliberate financial discrimination by Canberra against the people of this State. Approximately two weeks ago, during the debate on the Appropriation Bill I detailed, on the figures available at the time, the extent of that discrimination in almost every sphere of Government endeavour.

Aided and abetted by the Australian Labor Party in this Chamber, the Federal Government has engaged in a massive conspiracy of sinister proportions in coalition with the union movement to make life as tough as possible for the Queensland Government and, if possible, to destroy it. The extent of this conspiracy against a duly elected Government of a sovereign State is, I suspect, unparalleled in the history of the Australian Federation.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: If the honourable member does not like it, he can just sit there and cop it.

The Budget demonstrates that the Labor Party's campaign of discrimination against and victimisation of the people of Queensland has failed, and failed miserably. As can be seen from the Budget papers, deliberate and premeditated decisions made by the Commonwealth will deprive the people of this State of an estimated \$362m this financial year. The Hawke ALP/ACTU Government has rigged the tax-sharing rules to suit itself, and this State is bearing the brunt of the Federal Government's expenditure tax cuts while the level, the extent, the diversity of Commonwealth programs and expenditure is permitted—in fact, encouraged—to run riot.

It is a sad day for Australia when a Commonwealth Government decrees that State grants will no longer be a percentage of tax collections. That is what has happened. Such callous disregard for this State tears at the heart of the Australian system of Federation. Despite that, it is of note that, contrary to the tiresome claims of the political apologists for Trades Hall opposite, both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Commonwealth Grants Commission have acknowledged that Queensland's hard-earned low-tax reputation not only continues but—and I also notice the silence from the honourable members who were interjecting earlier—also continues to be consolidated.

The Grants Commission says that Queensland would have to raise an additional \$250m a year to bring its average level of taxes and charges to the levels applying in other States. Unlike the ALP, the Queensland Government makes no apology for that; it is proud of it.

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that the Queensland Government and local governments in this State levied taxes totalling \$617.18 per head of population during 1983-84. I will compare that amount with the taxation by the Labor States—

New South Wales	\$876.68
Victoria	\$876.84
Western Australia	\$716.89
South Australia	\$650.97
Tasmania	\$563.71

I remind honourable members opposite: \$617.18 per head of population in Queensland. Consideration should be given to what the Queensland Government would be able to achieve if the same deal that is handed out to New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia in tax-sharing was given to Queensland—if Queensland received a just and fair share of its entitlement to the national taxation cake. Those factors make the Budget an even more noteworthy achievement. I welcome the additional police, nurses and teachers. I trust that the Queensland Teachers Union will now accept that the commitment of the Queensland Government to reduce the class sizes is a real, genuine and ongoing one.

As the honourable member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) mentioned earlier, the State Government will step in to make up the difference in funding as a result of Commonwealth cut-backs to pre-school funding at a cost of some \$6.6m this financial year.

The news of a hospitality training college to be established on the Gold Coast in conjunction with the already considerable work being carried out by the College of TAFE is a further positive indication of this Government's support for both the tourist industry and young Queenslanders.

Further development of the region's hi-tech industrial park will assist in widening the Gold Coast's economic base. The Queensland Industry Development Corporation is an innovative reform that will enhance the State's economic growth.

The Budget also confirms the National Party Government's support for small business. We remain the first and, so far, the only State Government to legislate in respect of retail shop leases. This year, for the second year running, the allocation to the Small Business Development Corporation has been doubled from \$737,000 to over \$1.3m.

This Government, unlike the policies promoted by the Opposition and the trade union movement, acknowledges that small business employs 60 per cent of Australia's non-government work-force, and that in the United States of America small business has been the driving force behind the massive job creation over the past few years, particularly under the Reagan administration. The US Government has had the courage to reduce the size of the government, to implement tax reform, to deregulate the labour market and, when necessary, to take on the greedy self-centred mandarins of the trade

union movement. They are all reforms bitterly opposed by the Australian Labor Party; but they are policies that will work in Australia and are a basic thrust of the Queensland Government's program. People respect that and will continue to support those reforms.

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that for the 1984 calendar year, 9 037 people, or 753 a month, moved to Queensland. That influx increased in the second half of the year to almost 1 000 per month. During the same period, the socialist utopian State of New South Wales lost 7 447 people and Victoria 3 977, and 3 600 fled from South Australia.

Queensland's net interstate migration was 10 times that of Western Australia and 17 times that of Tasmania, the only other States to record an increase. In fact, in the five-year period to December 1984, 114 882 people have moved to Queensland, and 59 777 left New South Wales, Victoria lost 50 220 and 21 931 left South Australia. What a terrible indictment of the Labor Party's policies in those States! Those figures probably represent one of the greatest internal migration trends in Australia's history and, as time goes on, the sphere of influence will increasingly move to northern Australia.

People have confidence in this Government, and the Opposition and its colleagues in Government in Canberra cannot stand it. As they become more and more desperate, their tactics become more and more obvious. Despite their pitiful attempts to pull Queensland down, this State continues with its sound economic management—the best in the country. Despite their claims, Queensland continues to outperform the other States on a per capita basis across a wide range of key economic indicators.

For example, Queensland had the highest employment growth of all States in the 12 months to August 1985. Last month it was the only State to generate new jobs—4 200. Every other State lost jobs. Queensland had the highest rate of population growth of any State. The new dwelling units approved in the financial year just ended were above the national average. New motor vehicle registrations for the 12 months to July 1985 were also above the national average, and inflation to June 1985 was the lowest of any State. As I have mentioned already, despite the comments made by members opposite, the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Commonwealth Grants Commission have confirmed Queensland's low-tax status.

Of course, there are problems, which the Government acknowledges. The great sugar industry is a prime example. However, I quote from the prestigious hospitality magazine, *Traveltrade*. In a special Queensland supplement in the 26 August edition, the magazine joined *Rydges* and other prominent publications in expressing confidence in this State and, indeed, in its Government—

“Arguably the most confident, volatile and competitive destination in Australia today is Queensland.

Investment is high from Cape York to the New South Wales border, from the islands to the outback.

Head-to-head competition exists between entrepreneurs and developers for market segments. Hayman Island will re-open re-positioned at the very top of the market in competition with bed partner Hamilton Island; TAA has purchased Brampton Island and will compete for the couples market held by Telford, South Molle and others; Whitsunday 100 and Daydream Island are tilting at the traditional Great Keppel hold on young singles and couples.”

Mr Wilson: That has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr BORBIDGE: That has everything to do with the way in which the Queensland Government operates. Private enterprise, entrepreneurs, investors and business people have confidence in this Government, but they do not have confidence in the Australian Labor Party. The interjection made by the honourable member opposite would be one of the most inane that has been made for some time.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my colleague says, there is not much hope for the Opposition. I will continue to quote from the article I referred to—

“Likewise, in Cairns the pace is furious, with several developers involved in similar projects while on the Gold Coast, international chains have moved in and soon will be competing hard.

Brisbane isn't left out: Hilton soon will challenge the excellent Sheraton Hotel, with others to come.

It is difficult to find an area of the Queensland coast and islands which is free of development.

In total, about \$2.2 billion of development projects are underway or planned for the State, nearly a third of the national total.”

If that does not reflect a massive vote of confidence in this Government, I do not know what would. I point out that the words quoted in the article to which I referred are not my words; they are the words used in an independent industry assessment.

The article demonstrates just how wrong the Australian Labour Party is being proven to be on practically every major issue, every day of the week. The fact that the Australian Labour Party in Queensland has any credibility left at all is a tribute to the tolerance of the average Australian.

Unemployment levels have dropped for the sixth consecutive month. The massive private investment that is under way and the effects of the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program are starting to bite. Queensland's unemployment rate is now 9 per cent, which is 0.7 per cent less for this quarter than for the same period last year.

I draw to the attention of honourable members a media release from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) that was issued on 12 September. The Minister commented as follows—

“The August 1985 unemployment figures released by the Statistics Bureau confirm the declining trend in Queensland's unemployment rate, and demonstrate the continuing strong growth in job opportunities in the State.

In the past twelve months, 39,400 new jobs had been created in Queensland, representing 21.4 per cent of all new jobs created in Australia.

Queensland's employment growth rate of 3.9 per cent in this period is much better than the 2.8 per cent growth achieved nationally.

Of particular note, is the substantial increase in employment in Queensland during August, when employment in every other State fell substantially.

During August 4,200 new jobs were created in Queensland, while New South Wales lost 10,700 jobs; Victoria lost 9,300 jobs; South Australia lost 11,300; Western Australia lost 900 jobs and Tasmania lost 3,000 jobs.

In the past 12 months the Queensland labour force has grown by 3.1 per cent compared with 2.1 per cent nationally.”

I can understand why the prophets of doom and gloom on the Opposition side do not like to hear facts and figures such as those. Moreover, if the net gain of 13 000 payments of unemployment benefits transferred to Queensland from interstate over the past three years, Queensland's rate would be approximately 8 per cent.

The other matter I wish to raise in this debate refers to action being taken by the Federated Liquor Trades Employees Union, which, in my view, would be one of the most active gangs of industrial thugs operating in Queensland today. This union is seeking to gain effective control of the tourism and hospitality industry in Queensland. I urge tourism industry operators not to be intimidated by the standover tactics used by this union.

Pledges being sent to hospitality industry establishments require written agreement, under threat of black bans or further industrial action, that these establishments will not

abide by legislation that may or may not be presented to Parliament. This is open, deliberate and blatant blackmail. This union and its hot-headed organisers, who so closely associated themselves with the ETU during the power industry dispute, are now resorting to the same tactics and, like the ETU, they will fail. It is obvious that the policies being pursued by the union leadership are meeting with a strong backlash from responsible union members who are fed up with the bullying tactics of the union administration. It has been alleged that there has been gross mismanagement of the union's affairs.

I refer to an article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on Friday, 13 September—perhaps an appropriate day for that union—which states—

“A Grassroots rebellion, aimed at overthrowing the leaders of the Liquor Trades Union, is brewing.

Union documents, purporting to show that there had been an almost \$100,000 decrease in union funds in the past six months, were tabled at a meeting of more than 200 unionists at the Chardons Corner Hotel in Brisbane earlier this week.

The meeting was called by a group of Brisbane bar attendants, upset at the union's tactics in its industrial dispute with the Queensland Government.

About 25 bar workers from the Gold Coast travelled by bus to the meeting at the expense of the Queensland Hotels Association.

A Gold Coast bar attendant who was at the meeting but did not want to be named, said some of the facts and figures in two union financial reports for the past eight months were ‘real eye-openers’.

Included in the figures released to the meeting and the associated claims were.

Union fees will rise by \$20 next year.

Union leaders will get a \$118 pay increase on top of their present \$500 wage, including car.

In the past six months union funds have fallen from a profit of \$81,774.33 to a loss of \$12,888.79.

Four union members, including a member's wife, visited Tasmania to report on the Wrest Point casino in readiness for the opening of Jupiters Casino, despite a similar report having been completed two years ago.

During the trip the four spent two days in Melbourne at union expense.

A \$3961 donation was made to sacked SEQEB workers without assent from workers.

Several half-page advertisements, costing about \$4000 each were placed in newspapers without union members' knowledge.”

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Those comments have been made and, for the benefit of honourable members opposite, I am quite pleased to table the article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* so that those members who do not believe me can read it for themselves.

I urge both employers and employees to make a stand against this blatant industrial thuggery.

The liquor trade union's comments concerning voluntary contract employment border on hysteria. The concept of voluntary contract employment has considerable benefits for employees who, by their own choice, would be able to opt into such a system.

It is obvious that the union movement does not support such a freedom of choice and will resort to extraordinary lengths to prevent it. It does not appear to believe that

employees should have the right to make up their own minds, just as it does not believe that electricity consumers should have the right to electricity.

The Northern Territory abattoir dispute is a prime example of contract employment working to everyone's advantage—the employer, the employee, the export market, the good of the community—all except a handful of union-leaders. The workers there opted for contract employment and are better off.

Mr Stoneman: They don't like this. This is a very sore and telling point.

Mr BORBIDGE: I note the very valid comment by my friend the member for Burdekin.

A relatively small number of union-leaders appear petrified that, under such a system, freedom of choice will be given back to employees, and that is what the union movement and the Labor party are scared of. Employees in the tourism and hospitality industry should not allow themselves to be hoodwinked into believing the untruths and blatant misrepresentation of fact being used by the liquor trade union at present. Employers should resist the shameful attempts being made to force them into handing over effective management of their own business.

Mr Wilson interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Does the honourable member agree with the tactics being used by the liquor trade union at present?

Mr Wilson: I don't know what tactics that union is using; all I know is what you are saying.

Mr BORBIDGE: That response is mind-boggling.

This union stands condemned in the eyes of the community for the intimidation and standover tactics that it is exercising not only against employers but over its own members as well. It is attempting to take control of the tourism and hospitality industry in this State. Its increasing militancy is placing the jobs of its members at risk. It is no wonder that so many workers in the tourism and hospitality industry will go to considerable lengths to avoid being conscripted into its membership. Indeed, when the union uses tactics such as the ones to which I have referred, it is not surprising to see the allegations made in newspaper articles, such as the one in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* that I have quoted.

I support the Budget. It is a very good one. It is the best Budget that will be handed down by any Government in Australia this year. I commend the Premier and Treasurer and his staff, the under secretary (Leo Hielscher) and others on what has been an outstanding achievement in the face of the deliberate and premeditated obstruction and difficulty imposed upon the people of this State by the political colleagues in Canberra of those who sit opposite in this Parliament.

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

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (9.26 p.m.): It is interesting to listen to the comments of Government members. There is the old saying that there are statistics, damned statistics and lies. They have been quoting statistics in this Chamber all afternoon—in fact, for the four weeks of this session. I guess that they can select particular statistics that will justify their point of view.

Mr Henderson: What do you do?

Mr De LACY: We in the Opposition quote statistics to support our case. The fact is that most creditable economic commentators and financial analysts who do discuss the economic performances of the different States and the Commonwealth are saying that Queensland is dragging the chain in the economic revival that is presently taking

place in Australia. Every time one picks up a State or national newspaper one reads that there is a general consensus. They make such comments as, "The boom has burst in Queensland", or, "Unemployment is at a higher rate in Queensland".

If there is one indicator that ultimately measures the economic performance of a State, it is the employment rate. Queensland has the unique distinction of having the highest unemployment rate in Australia for nine consecutive months. It does not matter how Government members shonky their statistics, that fact remains. I heard a Government member say today that Queensland has the lowest inflation rate in Australia. I suggest to honourable members that those two statistics go hand in hand. Queensland has the lowest inflation rate because it has the poorest economy. When the economy is poor, prices do not increase.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr De LACY: It is a very sad state of affairs.

In the last few days, a couple of sets of statistics have come out which probably bear mentioning. They add to the plethora of statistics that have been quoted ad nauseum in this Chamber this afternoon.

An article in today's *Telegraph* states—

"The State Government's tough anti-union stand has failed to reduce the number of industrial disputes."

People in Queensland were led to believe that the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and the National Party Government were taking on the unions so that they could have industrial peace. In fact, the result has been the opposite. In the year to May last, Queensland recorded a dramatic rise in the level of industrial disputes, in stark contrast to the national trend of a reduction in the number of working days lost. Working days lost in Queensland increased by 120 per cent to 447 for every 1 000 employees—by far the highest in Australia. New South Wales was the only other State to report an increase, but it was only 1.7 per cent. If those figures are not damaging enough, I do not know what is.

The fact is that the Queensland Premier is taking Queensland and the community on a path that, as we all tend to agree, is leading to economic problems of enormous magnitude.

Another statistic that was released recently and which I read with interest revealed that Queensland now has the highest divorce rate in Australia. Given the great effort made last year, the Year of the Family, by the Queensland Government and the Minister responsible, who is in the Chamber, to bring back the old values of family life, that statistic is highly ironical. The net result is that Queensland has experienced an unprecedented increase in family break-down. It just goes to prove that maintaining the family way of life, the family system and all those good things in our society, has nothing to do with propaganda campaigns by Governments and Ministers whose photographs appear in every paper and every glossy magazine that one picks up. The Minister for Welfare Services (Mr Muntz) does not have a bad face, but I do not think that it did much to save marriages in Queensland last year.

Mr Davis: His photograph appeared on 40 pages.

Mr De LACY: I believe that that is a record. In fact, another statistic that I should mention is the number of photographs or the number of pages on which photographs of Ministers appeared in Government publications in Queensland. The Minister to whom I was referring broke the international record in that regard.

Mr McPhie: Do you have the statistics for the Federal Ministers? How do they get on?

Mr De LACY: They would not hold a candle to people such as the Minister for Welfare Services. They are amateurs in comparison.

This afternoon, the honourable member for Mirani (Mr Randell) spoke about compassion. He referred to the National Party Government as a party of the people. He said that it had compassion. I find that hard to believe. He said that the Labor Party knows nothing about compassion and that it does not care about people or pensioners.

A document that has come into my possession shows the way in which pensioners are treated in Queensland in contrast to the way in which they are treated in two other States on the eastern seaboard, Victoria and New South Wales—those two “terrible socialist” States. These statistics are on the necessities of life—those important things that people need to spend money on in order to live.

Mr Randell: Can you tell us who compiled that?

Mr De LACY: Yes. The honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) compiled this document.

Government Members interjected.

Mr De LACY: The honourable member for Bundaberg has compiled these figures. If Government members want to question them, they are at liberty to do so.

Mrs Chapman: We certainly will.

Mr De LACY: I will look forward to that.

For pensioners in Queensland, it costs \$203.10 to register a four-cylinder car. In Victoria, it costs \$114 if they live in the metropolitan area and \$98 if they live in the country. In New South Wales, the fee is \$161. The reason for the difference is that, in Victoria, a 50 per cent concession applies to third-party insurance and registration. If they still happen to be TPI pensioners, no registration fee is payable, and third-party insurance is discounted by 50 per cent. Honourable members should compare that with what pensioners pay in Queensland. In New South Wales, pensioners do not pay a registration fee but pay full third-party insurance. In Queensland, pensioners receive a concession of \$20 only on registration fees.

Mr Stoneman: There is no State fuel tax.

Mr De LACY: Although, as the honourable member for Burdekin said, Queensland does not have a State fuel tax, the fact is that we still pay more for petrol in Queensland. I suggest to the honourable member that that is the most important thing for pensioners.

Mr Stoneman: I paid 62.9c down there.

Mr De LACY: The honourable member will have to pay that when he comes to Cairns.

Ambulance services for pensioners are as follows: in New South Wales and Victoria they are free, yet in Queensland they cost \$35 in Brisbane and \$14 if the pensioner has a full entitlements health card.

If a pensioner insures his house for \$40,000—in Queensland he will pay \$58.20 for stamp duty and fire levy, in New South Wales the cost is \$16.76 and in Victoria the cost is \$21.33. For pensioners on a fixed income and who do not receive the pensioner rebate, the Queensland stamp duty and fire levy is \$67.80. That has to be compared with \$16.76 in New South Wales.

On the subject of electricity, in Brisbane a single pensioner who uses 400 units of light and power and 325 units of controlled water-heating per quarter—I suggest that is the average usage for a single pensioner—would be faced with a cost of \$69.93; in Sydney, \$29.82—well less than half—and in Melbourne, \$50.74. The reason for the big

differential is in the rate rebate—I am sorry, I will not continue with that. That means that Queensland's pensioners are worse off in providing for the essentials of life.

Mr Randell: Weren't those figures too good?

Mr De LACY: I will accept that and I will return to those figures. In Queensland the rate rebate is up to \$150 a year; in New South Wales it is up to \$300 a year; and in Victoria it is up to \$270 a year. They do not sound too bad, do they?

As I was saying, Queensland pensioners are much worse off in providing for the essentials of life. In totalling the cost of those four or five commodities, the annual saving in New South Wales is \$410 and in Victoria it is \$359. This afternoon Government members have spoken about compassion. I put it to them that the Labor Governments of New South Wales and Victoria show some compassion to their older citizens, but the Queensland Government shows none.

Mr Randell: What about all the people from the southern States coming up here to retire?

Mr De LACY: The reason people come to Queensland to retire is that Queensland has a marvellous climate. I speak as the member for Cairns, which is a marvellous place to retire. I suggest that Queensland has other places where it would be great to retire. The others coming to Queensland from New South Wales and Victoria are the quick-quid merchants—the white-shoe brigade.

Mr Burns: National Party members.

Mr De LACY: Yes, National Party members. They know that this State has a National Party Government, which is sympathetic to that kind of person. It is a Government which is not interested in compassion, in looking after the average person; it is only interested in the quick-quid merchants.

The Budget contains a few items that relate to the Cairns electorate and I wish to take up those matters. In relation to schools, I have identified three areas in the Cairns electorate that need urgent attention. When the Premier and Treasurer delivered the Budget speech, I listened eagerly to see whether the problems at those three schools would be addressed. I regret to have to say that each year the Budget papers become more and more lengthy and more and more glossy, but in terms of giving specific details, they tell less and less. At this stage I am not certain whether these three problems have been fully addressed.

Prior to the presentation of the Budget, I asked the Minister for Works and Housing to ensure that the rectification of these matters was included in the Budget. I know that the parents and citizens and the teachers connected with these schools have contacted both the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Education. As soon as the Budget was delivered, I wrote to the Minister for Works and Housing and asked him to confirm whether these necessary facilities would be included in the normal works programs. As yet, I have received no response.

One of the problems is at the Trinity Bay State High School, which is one of the largest high schools in Queensland. I understand that, with an attendance of 1 680 students, it is the second-largest high school in the State outside the metropolitan area. The completion of the Woree State High School was expected to take some of the enrolments away from Trinity Bay State High School, but in fact that has not proved to be the case. The predicted enrolment of 1 200 at Trinity Bay will not be reached this decade. Permanent facilities exist at the Trinity Bay State High School for only 1 200 students. Therefore, nearly 500 students are located in temporary accommodation or in overcrowded class-rooms.

The main item requested by the Trinity Bay High School is a performing arts complex or music block. Music classes are currently held either in other class-room

space, thereby taking up scarce class-room accommodation, or in all sorts of makeshift areas, such as under the stairwell in the administration building, and so forth. The other reason why the Trinity Bay High School deserves a performing arts complex is that it has pioneered music education in Queensland. The youth orchestra that is based at Trinity Bay High School performs all over Queensland, and it also travels overseas. Only last year, it went to New Zealand. The Trinity Bay High School has pioneered music teaching. The principal has always been very active in that field. The school has an exemplary record. If any school in Queensland has earned a music block, it is the Trinity Bay High School.

I address the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) and ask him to examine the problem. The matter certainly was not mentioned in any of the Budget papers. I ask the Minister whether construction can be carried out under the normal works program.

The Woree and Hambledon primary schools both have similar overcrowding problems. The Woree Primary School needs a covered play area. On a number of occasions in this Chamber, I have said—and I will continue to say—that more covered play areas are needed. I may even become identified with that point of view, just as my colleague the honourable member for Mount Isa (Mr Price) is always talking about the need for air-conditioners in the schools in his electorate. With its Brisbane-based mentality, the Education Department looks upon covered play areas or covered games areas as luxuries. In the hot, wet, tropical climate of far north Queensland, covered play areas are a necessity, not a luxury, particularly in the more modern schools that are not built on high blocks. If it is very hot or raining, there is nowhere for the children to go.

There are 860 children at the Woree Primary School, which has a single covered play area. I have seen children eating their lunch in that area. In fact, last week I saw them again. Because there is insufficient room for every child to sit down, some must stand. When the weather is fine, the children spread out over the countryside. However, when it is too hot or when it is raining, the children have nowhere to go.

The Hambledon school has a similar problem. It also has a problem with its tuck-shop, which has been condemned by the Mulgrave shire health inspector. Since 1976, requests have been made of the Minister for Works and Housing and of the Minister for Education, who have continually replied that it is a matter of high priority but that it is dependent on funding. I hope that facilities can still be constructed out of ordinary works program funds. I ask the Minister to confirm whether that is possible.

This morning, I was very pleased to read the editorial in *The Cairns Post* that related to the issue of staffing at the Cairns Base Hospital. I raised this matter in a speech last week. A ridiculous situation exists at the Cairns Base Hospital, where a coronary care unit has been established and equipped with sophisticated electronic cardiac monitoring equipment valued at hundreds of thousands of dollars. Although that occurred 18 months to two years ago, the unit has not yet been opened. The warranty on all the sophisticated equipment has now expired. The unit has not been used or made operational because no nurses are available to staff it. When I approached the Minister for Health, he said that staffing is a responsibility of the hospitals board. When I approached the hospitals board, I was informed that it does not have enough staff. I note that in the Budget papers the Premier and Treasurer said that provision is made for an additional 270 nurses. Big deal! 270 nurses are not enough to staff the additional facilities that are being provided in the State, let alone overcome any of the deficiencies that exist.

When I examined last year's Budget papers, I saw that approximately 700 additional nurses would be appointed. This week I intend to place on notice a question asking the Minister for Health whether or not 700 additional nurses were appointed last year. If they were not forthcoming last year, can honourable members really expect to get the full 270 this year? If the 270 are forthcoming, to what extent will that alleviate the problems in the health system?

Mr Innes: Have you a dialysis unit up there?

Mr De LACY: There is a dialysis unit, yes. A long story is attached to that. I do not know whether I should digress, but the reason that dialysis unit was provided—and I might add that it was never given as high a priority as a cardiac unit—is that the State Government, in its wisdom, provided one in the Atherton hospital, which is a very small provincial hospital. To overcome the political problems associated with that, the State Government provided a dialysis unit at the Cairns Base Hospital, which, of course, is the central hospital for the whole of far-north Queensland.

The honourable member for Sherwood probably wants to know why the Government ever provided a dialysis unit at Atherton. It is because one of the Premier's old friends happened to be resident in Atherton and in need of a dialysis unit. The person to whom I refer was the Premier's No. 1 spy in the days of the loan scandals, that is, Wylie Fancher.

Mr Innes: Is the Cairns one operating?

Mr De LACY: It is operating, yes. The next point in the Premier's Budget speech is his announcement that Queensland will get 104 new police officers. He made that announcement with some breast-beating. 104 police officers will not be anywhere near enough in overcoming the shortage of police that is experienced in many centres in Queensland, particularly in Cairns.

It is no secret that in recent times a great deal of media publicity has been given to violence in the streets of Cairns. There was almost a Jaws mentality reigning in Cairns some months ago when, in fear of turning away the tourists, all the city fathers were not prepared to admit that a problem existed in the streets. However, if people do not admit that a problem exists, nothing is done about it.

I am on record as saying that it is a major problem. It is a problem that needs to be addressed and addressed in a number of ways. One of the ways in which it can be addressed is by increasing the number of police, by increasing the amount of overtime available to police officers and by allowing police officers to get out on the streets at night-time. I am pleased to say that, since the publicity was given to the alleged violence in the streets of Cairns, the police force in Cairns is making an effort to go out on the beat, to patrol the city, and there has been a marked improvement in the social situation late at night. This is partially but not completely due to the activities of the police.

Members of the Aboriginal community in Cairns got together because they were receiving a good deal of criticism. Many of these young people who were allegedly causing problems were Aboriginal people. The Aboriginal community has reacted in a positive way. It has organised its own late-night patrols on the week-end. It has a roster system under which members of the Aboriginal community get out into the streets, where they meet and talk with the young people and find out what the problems are.

I am pleased to say that, as a result of the publicity that surrounded the problems which existed in Cairns, the outcome has been very positive. I have been intimately involved with the police, with these Aboriginal groups and with the different community organisations in Cairns. If nothing else has happened, at least the Aboriginal people are beginning to learn that there really is a problem and that the police have a very difficult job to do in controlling the problem.

The hoteliers, the council and the police are now communicating with the Aboriginal groups. What I found to start with was that the different sides to the dispute really had very little in common. There was no communication. Before a problem can be solved, people need to get together and talk.

As I said, 104 additional police officers is a long way short of the mark. The number is a good deal less than that requested by the Commissioner of Police and, I understand, a good deal less than that asked for by the Minister for Police. It is certainly not nearly sufficient to address the very real crime problems in Queensland.

Another point made in the Budget that I refer to—it could be said that it has already been spoken about often enough—is the Premier's response to the deep trouble in which the sugar industry finds itself. The Premier announced, again with much fanfare and breast-beating in media statements, that the State Government would not wash its hands of the sugar industry, that it would provide \$20m. I suggest that that is a confidence trick. To begin with, it is only a loan. Theoretically, it will be made available through the Rural Reconstruction Board. The documents accompanying the Budget show that, at 30 June 1985, the Rural Adjustment Fund and the Rural Reconstruction Fund had accumulated balances in the order of \$38m or \$39m. The projected expenditure is much less than that.

I intend to place on notice a question asking the Minister for Primary Industries where the \$20m will come from, where it will be slotted in and what it will be used for. I suggest, however, that it is another chapter in the long saga of this Government's deceit in respect of funds that have been theoretically made available to the sugar industry through the Rural Reconstruction Board. Government members continue to use the discredited figure of \$31m, which it has been suggested was made available by the Government to the sugar industry. That is not true. It is not borne out by the facts as revealed by the annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Board and by the Budget papers. For instance, this year's Budget papers show that, in 1983-84, the State Government made \$10m available. However, last year, prior to the Federal election, at a time when there was much talk about the sugar industry, the State Government produced what it called a facts sheet, which was distinguished by its paucity of facts, claiming that \$15m had been provided during that year. One of those two documents is obviously incorrect. The more one delves into the matter, the more one finds that the State Government is involved in a massive confidence trick.

The most disconcerting thing about the Budget speech from the point of view of the sugar industry was the Premier's absolute refusal to co-operate in a price support scheme. He said—

“Only the Commonwealth has the financial resources to meet this need and it is that Government which derives the substantial taxation and excise revenue from the industry.”

He called on that Government to provide the total amount required to provide price support for the sugar industry. He said that it should do so in the same way that it supported the steel industry and the car industry in New South Wales and Victoria.

In the few minutes remaining to me tonight, I refer to the 100-day committee report. I must say that I am very disappointed with it. I will speak now as an individual and not necessarily as a member of the Australian Labor Party. However, notwithstanding that, I think I can speak on behalf of most members of the Labor Party. The Labor Party set up the legislation for the organisation of the sugar industry and the marketing of sugar and, in fact, set up the structure in the sugar industry that has served the industry well for many years.

The Labor Party believes that it created the foundation for a great industry in Queensland. I think it would be a pity if that whole structure were thrown away because of the difficulties that confront the industry at present. I doubt that the deregulation proposed for the sugar industry will solve its problems or even go close to solving its problems. In Australia, the stage has been reached at which deregulation is being implemented for the sake of deregulation. If I could be convinced that benefits would flow, or if I could be satisfied that the benefits of deregulation could be properly quantified, I would be prepared to go along with that proposal and I would not put my head in the sand. However, nobody has spelt out the benefits, or it may be that no-one is able to. It is my view that the wrong path is being taken if Australia is launching itself into the scene of deregulation.

Progress reported.

SECOND-HAND DEALERS AND COLLECTORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading—Resumption of Debate**

Debate resumed from 3 September 1985 (see p. 619) on Mr Glasson's motion—
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (9.57 p.m.): The Opposition does not oppose any of the proposals brought forward by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) to amend the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act. Although I could be kind and say that it is good to see a Minister who is prepared to bring amendments of legislation before the Parliament, I will not be kind because I am surprised that, less than a year since the original legislation was introduced, it is necessary to amend it. That demonstrates the incompetence of this Government because not only this Act but also other Acts will be debated this evening so that they can be amended quickly. That so many amendments are necessary demonstrates that the legislation was not presented in a proper fashion.

The amendments that have been outlined by the Minister will certainly streamline the operations of the Act, and the Opposition does not disagree with that. If the amendments will make the operation of the Act easier for the Government, the police and second-hand dealers, the Opposition would agree that they are sensible. The amendments will in no way take away the rights of individuals but, instead, will help the dealers to operate in a more efficient manner.

The point I wish to make is that, when preparing this legislation, the Government must not have properly examined the operation of the Act; nor was it aware of the operation of many provisions contained in the Act. The Bill provides for exemptions and also takes away the rights of local authorities to present certificates at the time a licence is renewed. All these things should have been carefully thought out before the legislation was brought before the Parliament on the first occasion.

Mr Davis: That was pointed out at that time.

Mr MACKENROTH: That would certainly have been pointed out by the Opposition spokesman at that time, and it is obvious from the proceedings in Parliament tonight that the Act has failed to operate efficiently. However, the Opposition has no quarrel with the amendments that are before the House tonight and offers its support on that basis.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (10 p.m.): The Liberal Party will not oppose the amendments to the Act, but I do raise the whole question of the purpose, the effectiveness and the continuation of the Act. There is something wrong if it is back here after a major review. In his speech when introducing the first Bill in late November or December 1983, the Minister said that the Bill embodied a major review of the Act and was the first major review in 61 years. I cannot recall whether it was on that occasion or a subsequent occasion—the Act was amended further before it was passed into law last year—but some time earlier the then Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police was in charge of this legislation. I had seen the legislation, and I suggested that it be buried. It was until the new Minister took over.

The police officers who are currently responsible for drafting legislation or presenting drafts to the Parliamentary Counsel obviously put it through the system again. It is no fault of theirs that they view things from the police point of view, and they still view things from the perspective of the 1920s.

If one goes back to the debate in the House in the 1920s, one finds that the Second-hand Wares Act arose out of the circumstances applying in the 1920s. I will take a couple of phrases out of the debate. It dealt with the problem of phoney bottle-os, people who went round the suburbs masquerading as genuine bottle-os and using that as a

means of casing houses in order to later launch burglaries on those houses. Some people might not find this particularly unusual, but it was also enacted in response to a spate of pilfering on the wharves. The Act came out of an environment in which it was thought that people who dealt in second-hand wares were likely to be fences, people who dealt with and received stolen goods. That was the climate of the 1920s, a time when the general population were not well off, when credit was not usual, when commercial transactions were not frequent and when people sweated and slaved to buy the odd item of domestic necessity or furniture for the house.

The social and commercial climate has totally changed, and commercial retailing transactions are an everyday part of everybody's life, no matter how rich or how poor. What this legislation does not recognise is that society and the commercial climate have changed, and that is why it is getting into trouble. It fails to take account of reality.

Last year members were party to the creation of a structure that had a police perspective, and for good reason, because the police had been left with the administration of the Act which started in the 1920s. They maintained the perspective that from their point of view the underlying assumption was that people who deal with second-hand goods are likely to be thieves or, worse, receivers. Receivers were always considered to be worse than thieves. But the realities of the world are that today the majority of people who deal with second-hand goods are legitimate business persons, and such business has become part and parcel of many retail functions in society. People who deal in furniture, white goods, motor vehicles——

Sir William Knox: Trade-ins.

Mr INNES: Trade-ins of all descriptions fall foul of the definition of second-hand goods. This legislation is frozen in the circumstances of the 1920s, and it is proceeding on an erroneous assumption in the modern world. The Government has belatedly set up a committee to look at the interference of regulations and laws in commercial transactions in this State. That committee is being chaired by Sir Ernest Savage, and the members of the committee include such well-known entrepreneurs as Keith Williams. I am afraid that that gentleman would have a fit if he saw the definition of "entrepreneur" in this legislation, which is confined to antique-dealers and trash and treasure organisers.

Some go-getting, eminent business people are now in charge of a Government committee. But what is the point of having a Government committee if we do not take every opportunity that is presented to us to look at the realities of the effect of legislation upon commercial life. The Liberal Party believes that this legislation requires an absolute rethink. Because of a spate of submissions by legitimate business people operating in a legitimate market, this legislation is back before the House within a year. It has failed to take into account the realities of modern business, and for good reason. Policemen are not businessmen, and they are still working on the basis that dealers in second-hand goods are likely to be fences and dishonest persons. That simply is not true.

What the Government has spawned upon the unsuspecting public is a new bureaucracy—a central licensing authority, issuing licences at \$75 a throw. Is it \$75? It is certainly a significant amount of money. That money has to be paid for each licence application. There is also a local authority fee for each application.

Mr Glasson: That figure varies according to the local authority concerned.

Mr INNES: Yes. In my electorate, an antique-dealer who was taking antiques on consignment from six other persons was asked to pay six individual fees.

This legislation is off the rails. One has to go back to the original debates in this Parliament to understand the climate out of which this legislation arose. One now realises that the legislation is off the rails, and it is off the rails because the underlying assumption in it is wrong. The period of 62 years has revealed to us how much out of date that underlying assumption is.

I do not know whether the Minister saw a program entitled *Pressure Point* recently. It dealt with deregulation and privatisation. Sir Lennox Hewitt, a former chairman of Qantas and senior public servant—he still presides over a statutory authority in New South Wales—was asked for his view on the maintenance of certain statutory functions on behalf of the Commonwealth. He said, “Well, from time to time you must examine the circumstances which gave rise to the birth of that statutory function. If the circumstances have changed, you have to review the continuation of that function in the light of new circumstances.”

The circumstances here have totally changed. Recently, the member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) brought to the attention of the public the realities and ramifications of this exercise. Firstly, has it stopped theft? The answer is, “No.” The Minister well knows what the crime statistics are for breaking and entering and theft offences in this State.

Mr Littleproud: Theft is getting worse.

Mr INNES: It is getting worse.

What does this legislation do? It provides for a \$75 throw for everybody who runs an electrical goods shop, a furniture shop or an antique shop. That is crazy, coming from a Government that believes in free enterprise and, allegedly, small government. The legislation does not do what it set out to do. As I said, circumstances have changed. No longer are criminal bottle-os wandering round the streets of Brisbane in horse and carts. Because of the activities of the New South Wales bottle-os, or of people masquerading as bottle-os from New South Wales, this Act came into existence in the first place.

Last year, the Government failed to jump out of the blinkers that, for good reasons, were put in place in 1920. In those days, second-hand dealers were often fences, and the Act needed to be administered by the police. Second-hand dealers are no longer fences.

The Pawnbrokers Act is different. Pawn-brokers take goods on trust and must maintain those goods on trust until the pledge is redeemed. Although there are not many pawn-brokers round today, I can understand why the Police Department would want to keep control over them.

The Police Department should have nothing to do with the registration of second-hand dealers. The police have in their armoury a provision that says that people in possession of goods suspected of being stolen are guilty of an offence. If it is proved that the goods are stolen, they are guilty of a more serious offence. People who receive stolen property are guilty of a crime and are punished more heavily than those who are convicted of stealing. Those weapons remain in the Police Department's armoury.

The Liberal Party accepts that police officers are overtaxed in terms of the demands that are put upon them. The police force has serious business to do, and it should not, under this legislation, become involved with the creation of a bureaucratic structure to control second-hand dealers. To have experienced police officers traipsing round legitimate businesses trying to find out whether the poor unsuspecting people—in most cases—have a second-hand dealer's licence to cover trade-ins is ridiculous.

The Government is dealing with the return of old batteries and goods that have something wrong with them, but it is not dealing with trade-ins. It is not dealing with half the businesses in retailing in this State today. It should not be in the business of penalising the majority, who no longer are criminals in the sense of the second-hand dealers of the 1920s, who, if they were itinerant bottle-os, were likely to be fences and criminals. The Minister for Police (Mr Glasson) is tying up experienced members of his police force in doing no more than servicing a bureaucracy that has not shown to be effective and cannot be justified today.

If the Government believes in smaller government and if it believes in getting out of the hair of people in commerce and not subjecting them to excessive or unnecessary

regulation, the whole Act should be repealed. Simpler ways are available to the Government to achieve its goals, even if it believes that there is some validity in maintaining provisions relating to second-hand goods. The Act could simply say that any person receiving second-hand goods for reward must note the name and address of the person selling the goods and the date of receipt of those goods. Such persons could be ordered to maintain a record, so that if the police wanted to make inquiries, they would have a starting point.

There is no necessity for this licensing bureaucracy, for the fee or for lumbering totally innocent and legitimate businesses of all types in the modern world with this hangover from the 1920s.

Mr Campbell: If these Acts are repealed, what are you going to do with all the extra public servants that have been employed over the last couple of years?

Mr INNES: The police force in Queensland has a whole stack of legitimate and justifiable inquiries to make. I am not advocating that any policeman should be put out of a job. Instead, he should be put back on to the vital jobs, the away-from-the-office jobs. The police should not be involved in controlling commerce and industry. They are in the business of looking for thieves, and they are better released from the pursuit of harassment of legitimate business and dedicated to that primary task.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (10.15 p.m.): I take the opportunity of joining the debate firstly to support what the member for Chatsworth said, namely, that only a few months after the passage of the initial legislation the Government has had to introduce so many amendments. Mr Speaker, you will recall that at the same time as the initial legislation was dealt with, the Pawnbrokers Act and the Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act were also before the House. I take this opportunity to divert slightly and deal with a matter that comes under both Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act and the Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act.

At that time I made the point that replica guns are advertised weekly in the *Australasian Post* and similar magazines. The Minister said that he would be able to control that. On 27 March 1984, which is 18 months ago, the Minister said that—

Mr Elliott: Will you read it?

Mr DAVIS: Yes, I will read it. I will even speak slowly so the honourable member for Cunningham can absorb it. I will have to speak very slowly so that a defrocked Minister, such as the honourable member, can understand it. I will speak slowly for the benefit of the member for Cunningham.

The reply from the Minister reads—

“The members for Brisbane Central and Burdekin spoke about the gun lobby and replicas. I can assure them that they have no worries. The Burleigh Heads Armoury has asked for an investigation into the breaches that occurred about two weeks ago, and I am waiting for that information.”

I have in my hand a copy of an advertisement in the *Australasian Post* of 5 September 1985. This fairly extensive advertisement includes the words—

“Make your day with this exciting new range of light sports pistols.”

The advertisement shows a Smith and Wesson M.59, a Browning Hi Power and a .44 automatic magazine. A person does not have to be a personal shopper; these replicas can be obtained through the post from the Collectors Armoury at the Gold Coast War Museum, Spingbrook Road, Mudgeeraba.

Just as I did in this Chamber 18 months ago, I ask honourable members the difference between somebody holding up a bank or a TAB agency with one of these pistols and the real thing? If somebody was poking a Smith and Wesson M.59 into my stomach, I do not think I would ask whether it was a replica or the real thing.

Mr Elliott: Would you be nervous?

Mr DAVIS: Yes, I would be nervous.

It is obvious that the Minister has not done his job. I raised this matter 18 months ago. Any person—child or adult, male or female—can get guns such as those displayed in that advertisement. They could do a great deal of harm. Those pistols could be used in an armed hold-up just as easily as the real thing.

I ask the Minister to say what he intends to do about that. Is it just another example of the weak way the Government talks about law and order in this State?

In case the Minister or the members of the Queensland Police Force do not read *Australasian Post*, I will table a copy of the advertisement.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (10.19 p.m.): The diversion from the member for Brisbane Central was most entertaining, but I would like to return to the Bill. I assure the Minister that I wholly support the Bill. In fact, I support it so strongly that I urge him to take it much further and introduce even more exemptions than the ones contained in the Bill.

I can only endorse the comments made by the honourable member for Sherwood and say that the days when this sort of thing was needed are gone. Right across the board the provisions in the Bill are at conflict with modern business practices and common sense. I am sure that most honourable members have seen with wry amusement the little signs that are posted over the entrance to stores declaring that the premises contains a licensed dealer in second-hand wares. When one sees them one thinks, "That is interesting. I have not seen many of those."

I assure honourable members that the landscape is about to change. They will be seeing many more of them in the future. From now on, any business that takes a trade-in will need to be a licensed dealer—at the cost of \$75; at the cost of filling out all the forms; and at the cost of keeping the ledgers that are required by those people to record the details of all the second-hand wares in which they deal.

Sir William Knox: Plus the local government cost.

Mr GYGAR: As the honourable member for Nundah said, plus the local government cost.

Each and every one of them in Brisbane will have to pay \$75 to apply for his licence. The person concerned will then strike the problem of obtaining a permit from the local authority to sell second-hand wares. Licensed dealers in second-hand wares are such an anachronism that people have already run into problems with their local councils saying, "We do not want second-hand rag-bag dealers in our place. We will not give you a permit." It is not that they are suddenly changing their business; they are conducting exactly the same business that they have always run. But the councils do not appreciate what is in the Bill. They are not the only ones. I shall return to that in a moment. I do not believe that the Minister has seen——

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member lives in Fairyland. Everybody who takes a trade-in of any shape or form——

Mr Mackenroth: They would have a licence.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member talks his usual rubbish.

One of the problems is that the people do not know about it. If the Minister finds amusement in that, I ask him to tell me and other honourable members what information program went with this. I am being quite serious about the matter. If the survey that I

have conducted in my electorate in the last few days has any bearing on the matter, many innocent people did not know, and still do not know, that if they trade-in goods they are required to be licensed as second-hand dealers, that they need permits and that they are required to keep various documents.

I urge the Minister to examine the ledger. Detail is one thing, but asking a person to record the exact time that a particular item came into his or her possession is pushing things a little too far. For instance, take the ordinary run-of-the-mill electrical shop that specialises in repairs. Someone enters the shop with a television set and says, "What do you reckon?" The shop-keeper says, "It will cost you \$150 for repairs." The person says, "That is too much. What will you give me as a trade-in?" The shop-keeper may realise that the television is not worth 2s. 6d. because it is not worth repairing. However, in order to obtain a sale, the shop-keeper will say, "I will give you \$40 trade-in."

The shop-keeper takes the television set into the back room. Time is not money. Because the shop-keeper would not otherwise be working, he can afford to repair the set and offer it for resale. It is then second-hand. The shop-keeper must be a licensed dealer with a \$75 permit. He must fill in the forms and send them in to his local authority with the ledger showing that at 3.10 p.m. he obtained the television set from so-and-so, and the identification that was produced, such as the driver's licence number, the credit card number or whatever it was that verified the person's address. It is just not on.

I know what the police are intending to do with this Bill. I sympathise with their intentions. However, they have thrown their net far too wide and they have caught people whom they did not mean to catch. On the face of it, that is obvious. They obviously did not mean to catch people who accepted goods for return. They obviously did not mean to catch people who had traded in motor vehicle batteries. They obviously did not mean to catch people who dealt in tyres. I suggest to the Minister that there are many other persons whom the police obviously did not mean to catch, but they have caught them anyway. Some of the persons in my electorate are looking at \$80 fines and \$75 fees. Worst of all, they are criminals. That is what really hurts.

People who, with honest intentions, went into a small business and conducted it with integrity over the years suddenly found that the law had changed. They did not know about it. Nobody told them about the changes. One person said to me, "We are in here all day. Of course we read the newspapers. My husband is a fanatic—he reads them from cover to cover, and even reads the Government classifieds—but he did not know that we were supposed to obtain a licence." In his view, he is now a criminal. He will be booked for trading without a licence. That is what will hurt him. If the Minister must persist with the Bill, he should at least do one thing.

I know what advice the Minister has just received. He has just been told that they are not criminals, that it is not a criminal offence. That is easy for the Minister to say and it is easy for me to say. However, what happens when a policeman turns up and says, "You have broken the law. You are going to get a ticket. You are going to pay a fine."? The Minister should try to tell that person, if he or she is a law-abiding citizen, that that does not make him or her a criminal. People do not like it, and it should not happen to them.

If the Minister insists on proceeding with this Bill, I urge him to do one thing: go to the people who drafted it and ask them for a full and complete list of all of the types of small-businessmen who will be affected and then take steps to tell them. I do not believe that the Bill is necessary. I do not believe that it needs to catch these people. I believe that on reflection the Minister's advisers would say the same thing. After all, they have said it in this amendment Bill in at least three categories.

If the Minister is determined to proceed, he should insist that his advisers tell him each and every category of honest and legitimate businessmen who will be affected and then come up with a plan to tell them about it so that at least they know, and can take the necessary steps and can comply with the law, as they want to. The Minister should at least do that.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.26 p.m.), in reply: I will begin with the comments made by the Opposition spokesman and the Opposition's recognition of the fact that these amendments are being introduced to define the problems that have evolved since the introduction of the Act less than two years ago and to streamline their solution. I do not believe that the pitfalls can be found in any Act until it has been put into operation. The problems confronting people dealing in second-hand goods have been taken on board. The amendments are designed simply to help those people overcome the problems that they have encountered.

The first speaker on behalf of the Liberal Party, the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes), expressed concern about the problems faced by second-hand dealers. He said that circumstances today are different from those in the 1920s and 1930s, when society was less affluent than it is today. Business people are dealing in second-hand goods, nonetheless. The member mentioned dealers in used motor vehicles, did he not?

Mr Innes interjected.

Mr GLASSON: The motor trade was mentioned. Dealers in used motor vehicles do not come within the Act. May I correct a misinterpretation or a lack of understanding—I do not say that critically—by pointing out that the fee is \$120, not \$75. Then the local authority charge—

Sir William Knox: That is a local government fee.

Mr GLASSON: The local government fee is not a set fee in any local authority. It is subject to the local authority, which imposes its particular charges in relation to the statutes or its regulations. It is not a set figure.

I refer also to the fact that the honourable member for Sherwood said that the second-hand dealer was not an outlet for stolen goods. The fee for the Brisbane City Council is \$94.50, not \$75. It is estimated that in Australia, in 1982-83, \$125m worth of goods from breaking and entering crimes passed through second-hand dealers in the form of stolen goods. Of course, that situation is brought about by the explosion in the drug trade. The natural quick way to finance the community drug habit is breaking and entering offences. Logically, those goods are disposed of in hotels, by back-yard dealers or through second-hand dealers.

I am astounded by the lack of appreciation of the quantity of stolen goods passing through second-hand dealers. The amendments represent a move by the Government to protect second-hand dealers. One member asked why times should have to be recorded. Following a breaking and entering, to assist police officers who conduct investigations to recover goods stolen, it is not unreasonable that the type of goods, amount and time received be recorded.

The member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) referred to an advertisement for replica guns. I inform him that the Burleigh Heads establishment is facing 150 charges as a result of that advertisement. There has been no neglect by the Police Department, the Government or me. I agree with the honourable member about replica hand-guns. I defy anybody to distinguish a replica from the real thing. I emphasise that the appropriate action has been taken and that the matters will be before the court within a short time.

In reply to the member for Stafford (Mr Gygar), I repeat that the cost is \$120, not \$75. He said that people are ignorant of the fact that they should have a second-hand dealer's licence. The requirement to have a licence to deal in second-hand goods has existed since 1921. It is a very poor excuse for people to claim that they are unaware that they are dealing in second-hand goods. If the legislation imposes requirements of which people have been unaware, the appropriate steps will be taken to advise those who are affected by the Act.

Mr Innes: The point I was trying to make is that the use of the term is so extensive that people affected by it do not see themselves as second-hand dealers. Retailers accepting

trade-ins are caught by the Act. They do not realise that they are second-hand dealers within the terms of the Act. Why should they?

Mr GLASSON: I accept that that may be so in certain circumstances. If a battery or a tyre is traded in, the businessman would not consider himself a second-hand dealer simply because he resold those articles. These amendments are designed to cover that. I accept that there may be a lack of appreciation of the provisions. Our attention has been directed to trading in used motor mowers. As far as it is possible to do so, I believe that those matters have been covered by the Bill. The Government has adopted a considerate attitude to problems that have caused concern. However, I give an assurance to the honourable member for Stafford that, if the Government considers that further action is required, his comments will be taken on board.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. W. H. Glasson (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of s. 14; Renewal of licences—

Mr CAMPBELL (10.36 p.m.): The Minister has said that the licence fee will be set at \$120 and that a prescribed renewal fee has been discussed. I ask the Minister what the renewal fee was last year. I recollect that it was approximately \$20.

It is very important that this matter be examined by all honourable members, because the renewal fee of \$120 is payable by the sole trader, the little person in country areas. I instance the case of a second-hand licensed dealer who renovates bikes. That person only handles a few bikes at a time and, because he is such a small trader, a licence fee of \$120 could put him out of business. Many small business operators in country areas will be thumped by a fee of that size, and I believe that in their case, a nominal fee should be charged. The fee of \$120 is too much for small business operators to pay. The person I referred to is a retired gentleman who enjoys doing up bikes, but he will not have a hope of continuing in business.

This Government supposedly looks after small business. The truth of the matter is that the Queensland Government is putting people out of business. It is about time that the Government gave consideration to the charges that it imposes. To give small business traders in country areas and provincial towns a fair go, the Government should reconsider the prescribed fee that will be imposed on these people.

Mr GLASSON: In reply to the honourable member for Bundaberg, I point out that, under the provisions of the 1921 Act, the annual licence fee was \$2. That small fee applied in 1921, and it is now 1985. The increase to \$120 was effected by way of amendment to the Act approximately 18 months ago. No change in the fees charged was effected until last year. In other words, from 1921 to 1984, the renewal fee rose from \$2 to \$120.

The Opposition's claims arise from a lack of appreciation of what it costs to administer and check the licences throughout Queensland. The imposition of a fee was never intended to be a revenue-gathering, money-making procedure for the Government. The fee was increased to meet the cost associated with administering and checking on the legality of operations of second-hand dealers in Queensland.

The point that must be made is that a large quantity of goods passes through second-hand dealers, and that trade is sometimes associated with the drug scene. The very purpose of the amendments to the Act is to inhibit and control the increasing trade in goods that has resulted from the upsurge in the number of breaking and entering offences. Stolen goods are disposed of, in the main, through second-hand dealers.

Honourable members may say anything they wish, but that is the real purpose of the Bill.

Mr INNES: As a matter of historical correction, I refer to page 1820 of the proceedings of this House for the year 1921. The fee mentioned by the Home Secretary was 2s. 6d., which is one-eighth of \$2. It was stated at that time to be a small fee.

I suppose one could ask further, on the subject of justification, how many second-hand dealers have been prosecuted and convicted of selling stolen goods. The Minister's thesis tonight is that this whole structure and imposition is justified because of the enormous volume of goods sold by second-hand dealers. The Minister referred to pubs, but it was agreed that the Act does not cover pubs. The Minister referred to back yards. The Act does not cover back yards, because it is accepted that the back-yard dealers are the shonkies. The Minister has specifically said that most sales of stolen goods are made by second-hand dealers. I am specifically asking how many second-hand dealers have been convicted under this Act or its predecessor from—I will take the Minister's period—1982 till now.

If there are none, or very few, how can the Minister justify imposing a \$120 application fee plus the local authority fee which, in Brisbane, would be \$90? That \$210 in fees is being imposed on people who do things as innocent, normal and neutral as doing up bikes or motor mowers—that reminds me that I have traded in at least two in the last year—or exchanging dishwashers, small refrigerators and every other darned thing one can think of. Almost everything to do with hard goods can be traded in. The usual come-on in any advertisement is, "We trade anything", and that is absolutely routine among the absolutely honest dealers in this modern world. How can the Minister justify the imposition of these fees unless there is a very clear demonstration of cause and effect—of result against cost? I very specifically ask how many second-hand dealers have been convicted in this State of selling stolen goods in, say, the last five years.

Mr CAMPBELL: I want to make one more point. The Minister put forward a very good economic thesis on increases in fees compared with increases in the rate of inflation, but he has to remember that it was still \$2 in 1983 so that, in one year, the fee went from \$2 to \$120.

I point out that the member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) did mention exemptions. Why did the Minister not consider granting exemptions to dealers in country areas who will not deal with any large amounts of money?

Mr Innes: Little people in towns, too.

Mr CAMPBELL: The member for Sherwood can look after the towns; I will look after the country people. In fact, the Labor Party looks after small people everywhere.

I can see no reason why the Minister could not grant exemptions to people dealing in, say, less than \$1,000 or \$2,000 a year. That would help pensioners and other small fellows doing up bikes or furniture. There is a reasonable case for doing what I have suggested.

Mr GLASSON: The definition of second-hand goods allows the exemption of goods by Order in Council. That answers the question of the honourable member for Bundaberg.

I turn now to the point made by the member for Sherwood about the value of 2s. 6d. If he can relate £1 to 2s. 6d. he is a better man than I am. The figure in 1921 was £1 which, in my language, is \$2.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading—Resumption of Debate**

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 622) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (10.45 p.m.): The Opposition did not oppose the amendments to the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act and it will not be opposing the amendments to the Hawkers Act. The amendments in this Bill are similar to those that we debated in the previous Bill. I imagine that the members of the Liberal Party will put forward the same arguments as they did previously.

The member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) said the local councils were able to move in and stop people operating, because they had to issue them with permits. Knowing that he is a member of the Liberal Party and that he would have great influence in the Liberal Party in Queensland, I am sure that he could talk to the Liberal Party in the Brisbane City Council and get it to give carte blanche consent to anybody who wants a permit under this legislation. If the Liberal Party did that, there would be no need to impose a fee. Anybody who wanted a licence would not need approval. I do not agree with that, but that is what the member for Stafford is saying.

The Hawkers Act, the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act and the Pawnbrokers Act must contain these provisions. If we are to license people, the police must know that the local authorities want that type of activity to be carried on in their particular area. That is why we have town plans. I am sure that the members of the Liberal Party would not subscribe to the theory that we should do away with the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act and allow people in Brisbane to build and operate whatever businesses they wish. I am sure that each member of the Liberal Party who is presently sitting in the Chamber would have made a complaint to the Brisbane City Council about someone engaging in some sort of business in contravention of that Act. Every member of Parliament receives complaints from constituents about people operating businesses in contravention of town-planning Acts.

In the first instance, local authority approval is needed. I do not believe that further approval is necessary. If approval has been granted under a town plan, that should be sufficient to allow a person to operate a business for as long as he continues to renew his licence. The situation is not what the member for Stafford would have us believe it is, that is, that people are able to operate a business wherever they wish. Certainly the Opposition would not agree to that happening anywhere in Queensland. It would mean that hawkers, second-hand dealers or pawn-brokers could operate anywhere in the State. A second-hand dealer could start up a second-hand yard next to the home of the honourable member for Stafford. I am sure that he would be the first to complain to the Minister for giving that person a licence.

The Opposition agrees to these amendments because it believes that they will enable the Act to operate more efficiently. The previous provisions were needed, and we will support these amendments.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (10.48 p.m.): I rise merely to put paid to this quite ludicrous contention that the Opposition spokesman seized upon, of trying to compare hawkers under the Hawkers Act with second-hand dealers under the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act. Obviously the member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) was clutching at straws for something to say. Apart from trying to draw longbows and advancing confusing arguments, he said nothing.

If the honourable member studied the Hawkers Act, he would find that it deals with itinerant people—small set-ups that can come and go. If he had listened to what we were saying, he would know that we were discussing the position of established businesses which, by virtue of a change in the law, became second-hand dealers when they were not so before. The two situations are entirely different. The proposition that the honourable member so fatuously puts, obviously because he has nothing further to say on this Bill, is quite ludicrous, it adds little to the debate, and it leaves the Minister with nothing to say in reply. The honourable member did not say anything about this Bill.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (11.50 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on this Bill. I have nothing further to add.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 11, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

PAWNBROKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 626) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (10.52 p.m.): The Opposition does not oppose this Bill. The amendments contained within it are similar to those that have just been debated in relation to the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act and the Hawkers Act. One wonders why, in the initial stages, the three Acts were not included in one Act. That would have been a much easier way to deal with these amendments. This Bill will make it easier for pawn-brokers to obtain renewal licences, and the Opposition agrees to the amendments.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (10.53 p.m.): The member for Chatsworth must be feeling a little uncomfortable tonight. I notice that he has undone his top button and loosened his tie. Indeed, he is looking a little agitated. I would have thought that anyone who failed to understand the difference between a hawker, a pawn-broker and a second-hand dealer would have distinct problems coming to grips with the whole exercise. They are utterly different. Apart from the fact that, once upon a time, they all were likely to give rise to some criminal behaviour, their occupations and their methods of operation are totally different, and that is the essence of the Liberal Party's difference with the Minister for Police (Mr Glasson).

The definition of second-hand goods has changed completely from what it was in 1920 when the legislation was drawn up. The nature of second-hand dealers or the people who fall foul of the definition in the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act is completely different today. Pawn-brokers are still very much the same. A pawn-broker is a person who takes a trade-in or who takes someone else's goods and has an obligation to keep those goods for a period and to redeem the money in issue.

Mr Mackenroth: There is no reason why they can't be included in the same Act and a difference made in interpretation.

Mr INNES: We in the Liberal Party say that it would be a great mistake to include them in the same Act, because the type of operation and the character of transactions are completely different.

Hawkers are completely different from pawn-brokers and second-hand dealers. A hawker is an itinerant who wanders along the roadside or from place to place selling wares. The pawn-broker does not necessarily sell wares.

Sir William Knox: The pawn-broker doesn't own the goods.

Mr INNES: He does not own the goods, or at least not for a period.

The Liberal Party has no problem in accepting the amendments to the Pawnbrokers Act and the Hawkers Act. Those are quite different from the amendments to the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act. It is not the second-hand dealers who are likely to be criminals that the Liberal Party is worried about; it is those innocent people who will be paying \$120 a time, and there could be tens of thousands of them. They should not be in the gun.

With regard to the Pawnbrokers Act Amendment Bill—the Liberal Party supports the Minister and believes it is proper for the police to have a supervisory role. The Liberal Party supports the amendments.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.56 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on this Bill.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 14, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

POLICE COMPLAINTS TRIBUNAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 628) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (10.57 p.m.): The Opposition will not be opposing the provisions of the Bill. However I take this opportunity to raise a few matters.

On a number of occasions since the Minister took over the Police portfolio, he has promised the people of Queensland that he will have certain inquiries conducted and that he will make certain things public. One of those inquiries was by the Police Complaints Tribunal into cattle-duffing near Townsville. The Minister told the Parliament that he would table that report, but it has not been tabled. He promised an inquiry into complaints by a Mount Isa man about in-line machines. That report has not been forthcoming. The Minister promised an inquiry into a police bashing at Kangaroo Point. That report has not come forward. I understand that investigations into the police incident at Dayboro are continuing. I am continually speaking to the officer conducting that investigation. Each time I speak to him he finds more and more people to speak to. I understand that the report already contains 800 pages. One wonders whether that investigation will ever come to an end, whether the report itself will be made public and what action will be taken on it.

It is all very well to have a Police Complaints Tribunal and a Minister who promises to do certain things, but the problem is that nothing ever happens. The Minister should tell the House what has happened to those reports that he has promised to table—those dealing with the in-line machines at Mount Isa, the cattle-duffing near Townsville and the police bashing at Kangaroo Point—and whether he intends to make public the report into the incident at the Dayboro party.

I know that the Police Complaints Tribunal has looked into the cattle-duffing. If something positive does not come out of the investigation into the party at Dayboro, that also will be referred to the Police Complaints Tribunal. However, if the Parliament cannot get something positive from the Minister for Police, can it get something from the Police Complaints Tribunal because, even if it hears the evidence presented to it, it has to make recommendations to the Minister and it is up to the Minister or the Commissioner of Police to decide whether any action is to be taken on that report.

If we want the Police Complaints Tribunal to operate efficiently and effectively, it is about time that we started to allow it to make public some of its findings. I know that it is important for many of its hearings to be held in camera because people want to say things that should not be reported or cannot be reported. The Police Complaints Tribunal should report to this Parliament to let honourable members know what complaints it receives, what it has done about them, what recommendations it has made to the Minister or to the police commissioner, and what action the Minister for Police or the police commissioner has taken on those particular recommendations.

I do not like a situation in which police officers decide whether action should be taken. In the past police officers have done wrong. I know that, in general, the majority of officers of the Queensland Police Force are fine, upstanding citizens, but in some instances police go beyond the law.

In an answer to a question asked by the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes), the Minister said that over a two-year period police officers had been charged with 59 separate offences. Those charges ranged from armed robbery to indecently dealing with a minor and conspiracy. Police have been charged and have appeared before the court. Action has been taken. One cannot say that all police officers are good. It is obvious that they are not. The reports of the Police Complaints Tribunal should be made public and tabled in this Assembly so that honourable members know what is going on.

The police force is not innocent in everything that it does. Tonight, on television, the honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras) referred to a report that is to be released in which it is indicated that 23.7 per cent of prisoners on remand in the Queensland prison system ultimately will be found not guilty. That means that 23.7 per cent of the people who are placed in gaol on remand are, in fact, innocent. Queensland has the highest percentage. The nearest State to Queensland is one State that has a figure of 3 per cent. Police in Queensland are obviously charging persons before they have sufficient evidence.

Some people spend up to 12 months in gaol, appear in court and are then found not guilty. Naturally, those persons would like some recourse. To be able to make a complaint to the Police Complaints Tribunal is not much recourse, but at least it is one body to which a person can turn. Those people would like to know what happens to their complaints, and the people of Queensland deserve to know.

The Opposition asks the Minister to consider the points that I have raised when he is considering amendments to the Act in the future. I am concerned about the clause in the Bill that states that the tribunal shall consist of four members and that one shall be appointed at the discretion of the Governor in Council. I know that a similar provision is contained in the Act, that the Minister is increasing the number of members on the tribunal from three to four, and that provision is made for a quorum to consist of any three members of the tribunal. I am concerned as to whom that person will be.

On the last occasion on which it was a matter of discretion of the Governor in Council, the nominated person was a magistrate. The Opposition agreed to that. I do not know why the Minister cannot write into the Act who that person will be. If the Minister was going to nominate a magistrate on the last occasion, it should have been written into the Act at that time. I believe that the Minister will have someone in mind to appoint to the tribunal. If he does have anyone in mind, he is not doing his job. Will the Minister amend the Act and say, "The number of members of the tribunal will be increased to four, but I do not know who that person will be."? If it is to be someone representing the judiciary, or someone representing barristers or solicitors——

Mr Glasson: It will be a magistrate.

Mr MACKENROTH: It will be a magistrate. I ask why the Minister needs to say, "... one shall be at the discretion of the Governor in Council." Why can the Minister not say, "One shall be a magistrate."? That is a simple question to ask.

Section 2 (b) states——

"one shall be a Stipendiary Magistrate, who shall be Deputy Chairman;"

It would be quite simple to continue that and say, "one shall be a Magistrate", rather than say, "one shall be at the discretion of the Governor in Council". I am pleased that the Minister has said that the fourth member shall be a magistrate——

Mr Glasson: It is coincidental now that the third member of the tribunal happens to be a magistrate; but under the new provisions, one of those appointed to the tribunal will be a magistrate.

Mr MACKENROTH: I stated that. However, what I am saying is that section 2 (d) states that the fourth person to be appointed shall be at the discretion of the Governor in Council. I believe that it should be spelt out who that person is going to be. I do not mean that the Minister should give a particular name. However, I believe that he should spell out which section of the community that person will come from—the judiciary, the Bar Association, or some other walk of life. In my opinion, if Queensland is to have a Police Complaints Tribunal, it is not good enough to just pick a person up off the street and appoint them to that tribunal, because they would not have any expertise in considering cases that were put before them. It will be a tribunal, and it will make decisions. The provision should spell out explicitly who that person will be, not just leave it to the discretion of the Governor in Council.

The Opposition does not disagree with increasing the tribunal to four members and ensuring a quorum of three members. In forming that quorum, at least the Supreme Court judge or the magistrate would have to be there. If both of them were absent, a quorum could not be formed. The Opposition agrees with that particular amendment.

The Opposition agrees with the amendment giving the Minister protection from people, because in due course it will give Opposition members protection.

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (11.7 p.m.): I will also speak about the matter that has been raised by the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth). It seems to me, having examined some of the complementary legislation in places such as the United Kingdom, that a proper course for the Minister to adopt in appointing a fourth member for the tribunal is to consider somebody from a definite category, as the honourable member for Chatsworth has suggested. I suggest that a member of the Bar Association, the civil liberties area or a lay representative of that type would be an appropriate person to appoint to the tribunal.

Of course, considerable interest is being shown by the community in relation to this particular tribunal. It already consists of a District Court judge, a magistrate and a police officer. Nobody on the tribunal is from the general community, outside the administration of the legal system, either in the administration of the police force or the administration of the judicial system as it is presently applied.

I can certainly envisage grounds for appointing somebody who comes from a different field and, I would suggest, a different discipline. I do not suggest somebody who is totally unrelated to this particular interest, but somebody from this field who is not a judicial officer and who is not a member of the police force.

I am concerned also about the way in which the amendment is worded in relation to the appointment of the police officer. I note that the wording is that it is to be a person nominated by the Queensland Police Union or a person who is a retired member of the Queensland Police Force having retired at a rank of not less than senior sergeant.

I have read the Minister's speech, and I note that the intention seems to be that the alternative has been placed there so that if a police union representative is appointed and his term of office as a policeman comes to an end before his term of office on the tribunal, his term can be extended. However, the Bill does not say that. It therefore takes away something in which the police union, I would suggest, has a particular interest, namely, that one member of the police force who has the confidence of the police union will be a member of the tribunal. That, I suggest, is reasonable and proper and in line with other legislation in this State. The amendment, however, gives the Government the power to overlook the person nominated by the Queensland Police Union and to appoint somebody of its own choice who has retired from the Queensland Police Force.

I accept that the Government's intention is as it says, but why is the amendment worded in this way? Whatever the present Government's intention might be, it will not be any safeguard in the future if a Government or a Minister does not have the same intention. One can only question, therefore, whether the interests of the Queensland Police Union, which has legitimate interests in this matter, are fully protected. I suggest that it is an unhappy amendment, which opens the way in the future for the appointment, in this category, of people who do not have the confidence of the union. I suggest that the amendment should not have been worded in this way. If the intention is as the Minister said in his speech, the amendment should have been worded so that that circumstance was covered without leaving it open to the Government or the Minister, as it will do, to appoint somebody totally without the confidence of the union.

I have been informed that complainants before the tribunal have sought legal representation, but it has been denied them. It is the practice, I understand, for legal representation to be given to the police officer about whom a complaint has been lodged and who has been called before the tribunal to answer a charge. Unlike other tribunals of a similar type, as I understand it, no-one is appointed under the regulations to appear on behalf of the complainant, or the prosecution, as it might be called. The complainant, therefore, must appear without legal advice, without legal aid, to substantiate a complaint against a trained police officer, who has legal assistance when appearing before the tribunal.

At page 73 of the 1984 report by the Commissioner of Police, reference is made to this—

“Care also is taken to ensure that illiterate or disadvantaged people are given every assistance in the preparation and presentation of their complaints.”

I suggest that it is not just illiterate and disadvantaged people who need to be given help in the preparation and presentation of their cases. Most people in society who attend tribunals at which the other side has the assistance of a lawyer seek legal assistance. I suggest that it is quite proper for the tribunal and the Minister to consider that aspect and to determine the legal assistance and advice that should be made available to the complainant, or that the prosecution should provide somebody to assist the complainant, rather than the complainant's having to rely on help that may be given by members of the tribunal.

The Act makes provision for regulations to afford assistance in the matter. However, they are practically non-existent. All they have done is set out the various forms to be filled out at the different stages of the proceedings. The regulations themselves are silent.

I strongly suggest, therefore, that the Minister carefully consider the matter of complainants being given assistance or being allowed to obtain assistance if they wish to take a lawyer with them to assist in the presentation of their case. It is only proper that that should be allowed or that some other form of assistance should be provided.

Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (11.14 p.m.): In his second-reading speech, the Minister indicated that the reason for the legislation was the work-load of the tribunal and the increased demand upon the time of its members. Notwithstanding these statements, I feel, primarily, that that increase in work-load is symptomatic of the police force's being an extension of the Government. Recently, I read a statement by Lord Row that was printed in the *Police Union Journal* in August 1985. Lord Row was the Police Commissioner in London in 1828, and what he said indicates that a policeman's job today is the same as it was in those days. He said—

“The policeman's job is still the same. The protection of life and property and the preservation of public tranquility, and the absence of crime will alone prove if those efforts have been successful.”

I have no notion of turning this debate in an attack on the police, but, bearing in mind Lord Row's statement, I would say that the interpretation by the police of their role has become warped, to say the least.

In Queensland, the protection of life and property has become the prime concern of police—if a person happens to be rich and white. That prime concern does not work well if a person is poor and black. In short, the role of a police officer is to keep the poor and the black from the rich man's door. As for the preservation of public tranquility—apparently that has become the lowest priority of police. Recently, when many of the senior police retired, the result of the absence of those experienced police officers was that the younger and more excitable and more susceptible police officers were allowed to vent their spleen and dull their blades of experience, so to speak, upon the dance-floor hordes, the lonely drunks or the confused black men.

As to the absence of crime—this Bill attests to the success of that. Lord Row certainly knew what being a policeman was all about. In effect, by his statement, he was predicting the establishment of this Police Complaints Tribunal. In that statement he was saying that unless law enforcement officers stick to the guide-lines he spoke about, and unless they fulfil their purpose, the role of a police officer becomes corrupt.

When Governments interfere, when Governments dictate duties to police officers that do not relate to a police officer's role, and when Government's use legislative powers to direct the police force as a private army, the police force loses its integrity. When that happens, police officers lose the respect of the people they ought to serve—the people whose tranquility they are responsible for. Loss of respect brings with it an unwanted work-load; an increased work-load brings with it complaints about police; police complaints give rise to police complaints tribunals.

The tribunal will require a quorum of three members, as follows: firstly, as chairman, a judge of the Supreme Court will be appointed; secondly, as deputy chairman, a stipendiary magistrate will be appointed at the discretion of the Governor in Council; thirdly, as a member, either a person who is nominated or deemed to have been nominated by the Queensland Police Union or a person who has retired from the police force having attained a rank of not less than senior sergeant, will be appointed. The only member of that group who would have no axe to grind or no vested interest is the Supreme Court judge. However, if the judge is removed from any sitting—and I emphasise the words “any sitting”—the tribunal will forthwith lose its independence and it will lose public confidence.

Under no circumstances can the independence of a stipendiary magistrate be equated to that of a judge. A stipendiary magistrate, as a public servant, is subject to the directions of the Public Service Board and all other ministerial pressures and influences. In addition to that, such a person would have a history of having worked with other public servants,

such as police officers, throughout his public service career and have been subject to certain kinds of influence.

If honourable members would like to read about this matter, they will find that I illustrated that point in the debate on Supply in November last year. I emphasised the dangers of the summary justice doled out by magistrates, particularly in country areas where, I believe, they are highly susceptible to the influences I have mentioned. If the tribunal is to remain independent and retain public confidence, it must always have at least one independent person who is above reproach as a member, such as a Supreme or District Court judge as its chairman.

This Bill does not give such a guarantee. Moreover, if the members of the tribunal are to be balanced in their consideration of issues, say, between the police and the community, the community member ought to be chosen by the public and not by the Governor in Council. That point was brought up by my cohorts on this side. The Government has the same vested interest as the police. Public confidence in the tribunal will be maintained only if the chairman at all times remains a Supreme Court or District Court judge, with a community organisation nominating one member and the Queensland Police Union the other. There must be a judge and, to keep the balance, the community, not the Government, should nominate one member and the Queensland Police Union the other member. The tribunal will lose its independence and public confidence if for any reason its composition is changed, even if only temporarily.

To my mind, the proposed amendments to section 4 of the Act will actually emasculate the tribunal and make it a creature of the Government. That will result in a complete loss of public confidence in the tribunal's impartiality. The balance of the amendments are only cosmetic or are for the protection of the Government. That includes the amendment to insert a new section 18A because that will not allow the Government or the Commissioner of Police to get rid of or embarrass trouble-makers by reporting them to the tribunal. So the way I read it, if a complaint is made to the police, the Government or the police commissioner, they have the discretion as to whether the complaint goes any further. Marvellous, isn't it? I would wager that 99.9 per cent of complaints will finish in that fashion.

Genuine complaints can, under the Act, emanate only from the public—not from the police commissioner or the police themselves. But if the composition of the tribunal is amended, and that is taken in combination with section 18A, both the Government and the commissioner can use the tribunal for their own purposes. They can predetermine the results. One's imagination conjures up a quite frightening scenario when a tribunal is dominated and controlled by the Government and the commissioner. If that occurs, there is no way that the public can maintain any sort of confidence in the tribunal's deliberations.

I have discovered, and have said so for some time now, that the public do not understand the functions of the tribunal anyway. Mr Braddy brought up the point——

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Who wrote the speech for you?

Mr PRICE: I did. Why does the Premier not question me on it?

I referred to this subject last year and said, in reference to summary justice being meted out by magistrates, that the fear of people when entering such courts is unbelievable. They really do not understand what they are getting into. This tribunal will now duplicate that system, with people being put before it and judged without being helped. They will fear the tribunal just as they fear the Magistrates Courts. Because of ignorance, the tribunal carries a tag of suspicion and mistrust and even now the common belief is that it is an arm of the police. I have spoken to a number of people in my office who have asked, "What is the Police Complaints Tribunal?" One has to explain it in detail, because people simply do not understand. The Government's propaganda does not include enlightening the people about exactly what the tribunal does.

Mr McKechnie: Do you think Justice Murphy fears the High Court?

Mr PRICE: The Minister will never reach it, anyway. He will be wiped out in the Magistrates Courts. That is as high as he would ever get.

If all the potential problems I have outlined are combined, the result will have all the attributes of a horrific bureaucratic nightmare that the public will shun. But perhaps that is the purpose of the amendment.

I ask the Minister to consider all the points I have made, particularly the one relating to the Governor in Council actually nominating one of the members of the tribunal. I feel that an amendment to that area would allow the public to have some say in the composition of the tribunal.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (11.25 p.m.): I had not intended to speak in this debate, but I am rather shocked to see that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, the Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for kangaroos are treating this matter frivolously.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. Is this honourable member correct in referring to my colleague as the "Minister for kangaroos"?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I was just about to call the honourable member to task for that. He will refer to the Minister by his correct title.

Mr SMITH: Mr Speaker, I feel that I was provoked; but I accept your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SMITH: The various Opposition speakers have put the case quite sincerely and honestly, and the Government is choosing to ignore it. Basically, the community at large does not understand the role of the Police Complaints Tribunal. Secondly, people fear the role of the tribunal.

People whom I would describe as being in the middle rank in the community are fearful of appearing before the Police Complaints Tribunal. Teachers, who are among the more educated in the community, are quite fearful of bringing forward legitimate complaints. Recently, I have tried to encourage people to bring forward complaints. They are quite fearful of taking matters any further, because they feel that the tribunal is merely an instrument of the police and that all that will happen is that they will finish up with egg on their face or be discredited in one way or another.

Some Government members are treating this matter frivolously. I accept the Minister's sincerity in this matter, but the fact is that the wool is being pulled over his eyes. The public at large does not accept the tribunal or its impartiality. Government members may laugh, but the fact is that the tribunal is not working and the public has no confidence in it. Unless the Minister is prepared to take note of the comments that have been made tonight, he is failing to carry out his ministerial responsibilities.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (11.27 p.m.), in reply: I thank Opposition members for their contributions to this debate. I refer to three matters raised by the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth), who is the Opposition spokesman on Police. I made a commitment in public, in the media, that the report of the inquiry in the Mickey Bull case would be tabled in this Parliament.

Before the passing of these amendments, I for one would be very foolish and naive to make any comment in public. Quite obviously, I would be open to an action for libel. When that report is presented and tabled in this Parliament, it will reveal the sincerity and the thoroughness with which the Police Complaints Tribunal has operated. That report will be tabled in this House.

Mr Mackenroth: When it is tabled here it is privileged.

Mr GLASSON: I said that the report would be tabled. I was not in a position to comment outside this Chamber, but I will be able to do so after these amendments are passed.

Tonight, the honourable member referred to two other cases that are still under investigation and before the courts. Therefore, no comment can be made on them. I speak about the Kangaroo Point case and the inquiry into alleged misappropriation by police officers. Those matters are still under investigation.

As to the comments made by the member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy) and the member for Mount Isa (Mr Price)——

Mr Mackenroth: I asked you about four—Mount Isa, the cattle-duffing——

Mr GLASSON: I promised that the report in relation to the Mickey Bull case in Charters Towers would be tabled in this House.

The members for Rockhampton, Mount Isa and Townsville West (Mr Smith) said that the Police Complaints Tribunal is not accepted as being an independent body. What it has done is proof of the thoroughness with which it carries out its investigations. When the report in the Mannix case is released, honourable members will be aware of the thoroughness with which the Police Complaints Tribunal operates.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: It is a reflection on them, you know.

Mr GLASSON: Yes.

No worries will arise over the appointment of the fourth member, who could be a serving police officer or a retired police officer. Opposition members must agree that many police officers who have just retired have ability and expertise that would be ideal on the Police Complaints Tribunal. This amending legislation will not restrict membership of the tribunal to serving police officers, which is the case with Senior Sergeant Col Chant. When he retires, which is not far away, this Bill will enable him to continue on the tribunal. I have no further comment on that point.

I was disappointed by the comments of the member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) who implied that I took this matter cheaply. At no stage did I treat it as a joke. I treat it very seriously.

Mr Smith: You appeared to be; you were laughing.

Mr GLASSON: Never mind what I appeared to be. The honourable member made accusations——

Mr Smith: You were treating it frivolously.

Mr GLASSON: I certainly do not treat this issue lightly. This Bill contains a number of serious amendments which will assist the tribunal to operate in this State.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. W. H. Glasson (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 4; Tribunal——

Mr BRADDY (11.32 p.m.): I am not quite sure whether the Minister has grasped what I was saying. I am not worried about a person who is on the retired list being a

member of the tribunal. The original legislation provided that the Police Union would have a direct say in who was to be the police representative on the tribunal. That right has been taken away from the union now. The Governor in Council will decide between——

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Don't you think that is right?

Mr BRADDY: No, I do not think that that is right.

I think that the original legislation, which the Premier's Government introduced, was right. It said that the Queensland Police Union could select a person to be a member of the tribunal. I accept that what the Minister for Police says is accurate; I do not believe that he is trying to put one over the union, the Parliament or anyone else. The Bill enables the Government to extend the service of a person who has been on the tribunal as a serving police officer but who, under the legislation as it currently stands, would have to leave the tribunal on his retirement from the police force. That amendment could have been made by changing the wording of the legislation to provide that the service of an officer who is already serving on the tribunal could be extended beyond the term of his service in the police force.

Although the Queensland Police Union may not realise it yet, it has lost a right which, under this Minister, it may not live to regret. That might not be the case under another Minister. The Government could appoint as the union representative a person in whom the union does not have confidence. The Queensland Police Union, which has lost a right under this Bill, will have to live with that.

Mr PRICE: I am concerned with subclause (2) (d), which states that one of the members on the tribunal shall be appointed at the discretion of the Governor in Council. My protest is that, in looking for balance on the tribunal, the public should have a say, one way or other, regardless of whether it is a Government instrumentality or an independent body.

To get some balance and to allow the public to be a part of that body, that person should not be appointed at the discretion of the Governor in Council or be an appointee of the Government. In my mind, under this clause, that is what will inevitably happen. That person should be nominated by some local body or organisation. It should be somebody who would be able to contribute a genuine public input.

Mr GLASSON: I refer to the matters raised by the members for Rockhampton and Mount Isa and point out to them that clause 2 of the Bill amends subsection (2) of section 4 of the Act. Part of that amendment is as follows——

“(c) one shall be——

(i) a person nominated or deemed under this Act to have been nominated by the Queensland Police Union of Employees in accordance with this Act;

or

(ii) a person who is a retired member of the Queensland Police Force having retired at a rank of not less than Senior Sergeant,

as the Governor in Council thinks fit;

(d) one shall be at the discretion of the Governor in Council.”

In other words, the Governor in Council has the final word. If the Government feels that somebody who is nominated could be detrimental to the effectiveness of the tribunal as a whole, the final say lies with the Governor in Council. That is only proper and correct. The chance of this provision being used is very slight; but, for the independence of the tribunal, the protection is there.

Mr MACKENROTH: Having listened to what the Minister just said, I ask him to explain it a little further. He said that the provision would be implemented if somebody

proposed was considered to be detrimental to the tribunal. In fact, what he was saying was that, in the Government's opinion, somebody put up by the Queensland Police Union—in other words, a member of the Queensland Police Force—could be detrimental to the operations of the Police Complaints Tribunal. I ask the Minister to explain to the Committee how a representative of the Queensland Police Union could be detrimental to the operations of that tribunal.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Oh, come on now!

Mr MACKENROTH: That is what he said.

Mr GLASSON: I said that the final say is in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Procorp; Mr B. Johnson

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (11.38 p.m.): I draw to the attention of local authorities in Queensland an advertisement that appeared in the July/August edition of the *Locgov Digest*. In my opinion, that advertisement is both fraudulent and misleading. It relates to an organisation known as Procorp, which has a principal consultant by the name of Barry Johnson. The advertisement reads—

“

Professional
Commercial
Government

Corporate
Local
Consultants

PROCORP is a new concept in consultancy which is specifically attuned to the needs of Local Government and is sympathetic to the aims, objects and problems of Local Government.

PROCORP'S principal consultant, Barry Johnson, practised as a Solicitor for over 18 years specifically in the fields of administrative town planning and local government law and has 'hands on' experience in local government administration.”

That must be a different Barry Johnson from the Barry Johnson whom I know. I want to detail the true history and experience of Barry Johnson, the principal of Procorp.

Johnson was appointed to the Gladstone City Council in September 1975 to replace Alderman Roy Swenson, who was to return to the position of town clerk. I asked for an investigation into the city council.

In 1976, owing to the resignation of the mayor on 30 June, Johnson was elected mayor in about August of that same year.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: He is a mate of yours, isn't he?

Mr PREST: No. He is a member of the National Party.

I asked for an investigation into the Gladstone City Council's finances in 1977. Because Johnson was a member of the National Party and was a candidate in the 1977 State election for the seat of Port Curtis, that audit was not allowed. When I asked for the audit, Johnson said that I was council-bashing. After Johnson had been soundly defeated in his endeavour to enter State Parliament, an audit was carried out in January 1978. The audit took place on the council's books and finances from 1 July 1976 to 1 February 1978. The Auditor-General found that \$11,990.68 was missing from a safe overnight. He found that it was not as a result of a break-in but as a result of an inside job. The audit revealed that \$72,207.12 was missing and that other revenue not collected amounted to \$64,274.87. It was also found that the books of account had been juggled. This occurred whilst Johnson was an alderman or mayor on the Gladstone City Council. As I said, the period for which the audit was taken was from 1 July 1976 to 1 February 1978. That audit brought a great discredit to local government and, in particular, to the Gladstone City Council.

In summing up, the auditor said that the town clerk was responsible for the safe keeping of finances of the council, yet no action was taken against the town clerk by the council of which Johnson was mayor.

Because of public dissatisfaction, Johnson was defeated in 1979 at the local authority election. That is the total of Johnson's experience in local government. He was elected for only one term.

Johnson, as a solicitor, was no better. In fact, he was worse. Johnson was known to have 5 per cent knowledge and 95 per cent bluff. How was he going to advise local government? About 12 months ago Johnson came to work for a firm of solicitors in Brisbane. He lasted with that firm for only about three months before being shown the door. He has now popped up offering himself as experienced in local government and offering his services to local authorities. Local authorities should take my advice that they should not touch Johnson's Procorp with a 10-foot pole. He is one person against whom the Queensland Law Society should have taken action.

Because he has been a paid-up member of the National Party, Johnson has been protected. He is a con man with a ton of front. On other occasions I have spoken in this Chamber about Johnson's ability as a solicitor. In fact, his pet name is "Crime". Crime does not pay; neither does Johnson. However, he has the cheek to advertise his services. Every local authority in Queensland would be aware of Johnson's reputation. He has the audacity and the cheek to advertise that he is a consultant, a man with years of experience in local government, and 18 years as a solicitor. However, he cannot obtain a job as a solicitor.

Time expired.

Arts Sponsorship Scheme

Mr KAUS (Mansfield) (11.44 p.m.): I know that I speak for everyone in Brisbane when I say that our new Queensland Cultural Centre and Art Gallery are among the best in the world and that we can truly be proud that this city boasts such first-class amenities. However, it is frequently brought to my notice that arts bodies lack the necessary finance to expand and improve. I would like to propose a new business sponsorship scheme for the arts which perhaps the Minister could consider.

This would be a Government scheme intended to encourage a higher level of business sponsorship of the arts and to give public endorsement to sponsors in Queensland. The scheme could be worth anything up to \$1m annually, depending, of course, on the Minister's budget, and the Government could provide matching grants for new sponsorships.

If the Government showed its commitment to the field of sponsorship by making a sum available in a full year to provide an incentive to new business sponsorship through challenge grants or funding, much good could come of it. I do not regard

sponsorship as a substitute for public subsidy but as a supplement to enable the arts to grow. It is not a charity but a business relationship from which both parties would benefit.

The Government should develop a program away from the usual arts practice of responding to the initiatives of others and adopt a policy of identifying needs and seeking to satisfy them. To finance many of its proposals, the Government should issue challenges to local communities to match its funding or at least match it in part, whether from local authority sources or from other locally raised funds.

While hoping for increases in art funding by some local authorities, the Government wishes to encourage greater support for the arts from business and industry. The Government should do all that it can to develop such sponsorship and encourage its clients to do the same.

It is essential that the arts be made more accessible and new audiences established. Great emphasis is placed upon experiencing art in the context of the local community. That gives honourable members some idea of the funding.

An association of business sponsorship of the arts could be formed and open to any business creating new or additional sponsorship for arts bodies, including craft and film. Sponsored projects might include new revenue projects, new works, productions, exhibitions and tours, new buildings, improvements or refurbishments to existing buildings, particularly in the country, and the acquisition of new or improved equipment. I know that the provincial cities are pretty well set up.

No organisation would be eligible for an award more frequently than once every three years. Applications could be forwarded by business organisations or arts bodies, the money being paid to the arts organisations in all cases. I think Government initiatives such as this would be welcomed by the arts councils in Queensland. It would be a strategy for the arts for the coming decade.

All honourable members are aware of the criticism from time to time that culture and art in Australia are at a pretty low ebb. Of course, they are dependent on the funding provided by the Commonwealth. At least our critics could be shown that, in Queensland, every endeavour is made to promote all aspects of the arts and thereby set a shining example to other States.

League of Rights

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (11.48 p.m.): I am loath to refer to an organisation about which I have spoken on many occasions—and I know some honourable members are active financial members of it—that is, the League of Rights. It is one of the most obnoxious organisations that has ever operated in this country.

As honourable members know, quite a number of National Party members are active supporters of or members of the League of Rights. Over the years——

Mr Borbidge: You are short of speakers on that side, are you, Brian?

Mr DAVIS: The honourable member for “Sufferers Paradise” interjects frequently. He should listen and he will find out about that organisation. He ought to cross-examine a few of his buddy-buddies in the National Party, particularly the Premier and Treasurer, who has, over the years, been a keen supporter of the League of Rights. As a matter of fact, it has been well known over the years that Joh Bjelke-Petersen and his missus have been supporters of the League of Rights.

For the record, I refer to a report which appeared in *The Australian* newspaper. An unabashed supporter of the League of Rights is none other than our own Florence Bjelke-Petersen. Flo addressed a League of Rights seminar at the Wavell Heights Community

Centre in Brisbane on 10 August 1980. We remember that extremely well. The following day, *The Australian* reported—

“Supporters of the right-wing League of Rights were enraptured yesterday by a speech by the Queensland National Party’s number one Senate candidate, Mrs Flo Bjelke-Petersen.”

According to *The Australian*, she spoke for 40 minutes to the 200 present. She said—

“Joh thought it would be very nice for me to go along. He said I should speak to as many people as I could, especially if you are going to the Senate.”

The Australian also reported that Joh told them he was glad she was speaking there. She continued—

“He said there were a host of good solid people across Australia who supported the League of Rights. He said he was not interested in claims that the League was racist, anti-semitic, extreme right-wing or pro-nazi. They (the League) are anti-socialist and that’s what I like.”

Guess who was on the same platform? That no-hoper, Patrick Field!

The League’s publication, *New Times*, which I will refer to shortly, reported that Senator Bjelke-Petersen had sent a message to the International League of Rights conference in Calgary, Canada, in which she said—

“The League of Rights stands for so many good principles, one of which is, of course, supporting so strongly State rights.”

Coincidentally, the same issue contained the usual dose of anti-semitism, one article claiming—

“Judaism is implacably anti-Christian and it is, by definition, an incarnate lie.”

I shall now put on record what is to occur in a couple of weeks’ time in Melbourne, when the League of Rights 1985 annual national seminar is to be held. I ask honourable members to listen to the galaxy of stars who will be speaking. First—

“Outspoken RSL leader Mr Bruce Ruxton will be dealing with defence.”

The top speaker, who continues to claim that he is not political—that great flag-waver from the university—is to be—

“Distinguished educationalist, Dr Rupert Goodman, from Brisbane, will be speaking on the new assault on the Australian flag, and the significance of this campaign as part of the overall attack on traditional Australia.”

Whom do these right-wing bigots think they are trying to fool?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: Does the Premier support the League of Rights?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: Does the Premier support the League of Rights? Yes or no? If he supports the League of Rights, he has to be condemned. Does he support it or not?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I will tell the Premier where I do not stand. I do not support the League of Rights. Does he?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: I put it on the record that the Premier says he supports the League of Rights.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! I call the member for Gympie.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Tell us how he supports the coms.

Cut-back in Federal Funds for Kindergartens

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (11.54 p.m.): I am not too sure what the member for Brisbane Central supports. He is not too sure himself.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The member for Brisbane Central is the leader of the "League of Lefts" He is establishing his own identity. He has a number of followers.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: Yes, his leadership challenge is under way at the moment.

Opposition Members interjected.

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

Mr STEPHAN: I do not worry a great deal about the radicals on the Opposition side. They have difficulty finding something to say. When they speak, they are unsure about where they are headed. As members of the "League of Lefts", they have their own identity and their own leader. They now have their own followers.

This evening, I would like to highlight some of the actions of the Canberra colleagues of members of the Opposition. Members of the Opposition like to hear what is going on in Canberra, because the Federal Labor Government does not tell them very much about what is happening. In the Address-in-Reply debate, the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) attempted to justify the cut-back in Federal Government funding that will be borne by the pre-schools, creches and kindergartens.

I wish to highlight the concern that is felt in the community, particularly the concern that has been channelled through the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland. A couple of months ago, the association saw fit to take up the issue of the cut-backs in Federal Government funding. The association was seeking an additional allocation of funds through the State's budgetary processes. The association has been very satisfied with the amount allocated through the State's Budget——

Mr McKechnie: The Federal Government is attacking four-year-old children.

Mr STEPHAN: I would not be surprised if that was about all that the Federal Government could attack. Labor Party members are scared to go out into the streets to look for anyone else who could answer the attack; so, of course, they would naturally attack little ones and those who are unable to defend themselves.

I hope that all honourable members will take note of the appreciation expressed by the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland in a letter that is dated 12 September 1985 and reads——

"You may recall that I wrote to you a few months ago about the possible implications of the decision by the Commonwealth Government, in its May Mini-Budget, to withdraw from the funding of Preschool Education Services from the end of the 1985 year.

As I explained . . . , that decision left Community Kindergartens in Queensland facing the prospect of a 25% reduction in the level of its Government financial assistance at a time when increasing numbers of families could not afford to pay substantially increased fees."

That highlights the fact that it is not only the children but also family units who are affected.

Families are experiencing a great deal of difficulty in meeting the increased burden brought about by the cut-back in funding. That is a good indication of what goes on in the Federal field. The Federal Labor Government starts to implement a policy, and then it drops it; it then leaves it to the States to pick up the tab for the programs.

Mr Fouras: Why does your Government not support child-care facilities in Queensland?

Mr STEPHAN: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. If he listens to what I am about to say, he will understand the level of State Government support. The letter from the Creche and Kindergarten Association goes on to say this—

“We have just received details of the 1985/86 State Budget presented by the Premier, and we were very pleased to learn that the State Government has, in fact, provided the necessary additional funding to maintain the existing levels of financial assistance for kindergartens.”

The honourable member for South Brisbane asks why the State Government does not support child-care facilities. I point out that the Queensland Government has provided the necessary additional funding.

The appreciation of the community, as evidenced by the letter I have referred to, is very great. Opposition members do not like to hear that the State Government has picked up the tab for funding and will continue to do so. Opposition members do not like to acknowledge that the State Government will carry on where the Federal Government has left off. The Queensland Government performs that role regularly and it does so readily.

The letter goes on—

“I can assure you that the Association and the Community Kindergarten Movement sincerely appreciate the special consideration which we have received on this particular occasion, and for the continued support which we have enjoyed from the State Government over so many years.

The maintenance of the grant levels should enable Committees to confidently plan for the future, and to maintain fees at levels which will be affordable by a majority of families.”

That is one aspect of the appreciation expressed by the association. I do not have time to go into some of the other aspects, but it has given me a great deal of pleasure to place on record the appreciation that has been shown.

I do not have time to deal with some of the other aspects of the cut-back in Federal funding and the difficulties that have emerged in Queensland's educational program as a result.

State Government Assistance to Sugar Industry

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (11.58 p.m.): One has to say that the State Budget had good news and bad news. The good news was that it confirmed one point, and that is that the Queensland Government has been deceiving the cane-growers of Queensland about the money that it has been providing to the sugar industry. On page 106 of the document titled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*, the assistance given to the sugar industry is set out. It is interesting because it confirms that the facts published in the sugar industry brochure which was published over the signatures of the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) and the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) are false. Under the subheading “Sugar Industry” on page 106, the perspective states that the amount of aid given to the sugar industry for the year 1983-84 was \$10m in carry-on finance for growers. The perspective states that clearly and emphatically.

Wednesday, 18 September 1985

In late 1984 the Government issued to every cane-grower in Queensland a brochure titled *Facts About Sugar*. Under the heading "Fact 2" the brochure states—

"The Queensland Government has provided positive assistance to the sugar industry. . ."

The brochure stated that, under the Rural Adjustment Scheme, the Government had provided \$15m towards carry-on finance in 1983-84. That shows a 50 per cent error in the Government's figures. The Budget papers stated that \$10m was provided in 1983-84 towards carry-on finance yet, less than six months before that statement was made, a brochure issued over the signature of the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) stated that the Queensland Government had provided \$15m for cane-growers. Those statements were totally wrong and have been discredited by the Government's own figures. That was the bad news. The only good thing about it was the total discrediting of the *Facts About Sugar* brochure.

The supposed \$20m announced as aid to cane-growers has been another attempt to hoodwink them simply because, as at the end of the June 1985 financial year, the balance of the rural adjustment and rural reconstruction accounts totalled \$38.8m. Money was there waiting to be used by cane-growers and farmers. Although there was an announcement in the Budget that \$20m would be provided by the State Government, most of that \$38.8m had been provided by the Commonwealth Government, and that can be proved.

Mr Randell: What rubbish you are talking.

Mr CAMPBELL: For example, until the end of June 1984, the State Government had taken \$7.3m more out of the Rural Reconstruction Fund than it put into it. Those figures appear in the 1984 report of the Rural Reconstruction Board. I ask the member for Mirani (Mr Randell) to tell me that the Queensland Government has not taken \$7.3m more out of the Rural Reconstruction Fund than it put into it. It should be remembered that that has not just happened now; it has been happening for many years.

In 1982 the balances in those two accounts amounted to \$33.7m. Over the next three years the Queensland Government took \$16.2m out of those funds and put it into consolidated revenue. That money could have been left in those accounts and given to cane-growers and farmers. But, no, it was put into consolidated revenue. The fact is, as the Federal Government says, that this Government cannot be trusted. If this Government accepts Commonwealth money for the Rural Reconstruction Board and then rips it out and puts it into consolidated revenue, why should it be given any more Commonwealth money? Why should the money not be left for cane-growers and farmers? If Government members can disprove everything I have said tonight, I will apologise.

Time expired.

Commonwealth Government Grants; UNESCO

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (12.3 a.m.): I must first comment very briefly on the economic theories espoused by the member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) and earlier by the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers). Their comments will be treated with the contempt they deserve. Because what they said was absolute rubbish, I will not comment further. The member for Bundaberg said that the Government should be trying to do something for cane-growers, yet he is the man who said in this Chamber that he favoured the introduction of a wealth tax. That comment would go down extremely well with cane-growers.

Mr Randell: Tonight he advocated a capital gains tax.

Mr McPHIE: I heard what he said. He is in favour of every tax one can think of. The honourable member hanged himself with what he said.

I want to clarify a couple of points raised earlier today by members opposite about the Budget, particularly in relation to money that this State receives from Commonwealth sources. Opposition members have criticised Government members because they have pointed out that Queensland has been unfairly dealt with this year by the Federal authorities, particularly when one refers to what Queensland could reasonably have expected to receive at the beginning of the 12-month period.

Under Federal/State agreements, which, in some cases, are subject to Acts of Parliament, Queensland receives certain allocations of money. Formulas that had been agreed to have been changed within the last nine or 10 months. When those changes were made, this State received \$362m less than it reasonably expected to receive 12 months ago in the areas of health, Medicare, the Grants Commission and general revenue grants. Queensland received \$160m less in the areas of education, roads and housing. That totals \$522m.

To put it another way—the Queensland Government has had to bring down a Budget with half a billion dollars less than it reasonably expected to receive. I do not think that any Opposition member should be making excuses for the Federal Government and saying that the Queensland Government is bellyaching. It has just grounds for complaining. Queensland has been robbed by the Federal Government. That has been done deliberately and it has been to the detriment of the people of Queensland. If Opposition members want to stand up for the Federal Government, they should do so, but I would much prefer to see them stand up for the people of Queensland.

Earlier in the year I referred to the areas in which the Federal Government is deliberately wasting money on projects that are outside the normal flow of the opinion of the majority of people in Australia. I advocated that that wasteful spending should be cut, that the Federal Government should reduce duplication and penetration in those areas in which others have responsibility, and that it should put its own house in order financially.

Tonight, I wish to refer to another area, and that is the Federal Government's support for a communist front organisation—the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation. That organisation was formed in 1946 to “foster its members belief in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge”. They were fine ideals, but they have been perverted and subverted by the people who are presently running UNESCO.

Between 1946 and 1982, UNESCO had a membership of 161 nations, which is more than the membership of the United Nations. It is led by an authoritarian and volatile director-general from Senegal, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow.

UNESCO pushes a new international economic order to redistribute Western wealth to create a global welfare state. In fact, it is a front for communist organisations, and Australia is paying money to it. At the UNESCO world conference on cultural issues, Western culture, especially American, was condemned. Third World delegates in their hundreds participated in lavish entertainment by night but cried poverty by day. They demanded more Western money.

UNESCO is inefficient and corrupt. It has a secretarial staff in Paris of 2 700 and a professional staff of 1 100. Almost 80 per cent of its budget is used to support that top-heavy headquarters. Graft and corruption are patently obvious. M'Bow hands out promotions according to ideology and nationality, not merit. Yet Australia is contributing to the organisation.

On 29 December 1983, the United States of America said that if UNESCO did not reform, it would withdraw. The United States of America has withdrawn from UNESCO.

Time expired.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).