

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 1985

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Real Property Act Amendment Bill;
Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill;
Hawkers Act Amendment Bill;
Pawnbrokers Act Amendment Bill;
Police Complaints Tribunal Act Amendment Bill;
Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act Amendment Bill;
Administrative Boundaries Terminology Bill;
Disposal of Unexecuted Warrants Bill;
Criminal Investigation (Extra-territorial Offences) Bill;
District Courts Act Amendment Bill.

DEATH OF HON. J. P. GOLEBY, MLA**Seat Declared Vacant**

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from the Registrar-General a certified copy of the registration of the death, on 10 September 1985, of the Honourable John Philip Goleby, lately serving in the Legislative Assembly as member for the electoral district of Redlands and Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Redlands hath become and is now vacant by reason of the death of the said John Philip Goleby.”

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Third-party Insurance Premiums

From Mr Shaw (95 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke recent increases in third-party insurance and ensure future increases are determined after public hearing.

[A similar petition was received from Mr Warburton (528 signatories).]

Abortion Laws

From Ms Warner (16 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will repeal abortion laws.

School Aged Child Care Programs

From Ms Warner (43 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide State funding for school aged child care programs on an equal basis to the Federal Government.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

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

Dental Act Amendment Act 1984

Disease in Plants Act 1929-1972

Forestry Act 1959-1984

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982

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

Agricultural Banks (Loans) Act 1959-1981

Banana Industry Protection Acts, 1929 to 1937

Milk Supply Act 1977-1983

Stock Act 1915-1984

Sugar Experiment Stations Act 1900-1983

Forestry Act 1959-1984

Regulations under—

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981

Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979-1984

Medical Act 1939-1984

Hospitals Act 1936-1984

Poultry Industry Act 1946-1984

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1985

By-laws under the Dental Act 1971-1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Housing Commission Rental Policies; Allegations by Member for Woodridge

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: Last Thursday in this House the honourable member for Woodridge (Mr D'Arcy) made some wild and inaccurate statements about the Queensland Housing Commission's rental policies, in which he claimed that those policies were breaking up families. Far from breaking up families, the rental policies of the commission are helping to keep families together. That is because the rentals are income-g geared, and ensure that most assistance goes to those most in need.

Before the honourable member continues with his misinformation, let me give him a few facts on just how this system is working to help low-income-earners into secure and affordable housing. Let me point out also that the honourable member was one of those Opposition members who, when I introduced this scheme, strongly opposed it.

The honourable member brandished the figure of \$145 a week, and it was his obvious intention to give the impression that such an amount is the general rental rate for Housing Commission tenants. It is not. In fact, an overwhelming number of Housing Commission rental tenants are now enjoying moderate rents under the system which Mr D'Arcy opposed so strongly when it was being introduced.

So that he will be better informed, let me give the honourable member a few facts about the break-down of rents being paid by Housing Commission tenants under this

system. Under the income-gearred rental system, more than 76 per cent of all households are paying less than \$50 a week rent. In fact, 37 per cent are paying less than \$30 a week rent, 88 per cent pay less than \$60 a week and 98.6 per cent of all households are paying less than \$100 a week. That is the system that the honourable member opposed so strongly when it was introduced.

I am glad to have this opportunity, now that the system is working to the benefit of literally thousands of Housing Commission tenants by giving families accommodation at moderate rents, to repudiate the attack that the member is making on the system.

Mr D'Arcy also alluded to what I take to be the contribution made by children towards rent. Let me spell out the policy for him. The commission's policy is that parents are charged rent based on their income, and that children living in the house and earning income pay a proportion of that income, not exceeding 10 per cent, towards the cost of providing the housing.

Income-earning children up to the age of 18 years pay a contribution of \$8.85 a week, or 5 per cent of the minimum wage. Children aged between 19 and 24 years pay \$17.70 a week or 10 per cent of the minimum wage. Children 25 years of age and older pay 10 per cent of their gross income. The parent's proportion of the rent is, therefore, unaffected by this policy. They have security of tenure and there is no compulsion for them to leave their rented commission accommodation.

The honourable member would be advised to look at the facts before he starts wildly brandishing figures in an attempt to give a misleading picture of the commission's system of rents.

Industrial Action by Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: It has come to my notice that the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union of Australia has been forwarding to hotels, licensed clubs and similar businesses—goodness me, how they have been hit by the introduction of capital gains and perks taxes—what it calls a form of agreement, requesting that it be signed and returned within 14 days.

In the union's words, the crux of the agreement is that the union is willing to give an exemption to an organisation and its members, who sign such an agreement, in relation to a general stoppage of union members on the question of the abolition of penalty rates, or contract labour. In return, a guarantee is requested that, despite any forthcoming State Government legislation, the employer will continue to abide by existing award structures.

There is no way that employers or organisations should sign such an undertaking, which is nothing but a thinly veiled threat. The appropriate action would be to ignore the letter. Should any action develop in the future which affects employers, the matter can be notified to the appropriate industrial tribunal, which is the place to resolve such matters.

In a democratic society it is outrageous that any organisation should seek such undertakings. Why should any person give away his right to utilise legislation passed by a freely elected Parliament?

The matters raised are still unresolved, and the undertakings, if given, would mean nothing. This action is typical of certain sections of the union movement, which are always prepared to take a negative, reactionary attitude to possible changes. What is so sad about it is that the possible changes could lead to the creation of more jobs and so reduce one of the greatest problems currently facing society.

Any employer who signed such an agreement could find himself compromised in the future since no doubt the union would have little compunction in disclosing the names of those who had signed the document and trying to gain advantage from what could be seen as a weakness by that employer.

Once again I stress that the appropriate action is to ignore these requests, as they constitute unrealistic demands that should not be accepted by anybody who supports the system under which we live.

An employer who is a member of an industry organisation and has received one of these letters is urged strongly to contact that organisation if he has any doubt at all about the correct course of action.

I have a copy of the letters and the draconian type of agreement that the unions expect the employers to sign. I table the documents.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the documents on the table.

I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Federated Liquor & Allied Employees' Union of Australia
(Queensland Branch)

Registered under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1910
and the State Industrial Arbitration Act 1916

BRISBANE OFFICE
FLTU HOUSE
129 LEICHHARDT ST
SPRING HILL 4000
PO BOX 158 SPRING HILL
Phone (07) 839 3788

GOLD COAST OFFICE
TRADES HALL
149 SCARBOROUGH ST
SOUTHPORT 4215
Phone (075) 32 9711

BUNDABERG OFFICE
MR R. D. FULLER
44 RIEDY ST
BUNDABERG 4670
Phone (071) 72 6971

11th September 1985

OUR REF

YOUR REF

Dear Employer

I enclose a copy of an agreement which we request that you have signed and returned to this Office within fourteen (14) days of the above date.

The crux of the agreement is that this Union is willing to give an exemption to your organisation and members employed by your organisation, in relation to a general stoppage of this Union's members or the trade union movement generally, on the question of abolition of penalty rates or contract labour. In return we ask for a guarantee that despite any forthcoming legislation by the State Government on these issues you are prepared to continue to abide by the existing award structures.

It is hoped that you will appreciate that this Union has taken this action in an attempt to protect the living standards of its members without involving our industry in a massive industrial confrontation.

If you require any further information please feel free to contact this Office.

Yours faithfully

(signed) B. R. Elton

B R. Elton
Acting State Secretary

encl

Federated Liquor & Allied Employees' Union of Australia
(Queensland Branch)

Registered under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1910
and the State Industrial Arbitration Act 1916

BRISBANE OFFICE
FLTU HOUSE
129 LEICHHARDT ST
SPRING HILL 4000
PO BOX 158 SPRING HILL
Phone (07) 839 3788

GOLD COAST OFFICE
TRADES HALL
149 SCARBOROUGH ST
SOUTHPORT 4215
Phone (075) 32 9711

BUNDABERG OFFICE
MR R. D. FULLER
44 RIEDY ST
BUNDABERG 4670
Phone (071) 72 6971

OUR REF

11 September 1985

YOUR REF

Resolution Passed at a Combined Shop Stewards and Delegates
Meeting held on 11 September 1985

That this meeting of Delegates of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union expresses extreme concern at attempts by the Queensland Government to abolish penalty rates. This meeting also condemns the State Government for its intention to set up a contract labour system which will allow employers to force workers to be employed without penalties for less than Award rates.

This meeting determines that a document be circulated to all establishments, within this Union coverage, seeking written guarantees in respect to the following:

1. That the employer undertake not to support State Government moves to abolish penalty rates.
2. That the employer undertakes not to utilise State Government legislation seeking to abolish penalty rates.
3. That the employer provide an undertaking that irrespective of any State Government legislation, that they will not enter into a system of individual contracts with their employees but will continue to abide by current Award conditions and standards.

That this meeting further determines that the Industry be given two weeks to provide such assurances. After expiration of that period an industrial campaign be implemented centered upon establishments or groups who have refused to provide the undertakings sought by this Union.

This meeting authorises the Union's State Committee of Management to exempt all employers who have given such undertaking from any industrial action by this Union or any general campaign involving this Union over the issue of penalty rates and contract labour.

Agreement Between the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries
Employees Union of Australia (Queensland Branch) — (The Union)
and
(The Employer)

relating to wages and conditions.

The employer on the first part agrees to the following that:

1. The employer or his or her representative will not participate in any industrial or legislative campaign to have penalty rates removed from Industrial Awards or Agreements.
2. That the employer or his or her representative will not utilise State Government legislation intended to provide avenues for the abolition of penalty rates from industrial Awards and Agreements.
3. That the employer opposes any attempt to separate the hospitality or tourist industry from the mainstream of industrial regulation in this State and specifically will not support moves to remove the hospitality or tourist industry away from the jurisdiction of the established industrial tribunals.
4. That the employer undertakes not to negotiate separate individual contracts with his or her employees which fall outside existing Awards and Agreements.
5. The employer will continue to recognise the Union as the appropriate organisation to be involved in negotiations over wages, conditions and job security within its constitutional area of coverage.

The Union on the second part agrees:

1. To give the employer and its members, employed at the employer's establishments, exemption from any industrial campaign, engaged in by this Union and its members, in respect to the maintenance of penalty rates and introduction of contract labour.
2. To give to the employer and its members, employed at the employer's establishment, general exemption from any industrial campaign of a general nature in respect of the issues of penalty rates and contract labour.

This Agreement will take effect from 11th September 1985 and remain in force for a period of two (2) years.

Signed
for and on behalf of

Signed. B. R. Elton.
for and on behalf of the Federated Liquor
and Allied Industries Employees Union of
Australia (Queensland Branch)

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Building and Investment Society

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Has he been made aware of a report in *The Queensland Times* of 11 September 1985 in which it is revealed that the managing director of the Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Building and Investment Society sent a circular to staff members of that society to the effect that "staff are directed to influence members to lodge their proxies in favour of the chairman to vote in favour of the special resolution during their hours of employment with the society, but where a shareholder wishes to vote against the resolution the chairman of the meeting or another director of the society may be instructed on the proxy form to do so . . . Any staff not complying with the above will be subject to instant dismissal".

(2) As individual share-holders (which could include staff) may have different views from that held by the directors, is he able to take action against this apparent coercion?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) The directors of Ipswich and West Moreton Permanent Benefit Building and Investment Society are solely responsible for the control and management of the society, including assignment of duties to the society's staff. The Building Societies Act 1985 does not authorise me as Minister to interfere in any way with the society's internal affairs.

2. Control of Superannuation Funds by Australian Council of Trade Unions

Mr NEAL asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

(1) Is he aware of legislation presented in the Senate on 18 September which will give the Australian Council of Trade Unions control of the \$2 billion Commonwealth Superannuation Fund?

(2) What are the implications of this legislation, and are there any other such funds already set up or proposed and, if so, who will be controlling those funds?

(3) What effect will such funds have on business and employers in general?

Answer—

(1) Yes, I have been following the Senate debate on the Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill 1985 with great interest and considerable apprehension.

(2) Under this proposed legislation, the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust which administers superannuation contributions of Commonwealth Public Servants and employees of Federal statutory authorities is to be restructured. Three of the five trust

members will now be nominated directly by the ACTU. As well, the Commonwealth Minister for Finance is required to consult with the ACTU in relation to the nomination of the principal member, or chairman, of the trust. It is very clear where control of this superannuation fund will lie. This means that the ACTU will have virtual control over a substantial investment fund said to be increasing at the rate of \$7m each week.

This legislation is very much in keeping with the ACTU's push for union involvement in superannuation along the lines of the notorious BUS scheme, with six of its eight trustees being officers of unions involved in the building industry.

I am alarmed at the recent deal between the ACTU and the Federal Government over superannuation, as part of the extension of the infamous accord. The agreement raises the spectre of further industry superannuation schemes, along the lines of BUS, giving unions control over massive investment funds and the consequent power to make investment decisions substantially affecting the operation of Australia's financial markets. There is also a potential for inexperienced board members to make unwise investment decisions, placing employees' contributions at risk.

Honourable members will be aware that, last year, the Queensland Government acted by introducing legislation to forestall the operations of the coercive and union-dominated BUS scheme in this State. Unfortunately we are not in a position to provide similar protection for Queenslanders who contribute to the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund.

(3) Employers are naturally concerned not only that those type of schemes are of a nature that will lead to higher superannuation costs but also that they face union interference in day-to-day administrative and investment decision-making. It is a real possibility that unions may use superannuation funds and industrial blackmail to control Australian companies. This legislation clearly reflects the extent to which the ACTU is dominating the actions and policy of the current Federal Government.

3. Cannabis, Cleveland/Redland Bay Area

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

(1) Is he aware that Mr Fitzpatrick, SM, said in the Cleveland Magistrates Court on 27 August that the Cleveland area had more cannabis under cultivation than anywhere else in Queensland and that the area must rate as the biggest marijuana plantation in the State?

(2) As the Cleveland Police Station is not open on a 24-hour basis, what specific steps has the Government taken by way of additional police action since 28 August, when this matter was brought to public attention, to stamp out the drug trade in the Cleveland/Redland Bay area?

Answer—

(1) Yes, but from information available to police, it is not indicated that the Cleveland area falls into the category suggested.

(2) Cleveland Police Division is manned on a 24-hour basis, and detectives from the Wynnum district, which includes Cleveland, have been, and continue to be, very active in all law-enforcement fields—including the drug scene. Such strategy is responsible for the high incidence of drug charges before the court. In addition to the activity of Wynnum district detectives, this area is given attention by members of the Drug Squad and, in fact, a number of joint operations have taken place.

I am not prepared at present to further disclose police activity directed at drug investigation in the Cleveland/Redland Bay area.

4. Mangroves and Marine Plants, Caloundra-Southport

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) How many applications under section 71 of the Fisheries Act on form 21 have been made for a permit to cut, lop, burn, remove or otherwise destroy or damage any

mangroves or marine plants in the area between the Caloundra bar and Nerang River Bridge at Southport, including Moreton Bay and the bay islands, in each year since 1975?

(2) How many of these applications have been approved?

(3) In each case, what was the area of mangroves or marine plants to be cut, lopped, burnt, removed, destroyed or damaged?

(4) Who were the applicants?

(5) What was the reason for approval?

(6) What total area of mangroves has been destroyed as a result of Government permits issued under section 71 of the Fisheries Act in the last 10 years?

Answer—

(1) My department does not have records of mangrove and marine plants, permits and applications for permits prior to the incorporation of the Queensland Fisheries Service into the Queensland Department of Primary Industries in late 1981.

(2 & 3) The following indicates the approvals for mangrove-clearing granted pursuant to the Fisheries Act in the last four years—

| Year | Approval Number | Area Involved |
|------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1982 | 9 | Information not recorded |
| 1983 | 7 | 9 ha |
| 1984 | 12 | 32 ha |
| 1985 | 14 | 230 ha |

One approval in 1985 involved 200 ha for the clearing of vegetation on intertidal lands associated with the Gateway Bridge arterial road construction.

(4) A summary of the categories of recipients of mangrove-clearing permits issued during 1982 to 1985 are as follows—

| | |
|--|----|
| Government departments and authorities | 7 |
| Shire and city councils | 8 |
| Consultants and public organisations | 10 |
| Private interests | 17 |

(5) The reasons for granting mangrove-clearing permits are categorised as follows—

| | |
|--|----|
| Roads, powerlines, drainage and sewerage | 17 |
| Jetties, mooring and waterfront areas | 17 |
| Real estate development | 5 |
| Dredging and spoil-dumping | 1 |
| Sand and gravel extraction | 1 |
| Enhancing a film set | 1 |

When assessing an application for approval to clear mangroves, my department looks not only at the total area of marine plants but also at the significance of habitat involved. This involves an assessment, to the best of knowledge available, of the damage that the clearing will have on fish, crabs and prawn stocks. The quality of the habitat in respect of its ability to support marine life varies considerably. In some cases, relatively large areas of disturbance may have little impact whereas small areas may be of critical importance.

(6) The total area destroyed is approximately the same as that for which permits are approved as detailed in (2) and (3).

5. Downs Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd

Mr KRUGER asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Is he aware that it was the policy of the board of the Downs Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd to close the industry in that district and that new producers' applications to supply that association would be considered at the board's annual meeting in September?

(2) Is he aware that a Mr Ivan Burgess, who had owned two dairies at the time, purchased a third dairy for his son, Allan, and that a ministerial direction allowed for that producer to supply the Downs factory as from 1 July and, if so, why did he or any other Minister interfere with the decision-making of that board?

Answer—

(1) The dairy industry in south-east Queensland has been closed for a number of years and no new registrations are permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances. I am unaware of any proposal for the Downs Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd to consider applications for new suppliers at its annual meeting. I might add that this is not a matter for the association to determine, as the authority to issue new dairy registrations rests with my department and me as Minister.

(2) In 1980, there were two separate dairy registrations involving the Burgess family, with Mr Ivan Burgess and two other members of the family, Ross and Allan, involved in both properties. In April 1982, the name of the youngest son, Barry, was included in both registrations as an "other person" but not as a registered proprietor.

In June 1982, Ross, Allan and Barry Burgess purchased a further 95.6 ha of land, which was used for raising replacement dairy stock for both dairies. Mr Ivan Burgess did make representations for a third registration but, under the policy of the time, this was refused. As a consequence, the purchased land was added to existing registered dairies and the registration certificates were altered to list the four names as joint registered proprietors of all own land used for each dairying enterprise.

There has been no new dairy registration issued in this regard, and there certainly has been no interference with the decision-making of the board of the Downs Co-operative Dairy Association.

6. Estimates, Rural Reconstruction Board

Mr De LACY asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the Budget papers wherein, under the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditures for the Rural Reconstruction Board in 1985-86, estimated receipts for the Rural Adjustment Fund are shown as \$23,512,400 and for the Rural Reconstruction Fund as \$6,205,300—

(1) What are the sources of these estimated receipts, including (a) the Commonwealth, (b) the State, (c) interest and (d) repayments from borrowers?

(2) What are the expected disbursements of these funds, including repayments to the (a) Commonwealth and (b) State?

(3) What will the expected cash balances be as at 30 June 1986?

Answer—

(1) The sources of the estimated receipts are as follows—

Rural Adjustment Fund

| | \$ |
|---|-------------------|
| Commonwealth | 2 640 000 |
| State | 520 000 |
| Interest and redemption from borrowers | 12 410 000 |
| Borrowings from commercial sources to fund the new Rural Adjustment Scheme | 7 600 000 |
| Administration expenses | 342 400 |
| Total | <u>23 512 400</u> |

Rural Reconstruction Fund

| | \$ |
|--|------------------|
| Commonwealth | 5,300 |
| State | 300 000 |
| Interest and Redemption from borrowers | 5 900 000 |
| Total | <u>6 205 300</u> |

(2) For the estimated disbursements for 1985-86, I refer the honourable member to page 128 of the Estimates of Expenditure from Trust and Special Funds, 1985-86.

(3) The cash balances as at 30 June 1986 are expected to be—

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Rural Adjustment Fund | \$15 283 325 |
| Rural Reconstruction Fund | \$20 776 896 |

7. **Revenue from Sugar Industry**

Mr De LACY asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to a statement by him on 16 August in Cairns that the Commonwealth Government gets \$700m in taxes from the sugar industry per annum which was subsequently widely reported in the media—

(1) Will he provide details of the way in which this figure was calculated (the types and amounts of taxes involved)?

(2) What is the total amount of revenue derived from the sugar industry each year by the State Government in the form of taxes and charges, direct and indirect?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The Commonwealth Government's offer of price support to the sugar industry amounts to nothing more than further discrimination against Queensland.

By suggesting that the Queensland Government meet half the cost of the scheme, the ALP in Canberra is again attempting to treat us differently from the other States. Other State Governments were not called upon to contribute to the assistance and rationalisation schemes that the Federal Government implemented for the steel and car industries, nor were they called upon in the past when the great wool industry and the beef industry were in trouble.

Mr De LACY: I rise to a point of order. I asked question No. 7. The Premier is not answering that question at all.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Cairns has a lot to learn; he is pretty raw. He is wet behind the ears.

Answer (continued)—

Right down the years, these export industries were recognised as a national responsibility and treated as such. The sugar industry should be treated in the same way.

It is a matter of serious concern that the member for Cairns and his colleagues on the opposite side of this House are openly supporting this Federal Government discrimination against Queensland.

The Queensland Government requires only that the sugar industry be treated in the same way as the other industries that have been assisted by the Federal Government of the day because of their vital contribution to export earnings and the national economy.

The honourable member cannot escape the fact that the sugar industry in Queensland makes a huge contribution to Canberra's coffers, both directly and indirectly, in the form of taxation. In fact, all the Federal Government would have to do to finance the proposed price support scheme would be to forgo for a period of two or three years the excise it receives on spirit products derived from sugar, that is, on rum, power alcohol and ethanol. That would cover the total cost of the entire scheme.

The ALP, the Prime Minister and members opposite are finding themselves out on a limb on this issue. There is no reason why Queensland should be discriminated against in this way or treated any differently from the other States in a support scheme for such a major export industry. Even the Australian Democrats have recognised this, because their spokesman said that it is unrealistic and wrong for the Queensland Government to pay half the cost.

The Queensland Cane Growers Council also has said that the major responsibility for funding must rest with the Commonwealth Government. And why not? The Commonwealth collects the taxes from the sugar industry and from all those tax-payers, industries, small businesses and service industries that derive a portion of their income from sugar or from the economic activity generated by the sugar industry. The estimate of \$700m in taxation revenue derived by the Commonwealth Government from the sugar industry is a conservative one.

Mr De Lacy: Where does that \$700m figure come from?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the honourable member for Cairns would listen, he would hear that I am giving him that information right now. Obviously he needs his ears cleaned out.

Answer (continued)—

That estimate of \$700m in taxation revenue derived by the Commonwealth Government from the sugar industry is a conservative one. The estimate has been provided from an independent source and covers income tax, sales tax, excise duties, petrol tax, and so on, payable by direct participants in the industry as well as tax-payers who benefit substantially from the industry.

The amount of taxation revenue derived by the State Government from the sugar industry is negligible compared with the sums flowing to Commonwealth coffers. Most participants in the sugar industry would not be required to pay State pay-roll tax, because of the very generous concessions provided by my Government. Most land owned by sugar-producers would be exempt from State land tax, again because of the very generous concessions provided by the Queensland Government.

It is about time that the Commonwealth Government realised that, as the major beneficiary of taxes derived from the industry, it must provide the cash assistance needed to get the industry back on its feet. It must put back into the industry just a little of what it is taking out of it.

I point out to the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) that I have in my hand a copy of an advertisement that appeared in yesterday's *Townsville Bulletin*. That advertisement is headed—

“Hard Labour for Northern Australia!”

It goes on to state that the national debt, fuel prices, interest rates, Medicare tax and superannuation tax are up; that radical monetary groups, capital gains, assets tests and non-elected government by the ACTU are in; and that rural support, family values, regional television, bicentennial water programs, uranium-mining and the Australian National Line are out. The advertisement also states that, under the Hawke Government, sales tax has increased by 70 per cent, PAYE tax has increased by 31.5 per cent, company tax has increased by 7.7 per cent and other income tax has increased by 40.4 per cent. At the bottom of the advertisement are the following words—

“Mr Hawke, what was our crime for this punishment?”

That is a very good advertisement. The honourable member for Cairns will find a copy of that in the Parliamentary Library.

8. Statement by Senator Walsh on Queensland Economy

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

(1) Has he seen the reply by Senator Walsh in Federal Parliament in response to a question regarding the Queensland economy?

(2) Does the reply give a fair indication of the performance of the Queensland economy?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Yes, I have seen the reply by Senator Walsh and, no, it does not fairly represent the performance of the Queensland economy.

In particular, it is misleading in that it clearly fails to take account of the very high base from which the current economic performance of Queensland is being measured. This base is high because of the very high level of activity generated by resource development in Queensland. Now that the major projects involved are completed, it is to be expected that the Queensland economy will return more to the national average, albeit on the higher base.

In this regard, looking at two of the indicators used by Senator Walsh, we find that, with respect to new dwelling commencements for the 12 months ended March 1985, it is true that the figures for Queensland are down—from 22.6 per cent of the national total to 20.8 per cent, both of which are above Queensland's 16.1 per cent population share, and that, with respect to private fixed capital expenditure in the March quarter 1985, again Queensland's figures are down—this time from 18.6 per cent to 16.4 per cent. As with building commencements, both of these figures are above Queensland's population share of 16.1 per cent.

In addition, Senator Walsh conveniently—or deliberately—overlooked a number of other important indicators, as follows—

Exports

The value of Queensland exports increased by \$1,128.8m, or 20.6 per cent, in the year to June 1985. Compared with Queensland's population share of 16.1 per cent, 21.5 per cent of the value of total Australian exports during 1984-85 for Australia were contributed by Queensland.

Inflation

The Brisbane Consumer Price Index increased by 5.9 per cent in the 12 months to the June 1985 quarter compared with an increase of 6.7 per cent for the weighted average of the six State capitals for the same period.

Construction Activity

Compared with Queensland's population share of 16.1 per cent, the value of work done in the nine months to March 1985 was 18.9 per cent of the total value of work done in Australia.

Retail Sales

The value of retail sales in Queensland for the 12 months ended 30 June 1985 was estimated at \$7,537m—9.7 per cent higher than the estimated value of retail sales for the corresponding period to 30 June 1984. This compared with an increase of only 7.1 per cent for the remainder of Australia over this same period.

Labour Force and Employment

During 1984-85, the Queensland labour force expanded at a rate in excess of that for the remainder of Australia, expanding at a rate of 1.7 per cent compared with 1.4 per cent for the rest of Australia.

While there was a slowing employment growth for the first seven months of 1984-85, for the five-month period ending June 1985, 35 200 new jobs were created in Queensland, representing 63.3 per cent of the total increase in employment Australia-wide for the same period. That has been pointed out by my colleague on a number of occasions. This represents an increase at a rate of 3.5 per cent per annum, compared with only 0.8 per cent for Australia as a whole.

For the period from August 1984 to August 1985, Queensland's employment increased by 3.9 per cent (39 400) compared with 2.8 per cent for Australia as a whole. For the month of August 1985, Queensland's employment growth contributed 21.4 per cent to the total Australian growth, compared with Queensland's population share of 16.1 per cent.

In summary, Senator Walsh has deliberately attempted to mislead the Senate by referring to rates of growth and not the relative level of contribution to the Australian economy that clearly puts Queensland above the national average. Again, these clumsy attempts to knock Queensland backfired by actually showing how the Queensland economy outperforms the Labor States.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Proposed Amendments to Local Government Act

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to the Government's intention to proceed with amendments to the Local Government Act that are designed to do away with third-party appeals against land rezonings. Queensland's small business community and other interested organisations are in open revolt over this move, and I refer particularly to small business proprietors on the Gold Coast and to the hundreds of grocery retail representatives meeting in Caloundra who have condemned the Government's intention. I point out also that Mr Jim Kennedy will be advising Mr Ahern to that effect, if he has not already done so officially. I ask: Will the Minister, in the interests of responsible Government, defer debate and passage of the Bill now before this Assembly to allow for a reassessment of the need for this legislation?

Mr HINZE: It is rather unusual that, having introduced a Bill into the House on Thursday of last week, to be debated after seven clear days, which will be towards the end of this week, I am now being requested to have the Government defer any further consideration of it.

Mr Warburton: You didn't discuss it with the people affected.

Mr HINZE: The Leader of the Opposition should wait a minute.

Before next Thursday, I will have a full record of what has happened in all the Labor States, and I will tell him what is happening in every other State.

Mr Warburton: I'll give it to you now.

Mr HINZE: The Leader of the Opposition will do that? That is very good. He is very intelligent. For a change, he must have had a good week-end.

At this stage, I will certainly proceed with the Bill. A reason has not come from the Government benches as to why I should not proceed with it. Therefore, I say to the Leader of the Opposition that the answer is, "No"

Auditor-General's Report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to pages 2103 and 2105 of the Auditor-General's report, which show clearly that, last financial year, \$58.8m of the Consolidated Revenue Fund was left unspent. I table a copy of the two pages to which I have referred.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

That \$58.8m windfall was completely surplus to requirements.

I refer also to the claims made by the Premier as Treasurer of this State that he had no money for additional teachers, nurses and police—services in Queensland that are grossly understaffed. I now ask: Why is it that the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland has failed to spend almost \$60m last financial year on services that are so desperately needed for Queenslanders?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Without referring to the document, I would not know its exact purpose. However, the Leader of the Opposition has no clear idea of the responsibilities of a Government. At all times the Government has set aside certain moneys to cover the event of an increase in salaries or wages granted by the Industrial Commission. A great deal of money must be set aside to meet such contingencies. It is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition does not understand that. He believes that the Queensland Government should spend every cent it has and make no provision for contingencies. That is how the Labor Governments of the other States operate and that is why those Governments get into trouble.

I do not know the exact reason that \$53m was not spent. However, I assure the Leader of the Opposition that there would be a very valid and sensible reason for it. The Government must, of course, have funds to keep running the State.

Attitude of Leader of Opposition and ALP State Secretary to Capital Gains Tax

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the challenge that he issued to the Leader of the Opposition and to the ALP State Secretary (Peter Beattie) to state their position, prior to the by-election for the seat of Redlands, on a capital gains tax. I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Have the Leader of the Opposition and Peter Beattie responded to that challenge and, if not, is their silence to be taken as support for this new tax on enterprise, especially the achievements and initiatives of small business?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition and the ALP Secretary (Peter Beattie) have not responded to my challenge and indicated whether or not they support a capital gains tax. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition and Peter Beattie do support a capital gains tax.

I assume that Mr Beattie will be saying throughout the length and breadth of the electorate of Redlands that he supports a capital gains tax. Mr Beattie will have to say, "I support a capital gains tax." I suppose that is something that Mr Beattie will be trying to hide under a bush.

The support of the ALP for a capital gains tax makes a joke of its pledge to assist small business people. The Leader of the Opposition contends that he is concerned about

small business people. Does he support a capital gains tax? Of course he does. He is dumbfounded. He cannot answer that question. He blushes when he thinks of Mr Hawke promising on a television program that there would be no capital gains tax. The Leader of the Opposition is very embarrassed.

The failure by the Leader of the Opposition and Peter Beattie to take up my challenge shows very clearly that the ALP cannot be trusted.

Statements by Federal Minister for Tourism

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Is he aware of statements made by the Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr Brown), in which he described meals at some restaurants as being tax rorts and said that, if those restaurants could not handle the resultant business drop as a consequence of the new perks taxes, they should get out? Is the Minister aware also that the same Federal Minister said that regional areas would not be affected at all and that restaurants were fortunate that the Government did not impose additional services taxes applying to all meals? Is the Federal Minister in reality knocking the employment-generators in employment-intensive industries and, if so, what will be the likely effect?

Mr LESTER: It is absolutely scandalous that a Federal Minister should knock small business people in such a provocative way. Those people are the employment-generators. Small business people have taken the risks to get started, have provided a service and have created approximately 60 per cent of the employment opportunities in the private business sector. Many small business people and their employees face extinction because of the new capital gains tax and the so-called perks tax. In fact the value of the businesses owned by those small business people who survive in the future will be thumped down dramatically and they will be taxed on what is left. I will cite a few examples. In this State, 2 000 restaurants and cafes employ 10 people each, which amounts to 20 000 employees altogether. That means that, in the future, approximately 16 per cent of those employees will be put out of work, which amounts to a loss of over 3 263 jobs at least.

In the hotel industry, over 1 103 hotels operate and, on an average, 14 people are employed in each. In other words, 15 000 people are employed in that industry. A 5 per cent loss of employment would mean that 772 jobs would disappear. The Queensland Government can see very clearly that the Australian Labor Party is out to knock people who are involved in these employment-generating industries.

The accounts that are paid in many restaurants are paid by way of corporate credit cards, but that business has dropped to almost nil in the last few days. What seems to have been forgotten is that many of the deals that are concluded in the corporate board-rooms in our nation started off in the restaurants throughout Australia. Yet restaurateurs are the people whom the Federal Government is knocking.

I have to ask: Why is the Hawke Government moving to take away incentive and to castigate publicly those who are the smaller employment-generators? Why is the Hawke Government introducing new capital gains taxes when countries such as the United States are beginning to phase them out? Why is that happening? The Hawke Government is not in touch; it is out to knock employment, and knock incentive.

Reorganisation of Department of Harbours and Marine

Mr BURNS: I ask the acting Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services: Will he advise the House of the details of the wide-ranging proposals to totally change the administration of the Department of Harbours and Marine in Queensland? Is the Queensland Government considering the removal of harbour-masters from the ports of Thursday Island, Innisfail, Bundaberg and so on along the coast, and the centralisation of control into three districts, with a resultant loss in local control and a lack of decentralisation? Who constitutes the committee that is organising these dramatic moves? Is one of the ultimate aims an attack on the current pilotage system and the change to a contract system?

Mr GUNN: There is no doubt that the information given to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition comes from the pilots who are jumping at shadows, just as the honourable member is doing.

The Harbours Act will be revised in due course. It is under consideration at the present time.

Mr Burns: Are you going to remove those harbour-masters?

Mr GUNN: They will not be removed at all. They are jumping at shadows. I have had the harbour-masters in to see me because they are worried about superannuation. There is not a thing to worry about; I can assure the honourable member of that.

Mr Burns: I will accept your assurance that no harbour-masters will be removed.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Lytton that this is not a debate.

Mr Burns: No. I am merely accepting the Minister's assurance that nobody will get the sack; that no-one will be removed.

Production of Ethanol in Queensland

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I ask the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology: Will he advise the House of the latest technological developments in the production of ethanol and how these developments affect the feasibility of ethanol production in Queensland?

Mr AHERN: The Queensland Government has recently negotiated with a group in Queensland to examine further the possibility of taking sucrose through to ethanol in Queensland. The proposal is based on significant movements that have been made round the world in the production of ethanol.

The traditional form of fermentation, which utilises yeast, is being replaced by bacteria, which do the job much more effectively. In the United States of America, 30 new plants in the last two years have been constructed, and they take vegetable-based products through to ethanol via a bacterial route. It is much more efficient than the current process, and does not produce a non-biodegradable by-product. In the United States of America, 400 million gallons of vegetable-sourced ethanol a year is being mixed with fuel as an octane-enhancer for lead-free petrol. It is vastly different to the current process, and one that this Government wants to examine on behalf of the sugar industry to see whether it will assist in the solution of that industry's problems. The Government has made money available for the purpose of that investigation, and I am enthusiastic about its prospects. Given the international experience, it is clearly something that the Government must examine.

Prime Minister's Assurance to Rural Australia

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I direct a question to the Premier and Treasurer. At the farmers' rally in Canberra, the Prime Minister promised to give substantial relief to rural Australia. I ask: Does the Premier believe that the proposed capital gains tax is a complete reversal of the Prime Minister's assurance?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: That question must make honourable members opposite feel very ashamed of themselves. No doubt they feel like hiding under a log. At the rally, the Prime Minister did promise the farmers a package. He has given them a package; however, it is the wrong sort of package. He has given them a capital gains tax and higher petrol prices. In addition, he has removed 40 tax concessions previously enjoyed by farmers. He has given them a package exactly the opposite of that which he promised. Because of the deceitful tactics that the ALP adopts, every time it tries to get itself out of trouble it runs into more trouble.

Mr J. C. Needham

Mr VEIVERS: I direct a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. I ask: Does he know a Mr John Charles Needham? If so, on what basis is he known to the Minister? Has the Minister been engaged in any business transactions with Mr Needham? Further, has the Minister been involved with Mr Needham in any way in the exercise of his ministerial duties in the Samsonvale area?

Mr HINZE: The honourable member for Ashgrove has been doing some checking on me, so I will return the compliment.

The honourable member had some memorable times playing cricket during his 21 tests for Australia. His early career in that game has been mirrored by his career in this House.

In his first bowling spell against England, he achieved the magnificent figures of none for 146 and gave the gallery enormous entertainment as the English captain Ted Dexter hit his savage deliveries for successive sixes.

An Opposition Member: Answer the question.

Mr HINZE: Little Lord Fauntleroy!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I know that, in most cases, it is the Minister's prerogative to answer a question as he wishes, but I think that this is getting a little bit out of hand.

Mr HINZE: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

During his test career, he had a batting average of 31.26 and a bowling average of 41.36. As with everything else the honourable member has attempted, if the reverse were true he would be elevated to the greats.

The honourable member for Ashgrove never captained Australia, and he will never make it to the top in politics either. I commend to the political journalists covering this Parliament a few quotes about the honourable member for Ashgrove written by their English cricketing-writer colleagues. One writer described the honourable member, after his first tour in that country and following a less than fantastic result, as looking like a koala that had just emerged upside down from a gum tree. Another likened him to an Italian tenor. Can members imagine themselves being referred to as an Italian tenor?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have just said that I have no control over the content of a Minister's reply.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Chair has no control over the content of a Minister's reply. As I have said before, as long as it is within his jurisdiction—and I believe that it is—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have said before that it is entirely up to the Minister how he replies. It is not within the Speaker's jurisdiction to tell him how to reply.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. In the light of your ruling, Mr Speaker, I wonder how you reconcile it with Standing Order No. 70 (ii), which states, "An answer shall be relevant to the Question." I understand that you, as Speaker, are supposed to uphold Standing Orders.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! In the first place, I ask the honourable member to take into consideration the fact that I did not make a ruling on this. Under Standing Orders, a Minister has the right to reply to a question as he determines. I do not make the ruling on that. That is in Standing Orders. I also point out to honourable members that, at

this particular time, several honourable members in the House—I am not saying who they are——

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Certain honourable members are taking advantage of points of order to make irrelevant remarks. I deplore that. Standing Orders provide that they should not do that. I now ask the Minister to complete his answer.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a further point of order. My point of order is similar to the last one, on which you, Mr Speaker, did not actually rule. I refer you to Standing Order No. 70 (ii), which states, "An Answer shall be relevant to the Question." That is a Standing Order of this House. I believe that honourable members are entitled to have the Standing Orders enforced.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I said before that there is no point of order, and I consider the matter to be irrelevant.

Mr HINZE: I refer the honourable member to two of his own comments. He once said that to be a successful off-spin bowler, a person needed the dedication of a hot gospeller, the physical endurance of a long-distance runner and the hide of a rhinoceros. At least, he has the last qualification.

I tell the honourable member that he needs all of that and more to survive in this game and he does not measure up. The honourable member for Ashgrove also once said, "If punishment makes you panic, your spin-bowling career is finished." That applies equally here, and he can take my word that I am the best spin-bowler Queensland politics has ever seen.

The honourable member for Ashgrove likes to portray himself as a simple, unaffected, gregarious, warm, sincere, fun-loving, sports-minded human being. He is not. The honourable member is a second-rate failure. His feeble attempts to discredit me were so ineffectual that his role had to be taken over by his colleague—and I do not say "friend"—the honourable member for Salisbury. The honourable member for Ashgrove has been shown up by his own team-mates for what he is—a pathetic, bumbling, ineffective, sad little person who wants to play with the grown-ups but is so useless that he cannot even understand what the game is.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think that the Minister has made his point.

Mr HINZE: I thank you, Mr Speaker. I bow to your greater wisdom and knowledge.

I conclude by saying that when I asked one of the cricketing colleagues of the honourable member for Ashgrove, "How do you get on with Tommy?" he replied, "Well, he is a funny sort of bloke. Give him a ball and he will play all day." I suggest that the honourable member should get himself a ball—a big red one that fits in with his politics.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has a second question?

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Speaker, I asked that question without notice. The Minister did not answer it. I take it that he is not prepared to answer it.

Mr SPEAKER: Is that the honourable member's second question?

Mr VEIVERS: No, it is not my second question. It is only the first ball of the over.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member have another question?

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, I have. I will ask my second question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have told the honourable member on other occasions that he cannot turn question-time into a debate, and that is exactly what he has been doing. I asked the honourable member to put his question and he did not put his second question. I thought he was putting his second question, but he did not. As far as I am concerned, he has tried to turn this matter into a debate. I do not think I can allow him to ask a second question. As there seems to be a misunderstanding, I ask the honourable member to rise to his feet and ask his second question now. I ask him not to turn it into a debate.

Mr VEIVERS proceeded to give notice of his question.

Strike in Brisbane by Garbage-collectors

Mr COOPER: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Can he advise the House what action he and the Government intend to take to stop yet another group of unionists—this time garbage-collectors—from holding the community to ransom? Is he also aware of recent comments by the member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) and other Opposition spokesmen on local government matters that trouble-makers within the ranks of the garbagemen be sacked?

Mr LESTER: Quite frankly, the people of Brisbane have had enough of the attitude of many of the garbage-collectors in the city of Brisbane. The people of Brisbane, including pensioners and young mothers, have the right to receive an uninterrupted collection of garbage, which is an essential service. Continuity in the collection of garbage is not only a matter of convenience; it is paramount in the interests of maintaining public health in this city.

Some garbage strikes have been called without notice and for the most trivial reasons. It is interesting to note that since the Lord Mayor of the city of Brisbane (Alderman Sallyanne Atkinson) came to see the Premier and Treasurer and me, there has not been any trouble. The garbage-collectors know jolly well that the Government will not hesitate to back up the Brisbane City Council and give it the necessary support to ensure that garbage is collected on a continuing basis.

As for the member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw), who said that the irresponsible people who are going on strike should be sacked—let me give him credit for saying something right on that occasion.

Employment of Juniors by McDonalds Family Restaurants

Mr COOPER: In directing a further question to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, I refer him to reports that the Trades and Labor Council of Western Australia wants to boycott the fast-food chain of McDonalds Family Restaurants because of its plans to employ juniors at below-award rates. I ask: Does the Minister agree that such an attempt to prevent young people from obtaining jobs that otherwise might not be available must be resisted? Will he assure the House that McDonalds and any other group trying to overcome the problems of unemployment will be given the fullest support by this Government?

Mr LESTER: The McDonalds food chain has my total and full support and also the full support of the Queensland Government. I will examine the record of McDonalds, Kentucky Fried Chicken and a few other food chains that do so much to help our young people. For years, those companies have employed many school-age students on a part-time basis. They have taught those young people what the work ethic is all about—to be neat, efficient, meticulous and pleasant. The statistics, which are very clear, indicate that young people who have been through the McDonalds food chain usually find it much easier to obtain employment than do other young people who have not had the opportunity of receiving that training.

Further, the McDonalds food chain and others have held meetings with the parents of the young people to ensure that the training that they are getting is of the right order.

Indeed, recently, the member for Toowong (Mr Bailey) and I attended one of those meetings, which are held at night. It was a very happy occasion to see those young people being taught what work is all about.

Companies such as McDonalds, which have done so much to help young people at least to obtain employment, deserve our thanks. These organisations have offered to give jobs at a slightly reduced rate of pay to young people who are unemployed and cannot get work. It is better that these young people accept such offers so that they can learn how to go out and get work in the future and be paid for it. The community should get behind them. It is a far better deal than being left on the dole without any initiative or hope for the future.

Doomadgee Aboriginal Community

Mr PRICE: In directing a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs, I refer to the informal discussions that he had with the Doomadgee Community Council during which he advised that the old Doomadgee Mission reserve would be included in the deed of grant in trust. I now ask: Can he give me his assurance that that is the case? Can he reassure the Doomadgee people that there is no risk of their losing the tele-medicine facility, which is associated with Q-Net, despite the refusal of the Government to allow the Health Department to control the hospital installation and take over its management? If there is any section of my question that the Minister cannot answer, I will redirect it to the appropriate Minister.

Mr KATTER: There is no necessity for the honourable member to put any part of his question on notice. Discussions are still taking place on the hand-over of the facilities that the honourable member mentioned. He would be well aware of the problems at Doomadgee, particularly with the medical facility. As to the Q-Net system—I will have discussions with my colleague the Minister for Technology (Mr Ahern) concerning that system. The original arrangements were that that service would continue, but I will double check on that. I notice that the Minister for Technology acknowledges that that is the case. It has been stated very firmly from the start that those areas that constitute the reserve at Doomadgee will continue as a reserve when the deeds of grant are proclaimed.

Myer Stores Ltd

Mr NEWTON: I ask the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology: Does he agree that the plans of Myer Stores Ltd to establish its largest Queensland store in Brisbane's city mall, at an estimated cost of \$100m, is a further reflection of the confidence that the business world has in Brisbane's continuing development and progress?

Mr AHERN: I certainly agree with the assessment by the honourable member. I have read the article on which the honourable member based his question.

Mr Milliner: You wrote it.

Mr AHERN: I did not write it, but I agree with the honourable member's assessment. From time to time I am amazed by the constant efforts of all Opposition members to try to put down the Queensland economy. They make no effort to examine the objective nature of the situation; they simply knock, knock, knock all the time.

It cannot be doubted that the sugar industry and the sugar areas have problems, and I am as concerned as all honourable members about that. However, most of the other sectors of the Queensland economy are now performing very well. Earlier last year, I made reference to my concern for the heavy engineering industry. Recent surveys carried out by my department indicate that that sector is turning the corner. In fact, the heavy engineering industry has received a much-needed increase in the number of orders, which will enable it to provide an adequate number of employment opportunities and maintain reasonable growth.

I welcome the announcement by Myer Stores Ltd or, rather, the speculation referred to by the honourable member for Caboolture. That type of investment will be important for Brisbane and for Queensland, and it has my total support.

Discipline in Schools

Mrs HARVEY: I ask the Minister for Education: Is he aware that State schools in South Australia have been found to contain solitary confinement cells for punishing troublesome children?

Mr Price interjected.

Mrs HARVEY: I do not think this is a laughing matter.

Can the Minister assure the House that no such cells exist in any schools in Queensland, and that none are planned? Can he also assure the House that punishment for children who require discipline within school-rooms is administered at a reasonable level?

Mr POWELL: It is true that some publicity was given to such cells in South Australian schools. I assure the honourable member and other members of the House that my department has no plans to introduce such draconian measures in Queensland schools. Clearly there has always existed a slight problem with discipline in some schools.

Ms Warner interjected.

Mr POWELL: I have no doubt that the honourable member for Kurilpa was one of those disciplinary problems, because she cannot sit quietly and listen.

What is clear is that Queensland schools are adopting a positive attitude towards discipline. There is no way that Queensland will introduce punishment as a means of controlling children who do not know their work, as appears to be the case in other parts of Australia. My department adopts a positive attitude to class-room management. The Education Department has a program of excellence in teaching, including a series of seminars that teachers are invited to attend to learn how, through their own excellence, to control what occurs in the class-room. I assure the honourable member that the department will continue on that tack and continue the positive ways in which the department and the schools in Queensland handle class-room discipline.

Education of Aborigines

Mr LINGARD: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs: Is he aware of a report in the *Daily Sun* that Queensland is leading Australia in the field of education of people of Aboriginal descent?

Mr KATTER: As luck has it, I happen to have that article with me, and it should be brought to the attention of the House. The member for Fassifern, who asked this question, is an expert in the field of Aboriginal affairs and education. He is one of the people who can be thanked for the sort of background that has led to the success that the Queensland Government has had in this direction. The article states—

“Queensland was leading Australia in educating Aborigines, the chairman of a committee on Aboriginal employment and training said today.”

Mr Scott: Name the author.

Mr KATTER: The Opposition spokesman has asked me to name the author. He is none other than Mick Miller. He is most certainly no great apologist for the Queensland Government. I repeat that the author of this statement is Mr Mick Miller. Once again, the honourable member for Cook has fallen into a terrible hole.

The article states—

“Mr Mick Miller, chairman of the Review of Aboriginal Employment and Training Programs, said this seemed contradictory for the State, but Queensland

now produced about 400 Aboriginal graduates from secondary school and about 220 from university each year.

He said this record showed up the rest of Australia, where national employment and training schemes for Aborigines had failed.

Mr Miller attributed this to a consultative committee set up in Queensland in the early 1970s which encouraged such measures as allowing Aboriginal students to do homework at school instead of at home."

Queensland has a clever, capable and able Minister for Education of whom we can be most justifiably proud. He can feel very proud of the record that he and his department have achieved in that direction, as can all the people of Queensland.

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

SUPPLY

Committee—Financial Statement—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 19 September (see p. 1142) 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 CASEY (Mackay) (12.18 p.m.): Mr Row—

Mr Hinze: Try to make it interesting for a change, will you?

Mr CASEY: I certainly will. If the Minister is prepared to listen and be a little more attentive in this Chamber, I will make it most interesting for him.

Today I intend to have a few words to say about this State's great industry—the sugar industry. Prior to doing that, I wish to comment, as a long-serving member of the Queensland Parliament, on two large differences that I have noted with the passage of this year's Financial Statement through this Assembly.

Over the years, I have followed closely the different methods adopted by four Auditors-General. Each had his own perspective of his task and clearly pointed this out in his separate reports. Each was an excellent public servant. None, in my opinion, was in any way politically motivated. However, the changing attitude of those Auditors-General and the Governments that they served has led us down the path to that of the present holder of the office, Mr Vince Doyle.

Let me make one thing quite clear. I believe Mr Doyle to be as capable as anyone else whom I have seen in that job and, furthermore, he is a person with whom I have had a long association and for whom I have a high regard. His attitude to his task is clearly summed up in his opening comments of his various reports, but more especially by this statement in his report on the Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts for the year ended 30 June 1985. He said—

"I see it as unnecessary to include explanatory and descriptive material in my reports to the Legislative Assembly where adequate coverage is given in relative departmental statements and, in this case, the Treasurer's review provided with the statements."

There is nothing wrong with such statements, of course, but it means that, in a State such as Queensland, the political decisions of the various departments are no longer subjected to any scrutiny other than as a financial transaction. In other words, the need for a parliamentary public accounts committee in this State is now greater than ever so that there can be some questioning of the spending habits of the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and his Ministers.

More than ever, a need now exists for a cross-section of the Parliament, if not the whole of the Parliament, to receive in much greater detail the figures of the breakdown in expenditure of the various sectors of Government. The only explanatory and descriptive material that honourable members now receive is that which the Premier and Treasurer wishes to provide to them. The major expenditure of many departments is hidden under such comfortable headings as "Miscellaneous" or "Other Expenditure"

The second difference that I have noted is the unwillingness of the Premier and Treasurer or the Minister assisting him to maintain their presence in the Parliament during the currency of the debate on the Financial Statement. Today that is also in evidence. I well recall as a new member of the Parliament the manner in which the first State Treasurer with whom I served, Sir Gordon Chalk, remained in the Chamber for hour after hour of what can be a very tedious debate. It is a credit to Sir William Knox that he also did that during his period as Treasurer. By their constant presence, those Treasurers were able to reply—sometimes by interjection during the debate—to all of the points raised by the various members who spoke.

The attitude of Queensland's present Treasurer, the Premier, and his assistant, clone or rubber mould, whichever honourable members like to call him, is one of complete contempt for the Parliament and its format. Clearly, the Premier and Treasurer sees Parliament as the only legal restraint to doing what he wants to, as he wants to and where he wants to.

As I said, the main thrust of my address today to the Legislative Assembly will be devoted to this State's most important industry—the sugar industry.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr CASEY: I can hear a Government member groaning. I assure the honourable member that by the time I am finished, the pain in his stomach will make him groan even more.

Today's problems in the sugar industry highlight the fact that, for many years, its major millstone has been the failure of the National Party Queensland Government to give it the proper and justified leadership that it deserves. The National Party in Queensland has played politics with the sugar industry for so long that it has lost sight of the fact that, like all other primary industries in the world today, it is part of a shrinking export market. Unfortunately, complacency within the industry itself is equally to blame.

Despite the disastrous examples in recent years of the wool industry, the beef industry, the dairy industry and many more of this State's primary industries, sugar industry leaders, with the Sugar Board and its agent, CSR Ltd to the fore, continued to project that there was a great and expanding future for raw brown crystal sugar on the world's markets. Only a few years ago, sugar industry leaders—no-one else—encouraged the Australian industry to continue expanding. Because Australia was the most efficient producer of a raw brown crystal sugar, at a time of declining world consumption and increasing world stockpiles, the industry was told its future was assured.

I know that some of my critics will say it is all very well to look back now with hindsight. However, if a few of the newer members of this Parliament who are grumbling now peruse my speeches over the years in this Parliament and my public pronouncements outside, they will find that almost eight years ago I clearly warned a complacent industry and an ignorant Government of the dangers that were ahead of the sugar industry and the need to change radically its directional and structural policies.

Despite those warnings, this Government deliberately chose a path that has led the industry to disaster, and now it cries its head off for the Federal Government to come and rescue it without wanting to commit any of its own funds in the process. For donkey's years, the same Government and the same Premier said, "We do not want federal control of our industry. We do not want the Federal Government to have anything

to do with our industry." The Government said that even when its own colleagues were in Government in Canberra. Today the Queensland Government claims that the Federal Government has everything to do with the sugar industry. That is one of the greatest about-faces in the political history of Australia.

I ask who politicised the industry when it appointed a former well-superannuated National Party Minister to the highly sensitive and important role of chairman and chief executive of the Sugar Board. In the 1970s, who made the decision to spend the industry's surplus funds on a huge jetty at Lucinda Point for the main benefit of one major miller? More recently, who decided to spend up to a further \$30m on another bulk terminal adjacent to the Brisbane River for raw brown crystal sugar, despite the fact that the world trade in that commodity was declining? That edifice will become one of the great white-elephant memorials to the sugar industry and the decision made by the present State Government. It was not the people involved in the sugar industry who made the decision; the State Government made the decision and it told the industry that it would spend sugar-industry revenue on such structures.

Mr Simpson: Rubbish!

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Cooroora (Mr Simpson) does not know what he is talking about. The first time he ever got to his feet in this Parliament he could not understand that because production, distribution and exchange are controlled completely by this Parliament through its legislation, the sugar industry is the greatest example of socialisation that the nation has ever seen. If the honourable member does not know anything about socialisation, I refer him to what I said in 1972. He does not know the first thing about the sugar industry.

Mr Simpson: You are ignorant.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member's Government is the Government that has misused and abused the sugar industry every inch of the way. In the early 1980s, at a time when there was a huge world surplus and when the European Economic Community was subsidising its market, and also when the United States was moving into the production of huge quantities of artificial sweeteners, who encouraged the expansion of the industry? The answer to all of those questions is the same—the National Party Government in Queensland.

The Premier and Treasurer and his Government have shown a complete lack of knowledge of the sugar industry and its history. One of the reasons this Government has always been crooked on the sugar industry is that, because of Labor legislation that was first introduced to this Parliament 70 years ago, it became a model among Australia's primary industries. No-one on the Government side can deny that. I point out also, as Mr Row would know from his knowledge of his own area, that the corner-stone of all Labor's legislation that structured the sugar industry was the family-farm concept. From that concept, a model was developed with an element of sharing among growers, millers and workers in the sugar industry.

The other very important principle that was implemented from the word go was that complete control of the sugar industry, and legislation pertaining to it, would be the responsibility of the Queensland Government. However, what does one find now under the present State Government? By its own action, in turning to Canberra when it found itself in a mess caused by its own doing, the Government makes a stark confession that it is completely incapable of handling its own affairs. If the Queensland Government continues to avoid the starkness of the plight of the sugar industry and the need for immediate, corrective action, it may lose its sole-control status. Because the industry is so important to the economy of Australia, the Hawke Government will not let it decline any further.

In earlier years, when high prices were being paid for sugar-cane, the threat of a sugar-beet industry emerged in Victoria and Tasmania, and of a sugar-cane industry in

Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Successive Queensland Governments fought to maintain the sole-control status to which I have referred. Now, because of the hatred and bitterness in the heart of the Premier and Treasurer towards the Hawke Labor Government, one of the greatest industries in the nation is in danger of collapse. The hatred and bitterness of the Premier and Treasurer, so much of which was displayed during the South East Queensland Electricity Board dispute earlier this year, are once more evident in his attitude to discussions that must take place about the report of the Savage committee.

It is now almost seven weeks since that report was presented to both Governments; yet the Queensland Government, with 95 per cent of the cane and 100 per cent of the legislative control, has not instigated one positive measure to put the sugar industry back on the restructuring path that is so necessary for its recovery.

I draw the attention of the Committee to the report of the sugar industry working committee. It contains 34 separate recommendations that ought to be implemented in some form or other, or at least examined. Notwithstanding that, the Queensland Government has said steadfastly, "No way; we will not negotiate." The Queensland Government rejected the whole of that report, despite the committee comprising an independent chairman selected by the Queensland Government, two representatives from the sugar industry, two representatives from the Queensland Government and only two representatives from the Commonwealth Government. It was in fact a Queensland committee that made the recommendations, and once more the Queensland Government bears the major responsibility to do something about them. But, seven weeks later, it has not instigated one positive measure to put the sugar industry on the right track towards the restructuring necessary for its recovery.

Labor Premiers Theodore, Forgan Smith and Hanlon, and even the Country Party's Nicklin—I deliberately used the term "Country Party" rather than "National Party"—were to the fore as leaders when talks were held during previous crises in the sugar industry. But not the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). All he can do is criticise, whinge and undermine. He should be leading the Queensland delegation to the sugar industry talks in Sydney tomorrow. He should be to the fore, negotiating for all he is worth with the sugar industry and the Commonwealth Government to achieve a co-ordinated approach to the future of this great industry. He owes it not only to the 6 000 cane-growers in this State but also to the 100 000 people who are entirely dependent on the industry. He owes it to the communities right along the coast of this State who rely almost entirely on the economic well-being of the sugar industry for their livelihood. Without a sugar industry there will be absolute disaster for coastal Queensland. The industry must be maintained and continued in all areas in which it has been developed. The person with the primary responsibility for this industry is the Premier of this State.

Mr Kruger: We got an indication of that when he sent his Primary Industries Minister.

Mr CASEY: That would appear to be the case. It was the case several weeks ago when Mr Kerin first wanted to start negotiating with Mr Turner. Mr Turner was told that he did not have the power to negotiate—he could go and talk to his counterpart, Mr Kerin, but he did not have power to negotiate. If Mr Turner's hands are to be tied in Sydney tomorrow and if he will not have the power to negotiate, the person who has tied his hands—the Queensland Premier—should attend the talks instead and conduct negotiations with Mr Kerin.

What is even worse is that, after 17 years of leading this State, the Premier knows as much as a Victorian Liberal about the sugar industry. Four years ago in this House, when the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) introduced amendments to the 70-year-old Sugar Acquisition Act, he said that a full inquiry would be held into the need for legislation changes to the structure of the sugar industry. That did not happen, despite the recognition at that time that some restructuring was necessary.

Instead, in 1984 the industry initiated its own inquiry but, as soon as it reached the too-hard basket, it also foundered. This Government did not know which way to turn—again an admission of its lack of leadership for the industry. In desperation, it turned to the Commonwealth Government, intent on politically forcing it to hand over money without any sort of conditions, its hand held out like that of a common beggar. The one fact that this National Party Government has never been prepared to face is that it owns all the sugar produced in Australia—it does so under the very legislation I mentioned before when the member for Cooroora (Mr Simpson) was endeavouring to interject—and therefore has the primary responsibility for the welfare of the industry. The Queensland Government owns every grain of sugar produced in Queensland.

The Hawke Government very quickly responded to that pressure and, on 1 April, agreed to back a working party to investigate the problems in the industry. The rest is history—nothing but procrastination since seven weeks ago when the Savage committee's report was presented to both Governments.

Nobody in the industry wants to see change that does not take into account the battles of the past that led to the legislative structures of the industry today. But, despite all of the usual vicious National Party rumours, misinterpretation and outright lies, both Prime Minister Hawke and Australian Primary Industry Minister Kerin have insisted that the Savage committee report was a blueprint for discussion.

The State Government has had seven weeks to look at how it can restructure its legislation and to work out the effects on growers and millers alike of the various recommendations of the 100-day committee. However, to date, it has not come up with one positive thought. It therefore no longer deserves the confidence of the cane-growing areas of this State, and, that is exactly what is likely to happen in the sugar belt of Queensland.

The huge game that the National Party has been playing has come to a sudden halt. Small and big growers alike are now talking in the same vein. They want to hang in there in the industry to which they have devoted their lives and committed their capital. They do not accept that 40 per cent of growers should have to leave the industry, but they do accept that some sugar has to be taken off the export market. They realise that some form of legislative restructuring to bring about changes is urgent and essential.

If the Queensland Government is not prepared to act responsibly and responsively, many growers are prepared to turn to Canberra for legislative control of their industry. I make it quite clear that I do not support such a proposal and that Labor, as the alternative Government in this State, wants Queensland to retain legislative control. I also want to make it quite clear that, in discussions last Saturday, Mr Kerin again clearly indicated to me the Hawke Government's continuing commitment to keep the industry under Queensland Government control. However, the industry cannot wait round. People in the industry are now saying that, to get proper support, they may have to ask the Commonwealth to take control of the industry. They are certainly not getting proper support from the Queensland Government.

Coming from a sugar-growing area, you, Mr Row, must be well aware, as are other honourable members who have been involved for years with the sugar industry, that there will be no dramatic increase in world sugar prices. Consequently, we can depend only on sound and sensible adjustments designed to cut out some of the high cost structures in the industry.

Unfortunately the Queensland Government rules the roost. It has been a major blockage and the cause of all the problems. It is quite clear that the three big proprietary milling interests have the ear of the Queensland Government. Their attitude was made clear by the chairman of one of them who said last week, when announcing a profitable year—something that was not experienced by many growers or co-operative mills—“The company could increase sugar production with substantial advantage to both Pioneer and its growers.” What a statement to be made by one of the millers who have the ear of the Queensland Government when sugar has to come off the export market.

Those comments may have been well received by the share-holders of the company, but they certainly alarmed growers throughout the industry. They simply confirmed the opinion held by many, particularly those in the superwet belt, that the Queensland National Party Government, with the support of the big sugar companies, wants to concentrate the industry on the Burdekin and Bundaberg irrigation areas. That was the big fear raised with me only one and a half weeks ago when I was in the far-northern area inspecting all of the superwet belt of the sugar industry. If that is what is happening, the Queensland Government is talking tongue in cheek in its attitude to the Commonwealth Government. It wants to force the Mackay and far-northern areas, the mainstays of the industry over the years, out of sugar production. It would be disastrous for the economies of those regions, but it would be a skilful political coup against the Commonwealth should it come off.

The greedy and selfish moguls of the National Party within the industry would be delighted if that were to occur. Those who want to see a system of gentlemen plantation-owners are happy to endorse current proposals or, worse still, are insistent on doing nothing so that, as usual, the small and the weak will suffer and eventually be forced off their farms. The Labor Party made this industry great. It seems that the people of Queensland will once more have to elect a Labor Government if the sugar industry is to return to normality.

I want to lay to rest one other point on Commonwealth Government aid to the industry. The Premier and his cohorts love to use simple phraseology to explain everything. This morning, the Premier tried to do that once again in some of his garbled answers in Parliament. The latest statement is to the effect that, because the Federal Government gave \$800m and \$700m respectively to the steel and car industries, it should give heaps of brass to the sugar industry. Those two figures have varied, depending on the audience.

The assistance to the passenger motor vehicle industry was a package which included tariff structure alterations in return for a reduction in the number of manufacturers from five to three and of models from 13 to six. They were the key points in the assistance package that was given to the passenger motor vehicle industry. The package covered at least three States and is completely rationalising the car industry at no direct funding cost to the Federal Government.

With steel, BHP, as the monopoly manufacturer, has had to put up \$800m of its own money, and the only direct Government contribution is by way of a bounty on domestic sales. Because of a rise in the demand for steel, only \$20m has been paid out. Never mind the \$700m or \$800m; \$20m is the total sum that the Commonwealth Government has paid out. That is peanuts compared with the level of domestic price support given to the sugar industry for home consumption sugar in Australia under the Commonwealth/State agreement. It is no use telling that to some of the National Party members who are present in the Chamber, because they would not understand it. Because of the high price that is paid for home consumption sugar, despite the low prices for sugar on the world market, the Australian sugar industry is already directly receiving considerable aid for the growing of sugar. Reciprocally, of course, the industry saved Australian consumers millions of dollars when the world export prices were at a very high level. There has been that give and take. Those figures can be extracted without any difficulty whatever.

The simple truth is that Premier Bjelke-Petersen and his National Party State Government have dumped the great sugar industry. It is no use farmers protesting against the Hawke ALP Government, because not only has it accepted the price support recommendation of the Savage committee but also it is prepared to assist beyond that recommended price support. That was clearly stated by the Prime Minister in Townsville yesterday.

The weevil in the cane-field is the Queensland National Party Government, which pretends to represent rural producers but, as we now see, callously deserts them when

they need help. This cruel performance by the State Government shows just how far the National Party in Queensland has drifted from its original Country Party base. Could anyone in this Chamber have imagined the great Country Party stalwarts, Sir Francis Nicklin, Jack Pizzey or, later, Vic Sullivan, ignoring a plea from the industry for assistance in co-ordination with the Federal Government? They would have been hanging in every inch of the way, trying to do something about it. There is also the record of what Labor Premiers, such as Theodore, Forgan Smith and Hanlon, did for the great sugar industry.

This Government's performance is frightening proof that the National Party no longer cares about country people beyond their votes. It is frightening proof that it is no longer a rural-based political vehicle, but one for the citified international criminals such as Oskar and Brych, land and development shysters and the scum of the economic world who are willing to sling to political slush funds, such as the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, in return for favours and discrimination from a corrupt, immoral Government.

In the few minutes remaining, I shall refer briefly to a couple of other matters, mainly because the Estimates of the Premier's Department are not being debated this year. I think that some matters within those Estimates are of interest.

I refer, firstly, to the Queensland Government Representative Office in Bahrain. The Vote for 1985-86 is a massive \$552,000 for this one-man office. This averages more than \$1,500 a day, and is about \$284,000 above the appropriation for 1984-85 and \$181,450 more than the amount actually spent in that year. I can accept that living costs and inflation are high in the Middle East; but how can the Queensland Government representative (Mr Borzi) spend an average of \$1,512 a day, particularly when he seems to be a fairly regular visitor to Australia?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Mackay is at his old tactics again. He has been so involved with things that are corrupt that he thinks that every institution is corrupt.

Mr Casey: What is your point of order?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the honourable member can contain himself—I said that he has been so involved personally with things that have been corrupt, such as poker machines, that he has implied that this Parliament——

Mr Casey: What is your point of order?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Can the honourable member contain himself long enough?

Mr Vaughan: What is your point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I control this Chamber.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I can stand here all day; I do not mind. I ask the honourable member for Mackay to withdraw the statement that the Queensland Government and the Queensland Parliament are immoral and corrupt.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! *Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice* indicates that words such as "corrupt" and "immoral" can be regarded as unparliamentary. As the Premier and Treasurer has taken a point of order on that basis, I ask the member for Mackay to withdraw those two words, "corrupt" and "immoral"

Mr CASEY: Mr Row, I respect your ruling on the basis that you have laid down, and, because the Premier has objected, I withdraw those two words.

However, he may like to answer some questions arising from the Estimates of his department. Maybe he can tell honourable members why he is not going to Sydney himself to negotiate for the sugar industry.

The Vote for the one-man office in Bahrain is \$218,000 more than the total allocations for the offices of the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition combined, in which the staff number is nine. The 1985-86 Vote for the Queensland office in Tokyo, which has a commissioner and a deputy commissioner, is \$664,000, which is almost \$100,000 more than the amount spent last year. In contrast, the Agent-General's Office in London is the poor cousin of these other two Government offices, with only \$940,000 set aside this year for a staff of 20.

Finally, I refer to the phantom ministry of northern development. The secretive Budget papers cannot hide the fact that this so-called office has no budget, no department, no development program and no planning or research staff. In reality it is a clique attached to the Department of Community Services and consists of a typewriter and a journalist in Townsville.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's time, under the agreement, has run out.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (12.48 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I join in the Budget debate. I will raise a number of points, including some that relate specifically to my area and to some of its industries.

Firstly, I refute a point made by the previous speaker, who is a former and defrocked Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about one of the Auditor-General's reports with respect to his authority and powers. I ask the member for Mackay to correct me if I am wrong, but I think that he also referred to a television interview between Mr Quentin Dempster and the Auditor-General (Mr Doyle). However, the honourable member failed to inform the Committee of the total contents of that interview. Mr Doyle was asked by Mr Dempster—

“How does the level of Ministerial expenses in Queensland compare with those of Ministers in other States?”

Mr Doyle replied—

“I don't know. As far as I am aware, Queensland is the only State where there is this requirement that Ministerial expenses be specifically identified within the Departmental report to the Parliament.”

Mr Littleproud: That was interesting, wasn't it?

Mr FITZGERALD: That is an interesting statement, and the people should realise that, as far as the Auditor-General is aware, Queensland is the only State in Australia in which Ministers have to specifically identify their expenses within the departmental reports that come before the Parliament. Should honourable members so desire, I can obtain the date of that television interview.

In the short time left to me before the luncheon recess, I wish to mention the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) in this debate. Over the last couple of months, members of this Chamber, particularly members of the Opposition, have been listening to his performance. Following on from the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition in the debate, I ask the Chamber: Who could believe a Prime Minister who, time after time, stated as simply and as plainly as possible through the media that there would be no capital gains tax?

Mr Vaughan: Put it in its right perspective. When did he say that?

Mr FITZGERALD: I can show the honourable member film-clips that are held in the Parliamentary Library in which the Prime Minister said—

“I cannot put it any plainer. In the life of this Government there will be no capital gains tax.”

The question now is not whether a capital gains tax should be imposed; the credibility of the Prime Minister is in question. What did the ALP leader in this State

say about his Federal leader's double-cross? Nothing! He is not only the invisible leader of the rabble, but also the silent one.

Mr Vaughan: Unlike you guys, he doesn't tell lies.

Mr FITZGERALD: I will not ask the honourable member to retract that statement because I know that the Opposition has a habit of mud-slinging.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I note that the word "lies" was used in the exchange between the member for Lockyer and the member for Nudgee. I have already ruled in this Chamber, and it has been indexed in *Hansard*, that I will not allow one member to call another a liar. The word "lie" can be construed in a broader sense, but it is about time that the issue was cleared up. I ask honourable members in this Chamber to refrain from the use of the words "lie" and "liar". I ask the honourable member for Nudgee to withdraw the word "lies". In future, this rule will be enforced.

Mr VAUGHAN: I do so accordingly.

Mr FITZGERALD: I had said that the Leader of the Opposition is not just the invisible leader of the rabble but also the silent one. How could he go to the people and ask them to elect him as Premier of this State? How could he ask voters to support an ALP candidate who would in turn support him as a Premier of this State?

Mr Vaughan: Why don't you talk about the Budget?

Mr FITZGERALD: I am getting to that.

How could the voters of the Redlands electorate be asked to support that man for the high office of Premier of this State? By his silence on Hawke's double-cross, he also is damned to face the wrath of the electorate.

In his contribution to this debate, the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition based his criticism on the state of Queensland's economy. He attempted to portray himself as a person with an understanding of the complex facets of the economy of this State. He found himself defending the Federal Labor Government's discrimination against Queensland. He knows that the formula for the Grants Commission has been changed, and he defends the Federal Government's discrimination against Queensland, which totals more than \$362m, and includes revenue shortfalls of \$137m in general funding, \$135m in Grants Commission funds and \$82m in the Medicare shortfall.

The Medicare discrimination provides an excellent example of the Commonwealth's harsh treatment of Queensland. Queensland receives only \$29 per capita, whereas the other Labor States receive double or more than double its payments. Are these facts or are they not? There is persistent discrimination against Queensland because Queensland had a free hospital system. Compared with those of other States, Queensland's hospital costs were contained. Now, the per capita contribution from the Commonwealth to Queensland in Medicare payments is \$29, although the other States receive double or more than double that figure. However, Queensland continues to be Australia's growth State, with the nation's highest population increase last year.

The Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition finds himself in the same position as one of his predecessors, Perc Tucker. After Whitlam's fall, he was the twelfth man in the Opposition 11. He did not make the team. Eleven years after Hawke, students of politics will have to look up their history books to find the name Warburton. The rest of the Opposition fear that result.

There is something to learn from that. The Opposition must learn to stand up for Queensland. Tucker failed to stand up for Queensland when the excesses and discrimination of the Whitlam Government reacted against Queensland. Tucker only made twelfth man in the Opposition's team of 11 to return to the Chamber. I know that Opposition members are very worried. If the Hawke Government in Canberra runs its full term, at the next Queensland State election the Opposition will be facing a situation similar to

that experienced by the Perc Tucker-led Labor Party in Queensland in 1974. Opposition members know what will happen.

It is no wonder that the State secretary of the Australian Labor Party has resigned and is trying to obtain a seat in this Chamber. Either he is concerned about the economic policies put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) or he realises that there is no future in his present position and that he should go for the big job. I do not know which of those is true. He is convinced that the candidate in Redlands (Con Sciacca) will make a hopeless job of it. He has no confidence in that person. Being the State secretary of the Australian Labor Party, he was in a position to judge whether or not Con Sciacca would run a fair race. However, he decided to throw his hat into the ring because he knows that Sciacca would not do any good at all. That is the type of Leader of the Opposition one can expect in Queensland.

The level of unemployment in Queensland has been the subject of argument in this Chamber. Honourable members and, I am sure, the Government recognise that Queensland has a major unemployment problem.

Mr Vaughan: Nine per cent—the highest in Australia.

Mr FITZGERALD: The figure is around the 9 per cent mark. In fact, it is the highest in Australia.

The honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) referred to the disaster befalling the sugar industry at present. I am reliably informed that the unemployment level in sugar towns is about 12 per cent. I suggest to Opposition members that that would have some great influence on Queensland's present unemployment level.

Mr Vaughan: Well, do something about it.

Mr FITZGERALD: Do something about it?

Mr Vaughan: Yes.

Mr FITZGERALD: I believe that the sugar industry problems will not be solved overnight. I know that the problem is complex. At present, negotiations are taking place between the Queensland Government and the Federal Government. The Opposition's solution to the problem is that the Queensland tax-payer should pay double. Opposition members think that Queenslanders should not only pay their fair share towards the cost of the sugar industry, as they do as Australian tax-payers, but also forgo Federal Government expenditure and be a Queensland tax-payer as well. Opposition members say that Queenslanders should be doubly responsible for propping up the sugar industry. However, it is an Australian responsibility.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr FITZGERALD: Prior to the luncheon recess, I acknowledged that the level of unemployment in Queensland stands at approximately 9 per cent, which is one of the highest—

Mr Davis: Too high.

Mr FITZGERALD: As the honourable member for Brisbane Central says, it is too high. However, I pointed out that unemployment in the cane-growing areas of Queensland is in the order of 12 per cent. All honourable members know why that has occurred.

For some time, the argument has been advanced that a high rate of migration from the southern States to Queensland has occurred and that that has contributed to the high unemployment level in this State. Members of the Opposition have argued that that is not the case. In addition, recently, when I interjected while the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) was speaking, he was saying that one of the reasons why people are coming to Queensland is the abolition in this State of death duties. By

way of interjection, I pointed out that the abolition of death duties was brought about by this Government. The honourable member for Sherwood indicated—

Sir William Knox: I was the Treasurer who abolished them.

Mr FITZGERALD: As the honourable member for Nundah indicates, he was the Treasurer who abolished them.

The honourable member for Sherwood indicated that the people coming to Queensland are elderly and older people who are seeking to retire. That appears to be a strong argument. However, the question must be asked: Are young unemployed people and people who are joining the work-force coming to Queensland? I examined the statistics and I discovered that people of all ages are coming to Queensland. The argument that Opposition members and a few other members in this Chamber advance, that only elderly retired people are coming to Queensland, is erroneous.

The figures for the period from 1976 to 1981 revealed that interstate migrants coming to Queensland could be categorised in the following way—

| Category | Percentage |
|---|------------|
| Still at school (5-14 years) | 21.8 |
| Young working age (15-24 years) | 16.3 |
| Prime working age (25-49 years) | 40.0 |
| Older working age (50-64 years) | 15.2 |
| Retired (65 +) | 6.7 |

The figures indicate also that between 1 July 1979 and 31 December 1984, 133 871 interstate migrants moved to Queensland. Over the same period, New South Wales showed a net loss of 62 048; Victoria, a net loss of 63 838; South Australia, a net loss of 28 300; Tasmania, a net loss of 5 485; and Western Australia, a net gain of 13 116—the only State apart from Queensland to show a net gain.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics also conducted the annual internal migration survey. Each year, that survey is conducted to assist in estimating the movement of the Australian population. The survey relates only to persons aged 15 years and over. The most recent survey conducted in July 1984, and relating to the 12 months ended 30 June 1984, confirms that the majority of interstate migrants coming to Queensland are in working age groups. I repeat that the majority of interstate migrants coming to Queensland are in working age groups. The 1984 survey results are as follows—

| Age Group (years) | Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------|
| 15-19 | 9.3 |
| 20-24 | 19.6 |
| 25-29 | 14.6 |
| 30-34 | 9.0 |
| 35-44 | 19.9 |
| 45-54 | 7.3 |
| 55-64 | 11.3 |
| 65 and over | 9.00 |

These Australian Bureau of Statistics figures absolutely and categorically refute the arguments and propositions put forward by a few honourable members opposite. They prove that those honourable members are listening to their own rhetoric. Opposition members do not believe what has been statistically proven. The figures cannot be denied. Therefore, Opposition members simply say that Queensland is a great place to live and that is why people are coming to Queensland.

Unemployment in Queensland is still very high. However, the figures disclose that more jobs are created in Queensland than in any other State. Queensland still has the highest official unemployment rate. However, with the net gain of 13 000 unemployment benefits transferred to Queensland from the other States over a three-year period, the

Queensland unemployment rate is down by 1 per cent to 8 per cent. Therefore, Queensland is comparable with the rest of Australia.

As I said, at the same time it should not be forgotten that, because unemployment is running at approximately 12 per cent, Queensland is experiencing a major problem in the sugar industry. However, the remainder of the economy of Queensland is doing reasonably well.

During this debate, an argument was put forward by the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox) in favour of the gradual abolition of pay-roll tax.

Sir William Knox: Over a period of five years.

Mr FITZGERALD: The leader of the Liberal Party advocated the abolition of pay-roll tax over a period of five years and I am totally in favour of that. I agree with him when he says that it is an iniquitous tax because it taxes people who provide jobs. In my view, it is totally geared against employment. However, before anyone can ask a Treasurer to do away with pay-roll tax, he should put forward a suggestion on where that revenue will come from. The Budget papers demonstrate quite clearly that a reasonable amount of revenue comes from pay-roll tax.

The Government has raised the level of exemption but, although people may find that they are slightly better off than before, when the increases in inflation and wages are taken into consideration, I wonder whether that exemption is of any real benefit at all to employers. If I remember his argument correctly, the leader of the Liberal Party claimed that the State would pick up extra revenue because, as more employment was generated, more income tax would be paid. That argument falls down because I do not believe that the States would pick up more than a very small increase in the percentage of income tax disbursement.

As all honourable members would know, we live in the Commonwealth of Australia and the percentage of income tax collected in Queensland is distributed under a formula, and Queensland receives only a percentage of the total income tax revenue collected throughout Australia. If the amount of tax paid in Queensland is increased, it is not necessarily the case that its share from the Federal Government would increase by the same percentage. The argument put forward by the leader of the Liberal Party is not substantiated and does not indicate where the Queensland Government would obtain the extra revenue.

A case should be made out to the Treasurer that demonstrates how Queensland can do away with pay-roll tax over a period and still maintain its services. If that were not done, it is likely that the Government would be criticised along the lines of, "There is another tax" or, because the Government does not want to impose another tax, "They're going to cut the number of teachers; they're going to cut the number of nurses and they're going to cut the number of policemen."

Sir William Knox: Do you know that the police pay \$7m a year in pay-roll tax? Where do you think that money comes from? That money comes out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr FITZGERALD: The former Treasurer and present leader of the Liberal Party has indicated that Government departments pay pay-roll tax. That is so but, as a former Treasurer, he should know that that sum goes into the system and comes back out of the system. He should know also that the Railway Department pays a diesel fuel levy, which is a road tax which funds bicentennial projects. Although not as much money as is collected from the levy is paid back to the States, it must be accepted that many departments pay taxes, and are funded accordingly.

I support the basic proposition put forward by the leader of the Liberal Party that pay-roll tax ought to be abolished, but I believe that it should be done gradually. I ask the proponents of the theory how will it be financed. It is not easy for any Government to take such an enormous step over a very short period.

I now turn my attention to the recent announcement by the Federal Government about the introduction of a capital gains tax in Australia. I do not believe that the Federal Government has thought through that proposition. The imposition of a capital gains tax will react to the detriment to small business people and, in that category, I include primary producers. The reason I say that the Federal Government has not thought through the imposition of a capital gains tax is that, if people were engaged in small business or farming and wished to sell a property to buy another property, from the time at which the capital gains tax was introduced they would be liable to pay an amount of capital gains tax if the value of the property had increased faster than the rate of inflation.

Some people say, "So what? That sounds reasonable." However, I put this proposition to members. If I owned a farm prior to the announcement of the capital gains tax and decided that I wanted to be progressive, sell and move to another area, as soon as I bought the other property, even if it was of the same value, it would come within the purview of the capital gains tax. If I continue to live on the property I presently own I can, at any time within the next 10 or 15 years, decide to liquidate my assets and not be liable for capital gains on that sale. If I purchase another property and then sell it, if property values have not increased at greater than the rate of inflation, I am still not liable for capital gains tax; but if the value of that property increases at a rate greater than the rate of inflation, I am then liable for capital gains tax on the difference between the rate of inflation and the gain that I realise.

I will now deal with the way in which the introduction of that tax will exacerbate the problems of the sugar industry. People have been buying cane farms at greatly reduced prices in the hope of making a capital gain. Someone might say, "So what?" Years ago I wanted to sell a mob of steers. I was asked, "Why are you selling them now?" I replied, "Because we made up our minds that we wanted to sell them now. We don't fatten steers on our property." The person to whom I was talking said, "The fellow buying them is going to make a profit. He will buy them, fatten them and make a profit." I said, "I hope that there are quite a few of those people at this sale, because if there are people here anticipating that they will make a profit, I will get a fair market price for my steers."

That comment can be related directly to the sale of cane farms. Unless buyers have a fair expectation that they will make a capital gain, the present owner will not realise as high a price as he could have expected had conditions not changed through the introduction of the capital gains tax. I believe that that will be appreciated once values begin to drop, because people are being taken out of the market-place. Because of conditions in the industry, the market has been depressed, and the introduction of the capital gains tax will upset it even more.

Mr Simpson: The owner's equity drops.

Mr FITZGERALD: As the member for Cooroora points out, the depressed state of the market causes the property-owner's equity to drop. Once the banks realise that a property-owner's equity, which might have been 50 per cent or 60 per cent, has dropped as low as 40 per cent, they get nervous and foreclose. When people see a couple of forced sales, they realise they have to get out straight away, and the value of properties is depressed at an accelerating rate. That process has been triggered off by the capital gains initiative that the Federal Government has taken. I do not believe that the Federal Government has thought through the effect of that initiative. If a person decides to buy a cane farm—he might believe that there will be an improvement in five years' time——

Mr Simpson: It could be a sale through sickness or acquisition by the Crown.

Mr FITZGERALD: There are various reasons why people dispose of property. The introduction of this tax will exacerbate the present rural depression in Australia.

I want to comment on a speech made last week by the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes). At one stage, he dealt with me quite harshly. He advocated the opening of new coal mines in Queensland. He put forward the proposition that the Government should forgo the revenue that it earns through rail freight charges. I agree that it would be very good if coal could be carried more cheaply. For that matter, it would be good if passengers could be carried more cheaply. Because many Queensland industries, particularly rural industries, are in strife, there will always be people who say that rail freight charges are too high.

I point out, however, that if new mines are opened in Queensland they will have to go looking for sales on the world market, and they will do that in competition with existing mines. There is more than one mine in Australia, and not all the coal is marketed through one authority. Coal is not marketed under one brand-name; it is marketed by free enterprise companies. With a depressed world market, the existing mines take up any markets that they can find.

A substantial transfer of Australia's market has occurred. The Japanese market was once 60 per cent but has dropped to 55 per cent. Although the tonnage is increasing, the percentage is being cut back. Australia is now finding bigger markets in other parts of the world, particularly in Europe.

The argument advanced by the member for Sherwood that the opening of new mines would mean that all the mines in Queensland would be better off is erroneous. It cannot stand up to the test.

After the horrendous week-end road toll, cries have been heard for the appointment of additional police. Members of the Opposition and others have expressed disappointment at the lack of police officers. They believe that the appointment of additional police would prevent the road toll.

It would be wonderful if the Government could appoint additional police, but it is completely wrong for anybody to believe that their appointment would lower the road toll dramatically. For that to happen, a policeman would be required at every intersection, and policemen would be required to patrol the roads at all times. Where would the policemen have had to be stationed to prevent the accidents that occurred last week-end?

Mr Yewdale: Your Government established a Highway Patrol with nobody in it.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Highway Patrol operates to indicate the police presence. Opposition members support the Big Brother mentality. They believe that policemen should stand on every corner. They believe that if members of the public fear being caught by policemen they will not be drink-drivers. Many people claim that a high percentage of road accidents are caused by drink-drivers. I do not say that the week-end accidents were caused by drink-drivers, but I do not believe that random breath-testing would prevent drink-driving. The character of the Australian driver must be reformed.

Japan has very severe penalties for drink-drivers, but the attitude of the Japanese to drink-driving is entirely different from that of Australians. A Japanese company employee found guilty of drink-driving suffers the penalties imposed by the State as well as disgrace and loss of face. He loses company benefits and is considered to be an undesirable person. How many people in Australia pour another drink into a man who intends to drive and say, "Have another one; you'll be right."?

The Big Brother attitude, with a policeman waiting to grab anyone who commits a crime is not the right approach to preventing drink-driving. The Australian character must be reformed.

Additional police could help in solving crimes that have been committed. They could more thoroughly investigate breaking and entering crimes and give a higher clean-up rate, although Queensland has a good record. It is not fair to expect a policeman to watch every house in every suburb. That is impossible.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! Under the agreement, the honourable member has used up his time.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (2.34 p.m.): The year of 1985 will be known as the double-deception year for the Government in the area of education. This year was to see the culmination of the guarantee given by the Government in 1982 to reduce class sizes, but it has become the year for the big, broken promise on class sizes.

The Premier and Treasurer and the Budget documents indicate that this year an additional 1 087 teachers will be commissioned. In the 1982-83 Budget, the then Treasurer and Deputy Premier indicated that 1 545 additional teachers would be appointed. The number of teachers being appointed has decreased markedly from that announced in the first year of the big four-year program to reduce class sizes. In four years the Government shifted ground massively, and particularly so in the past 12 months. In fact, under this Budget, according to the figures available to me, the Education Department is short of approximately 1 000 teachers, which is a significant number. It is quite clear that the Government has not allocated the funds necessary to provide the number of teachers needed to enable it to honour its promise on class sizes.

It should be remembered that the class-size program was based on the recommendations of the Ahern Select Committee on Education. That Government-controlled committee recommended a maximum of 25 students for all classes in Years 1 to 3 and 11 and 12 and a maximum of 30 students for classes in Years 4 to 10.

As late as February this year, an article in the *Sunday Sun*, under the heading "Major shake-up cuts class sizes", stated—

"Class sizes and staffing levels in Queensland schools are in for a major overhaul this year as Education Minister Lin Powell introduces sweeping changes to the education system."

That is so, but it is in a negative sense. The article leads us to believe that the Government will honour its promise to reduce class sizes. It states—

"In a drastic move, classes of 25 will be introduced for grades one, two, 11 and 12, and classes of 30 for other grades.

'In reality, there will be a few classes over 30 and a few under, but there is no way around some of those situations,' said Mr Powell.

'If you have a class with 31 students and you bring another teacher in and have classes of 15 and 16 it's not economically viable.'

Cutting class sizes creates problems in classroom space, especially when the Education Department forecasts the end of 1986 as the time when classroom building programs will be up to date.

Population

'If we have more classes, we need more classrooms,' he said. 'But at the moment we are sure we will meet the building program by the end of next year' "

That is the end of 1986. The Minister indicated quite clearly that the Government would honour the promise that it made four years ago that it would implement a class-size program based on the recommendations of the Ahern committee.

That promise was made in the 1982-83 Budget by the then Deputy Premier and Treasurer and member for Ipswich (Sir Llewellyn Edwards). He said—

"The Government has repeatedly stated that a program of reduction in class sizes would be announced in the Budget.

The Ahern Select Committee recommendations on class sizes will be implemented in full over a four year period commencing in 1982-83. This, coupled with the needs of projected enrolment growth, means that an additional 1,350 State School teachers have been provided for in this Budget.

While very lengthy consideration was given to the possibility of a shorter implementation period, the total additional costs involved of upwards of \$50 million annually, the strain on manpower resources and the demands for additional capital facilities that would inevitably result, preclude any prospect of quicker progress being made.

In taking this decision, the Government has accepted the proposition that reduced class sizes are one of the primary means of ensuring quality educational output. Therefore, all additional teachers will be utilised for full-time classroom duties and there will be no increase in non-classroom teaching. My colleague, the Minister for Education—”

incidentally, he is now the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn)—

“will be taking all necessary steps to ensure that maximum effective use is made of total available teacher resources for classroom duties.

45 additional teachers will also be required to service the needs of Commonwealth-funded programs.

The Budget also provides for the appointment of an additional 150 teachers to cater for continued growth in the Technical and Further Education sector.

In total, 1,545 additional teachers have been provided for this year, an increase of 6.8 per cent on present teacher numbers.”

That is the promise that was so dramatically broken by the Government in this Budget. That is the first big deception in education this year.

Neither the Minister for Education nor other Government members should say that the class-size program to which I have referred was drawn up under a coalition Government. The same people who were in control then—apart from Sir Llewellyn Edwards, who was then Deputy Premier—are in control now. If any honourable member doubts that, I refer him to pages 2540 and 2679 of *Hansard* of 1982, which show quite clearly that the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), who was then Minister for Education, were responsible for implementing the Government's 1982 Budget policy on staffing.

On page 2679, in answer to a question from the then Opposition spokesman on education (Mr Smith), the Premier said—

“Within the context of the Government's 1982-83 Budget policy on staffing, certain guide-lines will be formulated shortly by Cabinet and the staffing requirements of all Public Service departments will be determined by the Public Service Board in terms of these Cabinet guide-lines.”

The Premier, who is the Minister responsible for the Public Service Board, made it quite clear that the board was responsible for implementing that staffing program.

By 1984, the alarm bells should have started to ring. On 29 March 1984, the Opposition spokesman on education asked the Minister for Education (Mr Powell)—

“For example, will he admit that the incidence of children's inability to read could, in fact, be reduced substantially if (a) class sizes were reduced to allow a lower student-teacher ratio and (b) many more remedial teachers were available to assist students with specific learning difficulties?”

The Minister's answer to the part of the honourable member's question was—

“(a) There is no proven relationship between class size and student achievement. It is the expectation of the Government that teachers have used the existing reductions in class sizes to increase the amount of individualised instruction and assistance for children with special needs.”

The Minister's reply contains a conflict. If children's education is enhanced by a reduction in class sizes, resulting in teachers being able to increase the amount of individualised

instruction and assistance for children with special needs, the reduction in class sizes must achieve the desired aims.

I have read every page of the Budget papers, but I could find no mention of the Government's 1982-83 Budget promise to implement its class-size program. Under the heading "Teachers for State Schools" in the Budget paper *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*, it is stated—

"The Government has provided an additional 1,087 teacher positions for State Schools and preschools in the 1985/86 Budget. Of these, 35 positions will be allocated to preschools, 396 to primary, 422 to secondary and 234 to special education.

The increases are largely to meet the demands of increased enrolments, further reductions in class sizes and to staff new facilities currently being constructed under the Department's capital works program."

Clearly the Government has thrown out the promise that it made four years ago.

In the paragraphs about the primary, secondary and special education sectors, reference is made to the continuation of the phased implementation of the class-size recommendations of the parliamentary select committee. The definite promise made four years ago by the Government has been broken.

I turn now to the material that every member would have found on his desk prior to the bringing down of the Budget. One particular document, which was put out by the Minister's committee, but which is basically from the Queensland Teachers Union, is headed "Reduced Class Sizes—What the Research Says". The information contained in that document was not concocted by the Queensland Teachers Union or by the parent bodies which support a campaign for reduced class sizes—a promise that was broken by the Government.

The document states—

"What the Research says

There can be no arguing with the fact that improved education outcomes are a result of reduced class sizes.

Class sizes of 25 and 30, depending on the year level, are the absolute maximum that can be sustained if children's education is to be improved."

That document relies on the work done by Professor Jack Campbell of the University of Queensland. He has clearly pointed out the detrimental effect of overcrowding in larger classes.

The document continues—

"Oversize classes produce 'overload stimulation' and feelings of stress and anxiety among children.

He concluded that in larger classes children became 'aggressive, withdrawn and egocentric'. They are, therefore, much less likely to take part in 'on-task behaviour'.

The significance of these findings lies in the fact that 'on-task behaviour' is assumed to be the most powerful predictor of learning and achievement.

In terms of lost learning, Professor Campbell calculated that an increase in class sizes from 21 to 31 meant a loss of 24 school days—more than one whole month's learning—from each student's school year.

Professor Campbell's findings are strongly supported by the work of Olsen, who undertook a major survey of nearly 20 000 American primary and secondary classrooms. In the early seventies Olsen concluded that the relationships between class size and student learning was 'well defined and consistent . . . smaller classes produced significantly higher scores than larger ones'."

The Minister may argue that education in Queensland should not be compared with that in the United States of America, but he and his colleagues know only too well

that many Australians travel overseas to do research on behalf of the education system in this country. Many of them go to America to undertake those studies. So, to quote American findings is quite relevant to the argument on class sizes.

The document continues—

“Don’t let them say:

Average Class Sizes Are On Target

This means that many classes are unacceptably high. All classes must be reduced in size. The Government promised that no Year 1, 2, or 3 or Year 11 and 12 class would be over 25, and that no Year 4-10 class would be over 30.

Don’t let them say:

Smaller Classes Do Not Mean Changes To Teaching Methods

This is immaterial. Reduced class sizes ensure that teachers spend more time with each child regardless of how they teach.

Don’t let them say:

Increased Retention Rates Are The Cause Of The Problem

It has been obvious for some years that the number of children staying after Year 10 would greatly increase. It just means that the Government has been spending less money on more children.”

The Government and the Minister need to justify their decision this year to break one of their major election promises, which was accepted by the people throughout the length and breadth of this State, many of them supporters of the Government. I clearly recall the demonstrations at schools in Dalby and at one school in the Minister’s electorate, the name of which escapes me at the moment.

Mr Powell: There were none in my electorate.

Mr UNDERWOOD: It was at a school in the Bundaberg area.

Mr Powell: There were none in Bundaberg, either.

Mr UNDERWOOD: There was one in the sugar belt somewhere up there.

Mr Powell: Probably anywhere north of Aspley is far-north Queensland to you.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I note that the Minister spends a great deal of time on the Gold Coast these days.

The recent argument by the Minister that the Government was not involved in political interference is another one of the great deceptions in education this year. In fact, to save his own political hide and to ensure the retention of his portfolio, he has involved himself in that operation. It amounts to nothing less than thought control—the reduction of freedom of speech, thought and expression by the students and young people of our State and the teachers teaching them.

The Minister for Education, supported by the Premier and Treasurer, said that all of Queensland’s teachers are irresponsible, that young people’s thoughts are not worth taking note of and that they do not have any right to have any thoughts. The Minister was pushed into saying that once a person reaches the age of 18 years, he could have his own say on things, but that was not allowed before that time. That is totally unacceptable and foreign to the curriculum in our schools and the methods of teaching that have been implemented for some time by very responsible teaching and non-teaching staff within the education system of this State. The Minister stands condemned for his attack on the staff and the students.

The Minister was recently involved in a silly episode as to whether students could or could not be involved in a competition for the design of a new Australian flag. What

was initially begun as a political stunt to curry favour with the Premier and Treasurer, in which he put forward some extreme views so that the Premier would support him, was very successful, because the Premier appeared on the front pages of newspapers and on television backing the Minister for Education 100 per cent. The Minister put the Premier in that situation so that he will maintain his ministerial portfolio when the Cabinet reshuffle occurs later in the year. However, a short time ago the Minister had his head on the chopping block. I congratulate the Minister for Education on being so manipulative of the Premier.

Mr Powell: Are you aware that the Western Australian Labor Government has also banned the Ausflag competition?

Mr UNDERWOOD: The same applies in that State. It has done some things with which I disagree whole-heartedly.

A Government Member: And Tasmania also.

Mr Powell: They followed Queensland's example.

Mr UNDERWOOD: What would one expect from that State? It does not surprise me what a person in Tasmania would do. They are all pretty well inbred down there, anyway.

Mr Jennings: That's pretty objectionable to the Taswegians.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member keeps saying that he escaped from the south, so I guess that he was living too close to them down there.

Mr Milliner: They booted him out.

Mr UNDERWOOD: They booted him out.

The Minister and the Government have been involved in a number of issues that the Opposition has been able to expose. The Minister has begun to run for cover and is digging up excuses for his action in banning Queensland students from participating in the Ausflag competition.

The Opposition was able to highlight that the Queensland Government was involved in the banning of High Court and constitutional education material that was approved and scrutinised by High Court judges. The Queensland Government banned the social science courses of SEMP and MACOS. It banned meaningful sex education. Although many young people need sex education and human relationship courses, they are not available to them.

Mr Henderson: Could you tell me where in the world sex education in schools has reduced promiscuity or anything else?

Mr UNDERWOOD: Later I will read a little quotation to the honourable member.

Queensland has the highest rate of venereal disease, births out of wedlock and other social problems. The honourable member should not talk to me about his Government's policies being effective in the protection of the lives of young people in this State in the future.

The Ahern committee said that sex education in schools is needed. Sex education is taught in the private school system in this State. It is only because of extremists such as the Minister for Education and the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) that Queensland does not have meaningful sex education courses. As a result of that, young people's lives are being destroyed unnecessarily.

Mr Powell: Balderdash!

Mr UNDERWOOD: The Minister is setting a good example. Let us see him stand up with his minority report and begin saying the same thing again. Let us have an argument about that.

Mr Powell: Very well.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The Minister is not going to implement sex education courses that are meaningful, with the participation of parents. Most parents want their children to be given sex education in schools.

Then there was the banning of the national anthem from schools and the banning of Mackay students from meeting the Prime Minister. That occurred at the same time as National Party politicians were thumping round schools declaring holidays and generally politicking for the election. That type of action shows quite clearly that this Government is involved in political interference and deception.

One of the documents that have been produced for *Education 2000* is the yellow curriculum guide, which has not been circulated widely. A section outlining the curriculum states that highly regarded or highly recommended people are to be brought in from the community to talk with the students.

The Government has already banned even the Prime Minister from having contact with Queensland students. Yet it will allow certain people to interface with Queensland students in this State's class-rooms. Because of the extreme policies of this Government, I am very worried—as are many people in the education system— about what this actually means. I am aware that people in the private-school sector have been given assurances by the education authorities that it does not mean another form of political interference and indoctrination. On the face of it, those people are accepting what they have been told.

Mr Lingard: How come Bob Hawke is at a school at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr UNDERWOOD: The Labor Party's campaign of exposing this National Party Government has finally made Government members realise that it does not do them any good at all to be seen to be interfering politically in the system.

The Minister for Education said that he did not want commercialism in this State's schools. The week before he made that statement, the schools in this State had a week of commercialism by way of the promotion of provincial newspapers in a program called "Newspapers and Education Week"

Mr Powell: That is not commercialism, you idiot.

Mr UNDERWOOD: If promoting the use of newspapers is not trying to sell newspapers, what is it? I am not condemning it. In my opinion, it is a good idea because it encourages students to read and to be able to better understand newspapers. I support that. However, it is also commercialism. The object of it is to encourage people to read newspapers. People are buying fewer newspapers per capita because they watch television. That is their news source.

Mr Cahill interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: The honourable member for Aspley would not know. He is out of touch. He ought to undertake a bit of education himself. His having spent a few years in class-rooms does not make him an expert.

Mr Milliner: He's "only joking"

Mr UNDERWOOD: He is "only joking"; I forgot.

I turn to the aspect of multi-culturalism that the flag competition raised. The Minister has since withdrawn part of the competition from the schools. More political

interference! The Minister should not leave the Chamber yet, because he will find himself involved in allegations of another deception, which he might wish me to withdraw.

I refer to an article on 2 February 1984 in *The Courier-Mail*. The article is headed, "Rona loses bid to ban education kit". The article reads as follows—

"Active education lobbyist, Mrs Rona Joyner, has been soundly defeated in her attempt to have a multicultural education resources kit banned from Queensland schools.

The Education Minister, Mr Powell, said yesterday that the kit, produced with 'the utmost care', was designed for teachers to help children live in a multi-cultural society.

It would be distributed to state primary schools as soon as possible.

'Many non-government schools have already obtained the kit and are happy with how helpful it is proving,' Mr Powell said.

The kit consists of a list of about 2000 publications from which teachers can choose appropriate classroom material, and a series of booklets outlining how multi-cultural education can be woven into school subjects such as social studies, mathematics, music and physical education.

Mrs Joyner has condemned the kit as 'an insidious, anti-Christian, anti-Anglo Saxon project.'

The article continues—

"The only support Mrs Joyner received from the committee came from Mr Henderson (NP, Mount Gravatt), who agreed with Mrs Joyner's condemnation of the kit in front of Mr Powell.

'Mr Henderson was marvellous, I was very pleased with what he said.' Mrs Joyner said yesterday."

The article further states—

"'Another 48 books relating to Aboriginals are being examined by the Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Mr Katter, and the Culture Minister, Mr McKechnie, and after the Ministers have decided if the books are suitable for inclusion, Cabinet will decide if the resources reading list has to be printed again,' Mr Powell said."

The aims of the multi-cultural education resources kit are to develop children in the following aspects: an appreciation of the multi-cultural aspects of Australian society throughout its history; a personal identity as a member of a multi-cultural society; support for individual ethnic identities, and recognition of the contribution of various ethnic groups to the national identity; awareness of the contributions which different ethnic groups, including their own, have made to the development of Australia; and cross-cultural attitudes favourable to a harmonious and rewarding life in a multi-cultural society.

In response to a question asked by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) about that article, the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) replied—

"I must reiterate that the kit is just that. It is not a course of study. It is a set of suggested resources for teachers to better enable them to understand cultural differences within classes.

There is no attempt by the kit or within the kit to change the Australian culture. In fact the reverse is the case. In the curriculum guides, teachers are advised how to cater for background differences and bring children to an understanding of others. The kit reinforces the principle of the Australian culture as a homogeneous one which has evolved over 200 years."

On the one hand, the Minister is saying that it is all right to use the kit and, on the other, a few weeks ago, the Minister said that the kit was insidious or "surreptitious".

On 6 August this year, the Minister was interviewed about the Ausflag 88 Ltd competition, and the Minister said—

“It is a ‘surreptitious’ means of using the children to change the flag.”

As I earlier outlined, I took issue with the Minister about that statement because the Minister was responsible for the preparation of a multi-cultural activities bulletin by the multi-cultural project team of the curriculum branch of the Education Department. The publication was a combined issue for the year 1982 and it included activities for Easter, the Multi-cultural Council calendar, social studies suggestions, celebrations, Christmas and Australia Day. For Australia Day activities, the publication contains about five pages of suggestions and it also includes quotations from the then Prime Minister (Mr Fraser) and that great racist, Professor Blainey.

Under a heading “One nation, one future”, the bulletin suggests that Australia Day should embrace all waves of immigrants, waves of migration, traces of route taken by the First Fleet and details about the voyage, and, lo and behold, on the last page the flag-design competition is mentioned! Admittedly, the competition was introduced by Mr Gunn when he occupied the Education portfolio, but its implementation occurred not long before the present Minister took over. When the Minister was fighting with Mrs Rona Joyner and the member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson), he said that he was aware of the competition, that it was a great thing to have in schools, and that it should be used. Although the design of the flag competition was endorsed earlier by the previous Minister, it has now been rejected by the present Minister because he was under siege from the Premier and back-benchers over his administration of the portfolio.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! In accordance with the agreement made by honourable members to shorten the times of speeches, the time of the honourable member has now come to an end.

Mr JENNINGS (Southport) (3.4 p.m.): The honourable member for Ipswich West has made comments about the Education portfolio and he referred to the Minister’s saving his ministerial hide. I do not think anyone would dispute that all Government members take pride in acknowledging, and are extremely confident of, the Minister’s handling of the Education portfolio. It is great to go round the various schools accompanied by the Minister for Education, because when he speaks or addresses a crowd, he can speak freely and can ad lib. The Minister knows the curriculum background because he has been involved in education all his life, and that is of great credit to him. In the light of the comments made by the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood), it is interesting to note that since the Minister took up his portfolio, the secretary of the Queensland Teachers Union has gone off the front pages of the newspapers, and the Minister has gone on.

There is no doubt that this is a very good State Budget. With the limitations on finance from the Federal sphere, it is an excellent result when Queensland can produce a Budget such as this one.

At the outset I raise a matter that concerns my electorate. I refer to accusations by the Labor member for Archerfield (Mr Palaszczuk) against the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd and its employees, the majority of whom live in the area I represent. I categorically deny his statements. The South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association has at all times met all the levies owing to the Federal Government, and to assert otherwise is a serious reflection of the employees of that organisation. It is equally wrong and, indeed, absurd to state that that dairy association could not properly handle all the milk from the Beaudesert suppliers.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr JENNINGS: The honourable member for Archerfield is interjecting, but those are the facts. He should listen to them because they come from an auditor’s report. Unlike the honourable member, I am not referring to speculation.

It is interesting to note that, in respect of the offer made by that association to amalgamate with the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association as far back as 1981, an auditor appointed by the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association to evaluate the offer made by the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association revealed in his report that, last year, the acceptance of the offer would have resulted in the suppliers to the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association receiving, for the year, a further cash amount of \$985,000 for their milk. I repeat that that figure comes from an auditor's report.

I note that the chairman of the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association (Mr Jim Egan) said in *Queensland Country Life* that the offer was not worth much at all. I wonder how many millions of dollars has been lost to the Beaudesert district by the refusal of Mr Egan and his fellow directors to enter into negotiations with the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association for an amalgamation which, if accepted, would last year have given the suppliers of the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association an additional \$900,000-odd. That figure is contained in the report of an independent auditor, so the honourable member for Archerfield cannot argue with it.

I note from the same auditor's report that the directors of the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association authorised payment for 844 000 litres of market milk at manufacture milk rates last year. The same report states that the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association suffered a trading loss of \$310,000 last year. Last Saturday I read in the press that Westpac Banking Corporation had appointed a receiver/manager to take control of the business. The member for Archerfield said that the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association was an efficient country co-operative. With that record does it sound like one? Its own auditor reported that 844 000 litres of market milk had been paid for at manufacture milk rates and that there was a loss of \$310,000 last year. It is obvious that further losses have been experienced this year, to the extent that the bankers have moved in and taken control away from Mr Egan. I wonder where he is now. Does the honourable member for Archerfield know?

What is the honourable member for Archerfield saying now about the offer of the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association for an amalgamation which would have given suppliers concerned almost \$1m extra last year, and security for the future? If Mr Egan and his fellow directors had responded when they should have, the situation of the employees would have been far better than it is now. There never was any pay-off or collusion by the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association, as asserted by the member for Archerfield instead, there was a well-documented, genuine offer for all to see which, if accepted by the directors of the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association, would have meant many millions of dollars to the suppliers in the Beaudesert district.

Any investigation should not be made into the affairs of the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association; on the contrary, there should be an investigation into the affairs of the Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association and the sorry handling of the whole matter by its directors. It is most unfortunate that the honourable member for Archerfield raised the matter in this House in the way he did. He reflected on the proud record of the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association. Over many years it has a record of honesty and integrity. It is not in the interests of this Assembly or of the industry for it to be impugned in any way.

Mr Palaszczuk: I stand by what I said.

Mr JENNINGS: The honourable member for Archerfield said that he stands by what he said. He is saying that he does not accept the auditor's report. In other words, he is saying that the auditor is wrong. He is setting himself up as an auditor and saying that the auditor is wrong. He is a game man who says here that an auditor is wrong. The honourable member is saying that the auditor, who has sworn to stand by his oath, is wrong. I realise that the honourable member for Archerfield is a relative newcomer to Parliament. I also realise that Opposition members have to play to the people in their

electorates. Unfortunately the honourable member chose wrongly on this occasion. I am sorry for him. He should not worry; Government members might give him a hint on other matters that he may pick on.

I am sure all honourable members realise that many people come to live in Queensland at this time of the year. The Special Major Capital Works Program will provide \$306m in addition to the normal program. No complaint had been made about increasing the exemption level for pay-roll tax. I am sure all honourable members would like to see pay-roll tax abolished, but we must be realistic. The Queensland Industry Development Corporation will be established with a paid-up capital of \$25m, with an initial lending capacity of \$260m.

In the past, when the Government has taken up an equity interest in a business, people who supply the business believe that the Government is guaranteeing it. When such a business goes broke, receivers are called in and the debts are paid off at so much in the dollar. However, the suppliers seem to think that, when the Government takes up an equity interest, it is guaranteeing the business. People do not realise that the Government is only a share-holder and that, in the same way as any other share-holder, it can lose money. That was the position at Currumbin. Education is progressing extremely well. Class sizes are being reduced.

Mr Littleproud: There is a gap because Mrs Harvey and I have dropped out of the teaching service.

Mr Henderson: Don't forget me.

Mr JENNINGS: The teaching service cannot afford to lose such quality teachers, but I suppose the difference can be made up with quantity. I suppose that the additional 1 108 teachers will help to make up for the loss of those three teachers.

Mr Randell: Haven't we done a marvellous job in the area of pre-school and kindergartens?

Mr JENNINGS: It is well known that the Government was forced into that situation, just as we on this side were forced a few years ago into accepting Government. We didn't want to do that. We wanted to continue in the way we were going, but we were forced to do what we did. We had to take the reins, and eight top-quality Ministers were plucked from the back-benches without any trouble, thanks to the overall quality of members on this side of the Chamber.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr JENNINGS: Government members are modest about the quality of members on this side of the House, but the facts prove it.

The people of Queensland enjoy a right that is not available in the other States. Those who live in one area can select a school in another for their children. If they are not happy with the school they select they can send their children to any other school. That right of choice is unusual in Australia.

Mr Palaszczuk: That is outlandish!

Mr JENNINGS: It is not at all outlandish.

Mr Palaszczuk: Are you going to have people walking round from school to school with students?

Mr JENNINGS: They do not do that, but they have the right to do so.

In my electorate I have the Southport Primary School, the Belleview Park Primary School, the Benowa Primary School, the Ashmore Primary School and the Musgrave Hill Primary School. Anyone with children in the area can send their children to any

one of those schools. The areas are not zoned as they are in New South Wales and Victoria. That is a terrific advantage.

The Federal Budget was introduced a few weeks ago, before the new Hawke/Keating tax plans were announced. And what beauties they are! It is the greatest double-cross that has ever been put over in this country. There will be a new explosion in the bureaucracy. Some people will do nothing but look over the shoulders of tax-payers.

Last week the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) said to the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen), "You table your tax return and I'll table mine." I did not know that the honourable member was so proud of mediocrity.

Recently, Mr Hawke, in a double-page advertisement in the press, said "We've just given Australia a new sense of priorities." He has certainly given Australians a new sense of priorities! He has said to small businessmen and farmers, "Go and jump in the lake." What happened the day after these tax changes were announced? Arthur Andersen and Co., which is one of the biggest accountancy firms in the world, inserted an advertisement in the press stating—

"If you want the new taxes explained, Arthur Andersen & Co. has 150 deductions all ready."

That is how crazy it is. The more complicated the tax system is made, the more the accountants and tax experts—non-producers—will be needed. That is exactly what the Federal Government in Canberra has done. It is a complete double-cross.

Mr Henderson: Do you notice how they are criticising us all the time for our advertising, but they do not say anything about this?

Mr JENNINGS: Opposition members would not want to say much about that. They now realise what a rort it is.

More and more tax-enforcers will be needed for the tax-dodgers. I know that the characters on the other side of the Chamber have canned the single-rate tax, but that is the only answer. It will provide an incentive for so many people. No-one will pay more tax on his current income. But if he wants to work harder—and he will work harder under that scheme—he will receive more money. Instead of working 40 hours a week, people will work 80 hours a week if they know that they will pay a 25 per cent flat rate of tax.

What did Mr Hawke say when he was told that the restaurant industry and catering industry might lose 10 000 employees? He said—

"Now, if, in the process that means some slight diminution in employment in the restaurant industry, well I believe that the whole of Australia will say 'well, that's the price that will have to be paid.'"

He said to the poor fellows in the restaurant industry, "To hell with you!" Many people are employed in those businesses.

Mr Randell: It is the only Federal Government in history that has taken two to three months to bring down a Budget.

Mr JENNINGS: It has taken longer than that.

Last year, Mr Hawke and Mr Keating said, "There will be no capital gains tax." They say that we have not lost anything to Canberra. The *Commonwealth Record* shows that, in the distribution of the 1984-85 tax-sharing grants, New South Wales received plus \$66.1m; Victoria, plus \$51.9m; South Australia, plus \$15.6m; Western Australia, minus \$16.3m; Tasmania, minus \$39.9m; and Queensland, minus \$77.4m. Queensland received the gold medal. That is how the Federal Government has diddled Queensland.

We do not have to worry about expenditure on defence, because defence is non-existent. Last year, the chiefs of staff warned the Federal Government that they were running out of money, men and bullets.

Mr Henderson: Did you know that an officer in the Royal Australian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers has to wait until 1988 to get a badge to put on his beret?

Mr JENNINGS: No, I did not know that, but it fits.

Security is the most important aspect. If the nation does not have security, it has nothing. We nearly lost the ANZUS pact. Bob Hawke went to Belgium and ratted on the Americans over the MX missile. By the time he did that, the New Zealanders had done something even more stupid; they would not even let American ships into their ports. It was lucky that Australia was not first in, otherwise we would have been out of ANZUS, too.

Mr Littleproud: Do you think that Souths No. 1 supporter had a big party at the week-end?

Mr JENNINGS: I think that Souths No. 1 supporter looks as black and white as the colours of the team that he supports.

If the Hawke Government was fair dinkum about creating jobs in Australia, it would award Government contracts to Australian firms. The 50c coin blanks are not made at Austral Bronze Crane Copper Ltd.

Sir William Knox: And the Qantas uniforms.

Mr JENNINGS: That is right. The coin blanks are made in South Korea. Where did the Government get its \$6m worth of vans for Australia Post? They were not made in Australia; they came from overseas. Yet the Federal Government talks about creating jobs in Australia.

Labor Governments also favour increased taxes. The Victorian Labor Government has increased licence fees from \$150 to \$1,800 per annum.

Labor has not changed. I go back to the 1947 Banking Bill to point out that nothing has changed in the Labor Party's philosophy or objectives. That legislation reads—

- “1. This Act may be cited as the *Banking Act 1947*.
2. This Act shall come into operation on the day on which it receives the Royal Assent.
3. The several objects of this Act include—
 - (a) the expansion of the banking business of the Commonwealth Bank as a publicly-owned bank conducted in the interests of the people of Australia and not for private profit;
 - (b) the taking over by the Commonwealth Bank of the banking business in Australia of private banks and the acquisition on just terms of property used in that business;
 - (c) the prohibition of the carrying on of banking business in Australia by private banks.”

Fortunately, the Bill was rejected by the Privy Council, but the philosophy behind it is still maintained by the Labor Party. If the left wing gets control of the Labor Party, legislation based on a similar philosophy could be introduced. Indeed, as all honourable members are aware, the left wing just about has control of the Labor Party. We are not dealing with Mr Hawke and Mr Keating; it is Mr Crean and other shadowy characters in the background who control this nation.

The capital gains tax will be a real killer. The Federal Treasurer, when announcing the tax package, said that the capital gains tax would be introduced from Friday. In other words, last Thursday, everyone was all right; but from last Friday, everyone will look at what they will buy and what they will not buy.

The tax will affect farmers and station-owners who are affected by droughts, floods and fires. Even the little man will be affected.

In my electorate, a fellow who runs a milk bar opens at 5.10 a.m. on the dot and closes at 8.45 p.m. on the dot, seven days a week. He works 15 hours 35 minutes a day and 109 hours 5 minutes a week. He and his wife are the only two in the shop. The point is that that fellow will never get wages for the hours he works. He is working to build up a business that he can sell at a capital profit, which, in turn, he will put into another business. If he is taxed on that capital gain, that will—excuse my French—knock the guts out of him.

The one thing that keeps small-businessmen going is the knowledge that, if they work hard and work flat out, they will benefit. The same thing applies to people in the bush. If a person is building up a big cattle property, he has to work like blazes for a number of years and put all the profits back into the property in the form of good breeding stock, among other things. No matter what the percentage of the capital gains tax is now, it will be a killer later on. For every Australian round the country—

Mr Borbidge: It will send rental accommodation up by 30 per cent.

Mr JENNINGS: As my colleague the member for Surfers Paradise said, the capital gains tax will force rents up.

It will destroy the basis of incentive that has flowed throughout the nation's history. Australia is one of the few remaining developing countries in the world, and vast areas of Queensland alone have yet to be developed. Approximately 500 000 square miles of Queensland is still leasehold. When that is converted to freehold, there will be an enormous influx of capital, given the right development conditions.

Senator Chipp considers that he and his party, the Australian Democrats, have had a big victory with the introduction of the capital gains tax. He went further and complimented the Government. I am astonished that he would compliment the Government on such a crazy scheme.

A number of lurks and perks have already been suggested. One idea is that a company or a business buys a plaque in a restaurant on which it can advertise for a few weeks. The company is then paid for the plaque and its representatives get a meal in exchange.

Things such as that are crazy; this nation does not want them. A flat-rate tax is simple. No-one will pay more tax. It will provide the incentive for people to work longer. I reckon that we can sell the flat-rate tax out in the market-place. The new scheme that has been produced is a beauty; it is one of the best.

Taxation on cars provided to employees does not affect members of the bureaucracy who have cars provided for them, but it will affect the employees of private enterprise. In addition, if a company that used to replace its cars every two years now decides that it will do so only every three years, many people in the motor industry will find themselves out of work. That is absolutely ridiculous and will have a big impact on the nation.

Mr Borbidge: Do you think Mr Hawke will pay the fringe benefits tax on The Lodge and Kirribilli House?

Mr JENNINGS: That is another thing.

Mrs Chapman: No, he's getting off scot-free.

Mr JENNINGS: That is right.

In this morning's *Courier-Mail*, the Australian Bank Employees Union placed an advertisement that states, in part—

“For bank employees, many of these ‘benefits’ are actually concessions given to offset conditions of work. Bank employees are not high income earners.

Those who can least afford it will suffer most.

It is obvious that these measures do nothing to create a fairer taxation system for Australians. Once again the ordinary working person must suffer as bandaid procedures are applied in a superficial attempt to alleviate the inequities of the system."

The problem with the new taxes is that the system has not been thought through. The big losers will be business. The taxation of fringe benefits will create many anomalies. Because the legislation has not been introduced to the House, half the details are not known.

The importance in the bush of a capital gains tax is absolutely incredible. The idea of hitting the Queen Street farmer, the Pitt Street farmer and the Collins Street farmer is absurd. If those people legitimately earn money in the city, why should they not put that into the bush? Why should they not build up their properties in the bush?

Mr Littleproud: It creates employment; it creates sales.

Mr JENNINGS: Of course it does. That is one of the most important things. If the Government removes that influx of capital into the bush, it will destroy many people in the bush. That money from the city provides much development work out there.

Mrs Chapman: "Profit" is a dirty word.

Mr JENNINGS: Yes, and they are prophets of doom.

Australia is currently facing a big crisis. Many newspapers have featured articles about the seriousness of the position of the people in the bush who have worked hard all their lives and about the fact that a capital gains tax on them will be an absolute killer and a discouragement to investment. What is absolutely vital is that Australians invest more and more and produce more and more. One instance is the beef industry, which can produce the cheapest beef in the world. Many other areas are worthy of investment.

The whole basis of the Federal Government's policy is that it can spend money better than individual Australians. A single-rate tax policy will ensure that a person spends his own money. Who better to spend it—the Government or the individual? That is what it amounts to. The Government thinks that it should spend more.

Only last year, Sir Arvi Parbo said that an increasing number of today's union-leaders had never done a day's work alongside their members. That is a great pity and is one of the reasons that many industrial problems are cropping up.

Another fact is that 70 per cent of companies that have introduced shorter working weeks since 1981 have had to increase prices and reduce production. As a result, a third of the work-force—that is more than two millions Australians—could find their income severely reduced or, worse still, have no income at all.

Because of the use of computers and all the other gobbledegook, today, Australia has a more intelligent society. That is why the single-rate tax is the answer.

Another very important matter on which I shall touch very quickly is Aboriginal land rights. Before doing so, I should say that the member for Cook praised the Government for its support of the Queensland tobacco industry. He said also that everything must be done to support that industry.

The Opposition argues with the Government about taxes; but I should mention, as the Minister for Primary Industries mentioned recently, the amount of money raised by other States from tobacco taxes. Of course, none is raised in Queensland. In New South Wales, it is \$69.36m; in Victoria, \$83.8m; in South Australia, \$29.27m; in Western

Australia, \$46.72m; in Tasmania, \$9.56m; and in the Northern Territory, \$2.4m. That is a total of \$241.4m raised in other States by way of tobacco taxes, but not a dollar is raised by way of a tobacco tax in Queensland. Do honourable members opposite agree with that?

Mr Borbidge: Silence!

Mr JENNINGS: Silence!

Last year, after the ALP conference at which the mob kicked, spat at and knocked Hayden down the stairs, a report was issued that big business liked the general trend at the ALP conference. What has happened now? What about the big employers and the many small businesses? That was one of the worst misrepresentations that it made.

Another great misrepresentation occurred in relation to Queensland's Aboriginal land rights. Queensland is the only fair dinkum State in Australia with land rights for Aborigines. The Commonwealth is a sham. What it is practising is simply apartheid. The Victorian Social Development Commission recommended that income tax should be increased on all non-Aborigines as a means of financing compensation in Aboriginal land claims.

Dame Roma Mitchell says many things. She criticised the Queensland Aboriginal land rights legislation.

Mr Borbidge: Who is she?

Mr JENNINGS: I think she has something to do with the Human Rights Commission. I think that the Federal Attorney-General found that out. Last year, Dr H. C. Coombs said that the National Aboriginal Conference was out of touch with Aboriginal organisations and that its executive was increasingly concerned about status and privileges for themselves. When one knows what rackets they have been working, one can understand why that is so.

In the House of Representatives, Mr Cobb asked the following question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs—

“Did he direct the National Aboriginal Conference not to purchase cars for NAC members and did the NAC go ahead and purchase the cars, despite this direction? Did the Minister then agree to the cars, acquired contrary to his direction, being purchased by 27 members of the NAC with the assistance of loans from the Aboriginal Development Fund? Further, did the Minister approve a \$409,000 reduction in the NAC budget to offset the loans?”

Mr Holding replied—

“A sum of, I believe, approximately \$250,000 was allocated in the National Aboriginal Conference budget for car purchases in the relevant period. I became aware of the NAC going over that figure and providing each NAC member with a car. That was contrary to the general direction I had issued. I then issued two letters to the NAC indicating that it should comply with my directions.”

Who runs that show? Despite the direction issued by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, the National Aboriginal Conference purchases cars for its members.

Mr Borbidge: Did the Federal Public Accounts Committee pick that up?

Mr JENNINGS: In the few minutes remaining to me, I was going to refer to that public accounts committee.

Many serious events have occurred in Mr Holding's administration. Aborigines are not being given individual title. In Queensland, they are being given individual title, but they are certainly not receiving any from Canberra.

Mr McPhie: We have a very good Minister here.

Mr JENNINGS: Of course.

The honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) summed up the situation beautifully when he praised the auditing system in Queensland. He said that the system introduced in 1977 was outstanding and the best in Australia. Queensland has not had the graft, corruption and rackets that existed in New South Wales and Victoria. Although they have parliamentary public accounts committees, what are they? Nothing!

The Racing Development Fund has done fantastic things for the racing industry in Queensland. It has been administered brilliantly. I challenge Opposition members to say that the Racing Development Fund money spent on racecourses should not have been spent. It is a blueprint for the industry's growth and prosperity throughout Australia. Many jobs have been created, which is most important.

I have praised the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) for his handling of the dispute between the SEQEB and the ETU. As far as the Government is concerned, an essential service is an essential service, and that is the way it should be.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (3.34 p.m.): The 1985-86 State Budget was a non-event. Both major daily newspapers, the *Telegraph* and *The Courier-Mail* gave far greater coverage to the marriage of Mrs Sangster (the former Mrs Peacock) to Mr Renouf, and to the Liberal Party's Peacock who had been reduced to a feather duster on the day that the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) brought down Queensland's Budget.

To support that statement, I refer to one newspaper which stated that the Premier's office had issued an instruction to all press secretaries to promote everything that they could find in the State Budget. However, they said that there was not much to shout about.

Mr Peter Morley, a political writer for *The Courier-Mail*, under the heading "Budget deserved few headlines", stated—

"Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen is a master at making headlines, but when it comes to his annual Budget his luck is out."

The Leader of the Opposition and member for Sandgate (Mr Warburton) made a very comprehensive speech to this Committee when he replied on Tuesday last. I will not waste the time of the Committee by speaking to the Budget, but will continue to support the words of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who, when speaking in the Address in Reply debate on 3 September, spoke of the broken promises of industries to build in Queensland; the fairy stories about the National Party's role in Queensland development; the billions of dollars that were to be spent in Queensland and the thousands of people who would be employed on those projects; and the hundreds of thousands of jobs that would be created to service those projects.

Unfortunately, though, those projects are phantom projects, having been announced over and over again. Those projects appear spasmodically as headlines, with a new one sometimes making the headlines for political propaganda and receiving the support of the same National Party cronies.

I will never support those phantom projects. I have seen too many small businesses go deeper into debt. Other people invest in hotels, motels or other real estate on the strength of an announcement by the Premier of these phantom projects, only to see that these projects never come to fruition. The businesses go bankrupt, or go broke and close their doors for the last time.

Young couples, too, have gone into debt and committed themselves to hire-purchase or loan repayments far in excess of what can be serviced by an ordinary flat wage, in the mistaken belief that construction of these industries would continue for years with wages boosted by unlimited overtime and other site allowances. So now we see great unemployment in this State, at the highest level of any State in Australia.

These phantom projects are always to come into my electorate of Gladstone in particular. When one reads about these projects, one finds out what has been done to the real estate market.

On 26 July 1985, *The Gladstone Observer* contained an article headed "Gladstone down, but prepared for growth". The article states—

"A Queensland valuers firm. . .

Herron Todd Valuers make the prediction in the new publication, 'Trendicator,' created to keep its clients informed of real estate trends within regional Queensland."

The article further states—

"The report says the number and value of building approvals have declined since 1981 by more than 84.5 per cent in Gladstone city and by 75.6 per cent in Calliope Shire. Real estate investment in Gladstone and area has declined dramatically since 1980/81.

Real estate values have dropped by between 15 per cent and 50 per cent, the report says.

"Townhouse units were selling at the peak for \$50,000 to \$55,000, and are now in the \$30,000 to \$33,000 value range. Quality home units have declined from \$105,000 to about \$50,000. The standard high set home which sold for \$50,000 plus in 1981 is now selling in the low \$40,000 range and single family dwelling sites which sold for \$16,000 at the peak can be purchased for about \$12,000.' it says."

The article continues—

"The report discusses a decline in occupancy rates for hotel/motel rooms but notes that Gladstone's port trade is improving."

I do not know how the Gladstone port trade would have any bearing on that. I cannot understand how the valuers relate the port trade to the hotel/motel bed trade. Unfortunately, the hotels and motels cannot fill beds with coal, grain, oil, bauxite or alumina, which make the ports so busy.

On 18 June 1985, *The Gladstone Observer* contained an article headed "Land prices yet to feel 'boom' ". I do not know what boom that article refers to, because certainly no boom is on the horizon and this State definitely did not experience a boom in the 1984-85 period.

Earlier this month, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) listed the phantom million-dollar projects that never came to fruition. I make particular reference to the Alcan aluminium smelter, at Gladstone; Boyne Island aluminium smelter Stage 2, at Gladstone; a coke plant, at Gladstone; shale-oil, at Gladstone; Rundle shale-oil, and not forgetting the other two shale-oil projects; and the caustic soda plant, at Gladstone.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in referring to the phantom projects, did not mention the 500 central Queensland jobs associated with the gas pipeline, to Gladstone; the plans for a \$2.3 billion oxidisation plant, for Gladstone; an alloy plant, for Gladstone; a titanium plant, for Gladstone; a chemical plant and steel-works, for Gladstone; a petroleum plant, for Gladstone; a caustic soda plant, for Gladstone; or a urea plant, which would employ 1 400 construction workers, for Gladstone. The list goes on and on.

When attention is turned to private enterprise, it will be seen that K mart was to provide a \$15m supermarket, which would employ 3 300 people, and that an eight-storey hotel/motel was to be built in the city. However, neither of those planned projects has come to fruition over the period that the Government is talking about. I have said that I would not support these phantom projects.

Every time the Premier and Treasurer returns from his overseas junkets, he makes the same kind of announcements. For years now, the Premier and Treasurer, after hocking more of Queensland by way of overseas borrowings, returns to tell Queenslanders

about the talks he has held with people involved in companies that want to invest billions of dollars in Queensland.

I have been reported in the newspapers as having said—

“Such investors have failed to support these phantom industrial projects we have been told of. In fact, Dr Oskar who had spoken to and had the full support of the Premier for his oil seed industrial operations, is still in prison in England. No doubt, with plenty of spare time to think up another fraudulent scheme that will gain the support of the Premier and his Government.

Really, how could any intelligent person believe the Premier of this State. His claim to fame must now be that he is seen as Australia's joke. Queensland and every Queenslander is now the laughing stock for all other Australians.

Every concert hall, theatre, stage and newspaper in Australia is used by every comedian impersonator or cartoonist to portray Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen as a stuttering, stammering clown, the most intelligent member of the Queensland National Party Government.”

No, the Premier and Treasurer will not have my support for these phantom projects.

In a publication titled *Queensland '85—State Enterprise*, the Premier says that other commercial developments that are planned include a coke plant for Gladstone—I understand that that is the same one as has been spoken about for years—and a manufacturing plant for caustic soda and shale-oil. That is, of course, the Rundle shale-oil project, the Nagoorin shale-oil project, the Condor shale-oil projects and all of the other shale-oil projects that the Government of Queensland will not support. Sir Ian MacFarlane has gone to Kentucky in America because he has been given assistance in relation to the extraction of oil from shale at a reasonable price. However, he did not get the support of the Queensland Government.

On 13 March this year, the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) is reported as having said—

“A proposed \$1.2 billion Gladstone coke plant would not be built in the near future because of a slump in the world coke market.”

Yet, last Sunday, the Premier said that the project is on its way.

I again refer to what has been said by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, as follows—

“A proposed \$300m caustic soda plant using Israeli technology in Gladstone has been put on the ‘back burner’ and it might not go ahead.”

That was another project that was supposed to be coming to Queensland and that Mr Ahern then said was not.

The report goes on—

“Mr Ahern said he viewed proposals to build a gas pipeline from either the Denison Trough or south-west Queensland to Gladstone with optimism.”

That report demonstrates that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology has different views and different ideas from the ones expressed by the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland. I have no doubt that Mr Ahern is more fair dinkum when he says that the projects will not be coming, but the Premier and Treasurer, for the purposes of political propagandising, has said that all of the projects are on the way.

The latest figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that in the Gladstone region, bed occupancy in the tourism industry is now 45 per cent. I suggest that that figure is inflated, because motels change hands frequently. A great percentage of homes have “For Sale” notices on them and have been placed in the hands of every agent in the area. Sales in real estate in the Gladstone area favour the buyer, and that is not a good sign. That shows that most vendors are under pressure and desperately need to sell. That is quite a different picture from the one painted by the National Party in this State.

In support of what I am saying, I point out that the latest electoral figures for Port Curtis show a drop of 891 in voters as at August 1985 from the number for December 1984. In just eight months, the electorate has been reduced by 891 voters. When one sees that the number of voters has been reduced from 18 403 to 17 512, one wonders how many people are in this growth city. According to projections made some years ago by the Co-ordinator-General's Department, in 1985 Gladstone should have had a population of 46 221, but there would be barely half that number in the region. Although this National Party Government says for political purposes that there is a great deal happening in Queensland, and particularly in the growth area of Gladstone, the statistics and the figures available from the electoral rolls show that the information that the Premier is feeding people is untrue.

I will give one more illustration of the Premier's political propaganda, half of which never comes to fruition. However, he still takes a bow and, for cheap political propaganda purposes, tells untruths whenever it suits him. The Local Government Association of Queensland recently held its State conference in Gladstone. I could relate many stories about what went on but, as I have only 18 minutes left, I will have to keep them for another day. The Premier opened that conference, and by all accounts, one could have been forgiven for thinking that it was Gerry Connolly on stage doing an impersonation of a National Party fun night.

First of all, the mayor of Gladstone gave the customary welcome. He praised the Premier for the \$50m infrastructure loan that he had given or promised to the city. Every now and again during the speech, the Premier stood to take another bow. Again, one could be forgiven for thinking that he had a burr in the seat of his pants, or in that vicinity. I will tell members the truth. The Gladstone district, let alone the city of Gladstone itself, did not get \$50m from the State Government in that infrastructure package.

I wrote to the Premier asking how that so-called \$50m loan had been spent, and in which year. The Premier replied in a letter. I ask leave to have that letter incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Postal: Box 191 Brisbane
North Quay 4000
Office: Executive Building
100 George Street
Brisbane
Telephone: 224 4800
Telex: AA 42300

Treasurer of Queensland
30th October, 1984.

Mr. W. G. Prest, M.L.A.,
Member for Port Curtis,
P.O. Box 239,
Gladstone. Qld. 4680.

Dear Mr. Prest,

In your letter of 20th September, 1984, you sought details of the Government's expenditure in the Gladstone area under the special infrastructure program announced in August, 1981.

The program was undertaken to provide the necessary infrastructure for the population of Gladstone, which at that stage was increasing rapidly and was expected to continue its rapid growth.

The elements of the program were:

- a rebuilding of the Gladstone-Benaraby Road, with a State Government contribution of \$2 million, and a total estimated cost of \$8 million;
- Pre-schools, primary and secondary schools and a T.A.F.E. college with a total estimated cost of \$18 million;
- a new 120 bed hospital;
- a new Police Station and the expansion of an existing Station;
- building of new Government Office space;
- building of a Community Health Unit;
- provision of 70 houses for Crown employees, to help overcome the housing shortage;
- development of new residential land by the Lands Administration Commission;
- \$6.25 million in concessional loans to Gladstone City Council and Calliope Shire Council.

However, the decline in the population growth rate in the Gladstone area, from the high level of 1981, has meant that the growth in demand for land, housing and other services has been lower than anticipated at the time the program was drawn up. For this reason, the Government, while ensuring that the backlog of services has been overcome, has tailored the provision of new services to the growth in demand for such services. The major variations in the implementation of the program, which have occurred as a result of this reduced growth rate, are:

- the withdrawal of L. J. Hooker from the plan to build a new Gladstone-Benaraby road; because of the reduced demand for residential land, L. J. Hooker postponed development of some residential estates, and also withheld contribution to the road, which was to serve these estates, until the estates can be opened as a commercial venture.
- the upgrading of the existing Gladstone-Benaraby road; as well as fulfilling its commitment to develop the first stage of the new road, the Government joined with Comalco to redevelop the existing road to Benaraby, which was considered more appropriate to the current needs of the area;
- only \$437,000 of the total \$1.5 million, which was made available to the Lands Administration Commission for development of residential land, has been needed to date, because of the reduced demand for land;
- the less than expected need for the provision of schools in Gladstone, due to the lower growth, and in some cases an actual decline, in enrolments; the current educational needs of the area are now fully serviced to standards at least equivalent to those of other areas of the State.

It should be stressed that the infrastructure backlog which existed in Gladstone has been overcome by the program, and that the Government is ensuring by this program that the Gladstone area does not suffer a shortage of services and facilities in the future.

As to your request for expenditure details, I set out below details of spending on the individual items of the infrastructure program.

1. GLADSTONE-BENARABY ROAD

Although the other participants have withdrawn from the project at present, the Queensland Government has gone ahead with its contribution to the development of the new Gladstone-Benaraby road, spending the following amounts:—

| | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 1982/83 | \$829,500 |
| 1983/84 | \$1,406,700 |
| 1984/85 | \$45,000 |
| TOTAL | \$2,281,200 |

Because the new residential estates have not yet eventuated, construction of the remainder of the road is not necessary at present. However, in a joint project with Comalco, the Government undertook the upgrading of the existing Gladstone-Benaraby road in 1983/84, at a total cost of \$3,555,200. Total expenditure on these roads to date has been \$5,836,400.

2. SCHOOLS

Pre-Schools

Five new centres have been built under this program, and the seven centres in the Gladstone area cater for 397 children. Expenditure on these centres has been:

| Centre | 1981/82 \$ | Expenditure 1982/83 \$ | Total \$ |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Boyne Island | 112,000 | 20,000 | 132,000 |
| Calliope | 118,000 | 3,000 | 121,000 |
| Gladstone South | 145,000 | .. | 145,000 |
| Kinkora | 148,000 | 8,000 | 156,000 |
| Tannum Sands | 27,000 | 120,000 | 147,000 |
| TOTAL | 550,000 | 151,000 | 701,000 |

Primary Schools

Two new schools have been opened under the program, and the six other schools have been expanded with new teaching centres and other facilities. These eight schools (including the Gladstone Special School) cater for 3,532 students. Expenditure on the schools is as follows:

| School | Actual Expenditure | | | Proposed Expenditure | Total \$ |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | 1981/82 \$ | 1982/83 \$ | 1983/84 \$ | 1984/85 \$ | |
| Boyne Island | 316,000 | 5,000 | .. | 30,000 | 351,000 |
| Calliope | .. | .. | .. | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Kinkora | 654,000 | 27,000 | .. | .. | 681,000 |

| School | Actual Expenditure | | Proposed Expenditure | | Total |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | 1981/82 | 1982/83 | 1983/84 | 1984/85 | |
| Tannum Sands | \$ 231,000 | \$ 1,189,000 | \$ 5,000 | \$.. | \$ 1,425,000 |
| Gladstone Central | .. | 25,000 | 8,000 | .. | 33,000 |
| Gladstone South | 237,000 | 104,000 | 6,000 | .. | 347,000 |
| Gladstone West | 209,000 | 46,000 | .. | .. | 255,000 |
| Special | .. | 52,000 | 8,000 | .. | 60,000 |
| TOTAL | 1,647,000 | 1,448,000 | 27,000 | 60,000 | 3,182,000 |

3. Secondary Schools

With the new school at Toolooa, the 1,881 students in the Gladstone area are serviced by two high schools (well ahead of the normal provision of 1,250 pupils per school). Because student numbers are no longer increasing, further extensions originally envisaged in the program must await a sufficient growth in enrolments. Actual expenditure and planned expenditure for the current year on the Toolooa High School are:—

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | | \$ |
| Actual expenditure— | 1981/82 | 808,000 |
| | 1982/83 | 834,000 |
| | 1983/84 | 547,000 |
| | Total | 2,189,000 |
| Proposed Expenditure— | 1984/85 | 562,000 |

T.A.F.E. College

The Gladstone T.A.F.E. College has been designed in two stages. Prior to the Gladstone Infrastructure Program, a sum of \$3,322,000 had been spent on building the new college.

Under the Program the first stage of the College has been completed. Design work has commenced on Stage II, and it is expected that this stage will be completed by 1987.

Actual and estimated expenditure under the infrastructure program on the two stages are:

| School | Actual Expenditure | | 1983/84 | Estimated Expenditure 1984/85 | Total |
|--------------|--------------------|------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| | 1981/82 | 1982/83 | | | |
| Stage I | \$ 2,320,000 | \$ 369,000 | \$.. | \$.. | \$ 2,689,000 |
| Stage II | .. | 21,000 | 1,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,022,000 |
| TOTAL | | | | | 5,711,000 |

As indicated previously, the current educational needs of the people of Gladstone are now serviced to standards at least equivalent to those of other areas of the State.

3. HOSPITAL

The new 120 bed hospital (including Medical and Maternity Wards) has been erected as planned. Actual expenditure for the last three years is:

| | |
|---------|--------------|
| 1981/82 | \$ 13,900 |
| 1982/83 | \$ 2,588,400 |
| 1983/84 | \$ 4,177,300 |

TOTAL \$6,779,600

An estimated \$281,000 is to be spent in 1984/85.

Although this expenditure is below the preliminary estimate of \$10 million, the hospital has been fully completed as planned.

4. POLICE STATIONS

New police stations have been constructed at Boyne Island and Tannum Sands, and the existing Gladstone Station has been expanded and upgraded.

Expenditure on these projects has been:

| | Expenditure | | | Total |
|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| | 1981/82 | 1982/83 | 1983/84 | |
| Boyne Island | \$ 135,000 | \$.. | \$.. | \$ 135,000 |
| Tannum Sands | 1,000 | 173,000 | .. | 174,000 |
| Gladstone | .. | 112,000 | 151,000 | 263,000 |
| TOTAL | | | | 572,000 |

5. GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Although only \$1 million was originally allocated to this project, the growing need for Government office space has meant that further expenditure has been necessary. A Government Office Block and Court House were planned in the program, and a Motor Vehicle Inspection Centre has been included in the revised plans. Actual and planned expenditure on these projects are as follows:

| Building | Actual Expenditure | | | Proposed Expenditure | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| | 1981/82 \$'000 | 1982/83 \$'000 | 1983/84 \$'000 | 1984/85 1986/87 \$'000 | |
| Gladstone Government Office Block | 592 | 316 | 1,244 | 34 | 2,186 |
| Motor Vehicle Inspection Centre | .. | .. | .. | 650 | 650 |
| Court House | 44 | 8 | .. | 2,530 | 2,582 |
| TOTAL | 636 | 324 | 1,244 | 3,214 | 5,418 |

6. COMMUNITY HEALTH UNIT

This project has proceeded as planned. Actual and proposed expenditure on the unit are:

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Actual Expenditure | 1981/82 | \$2,000 |
| | 1982/83 | \$154,000 |
| | 1983/84 | \$1,104,000 |
| Proposed Expenditure | 1984/85 | \$30,000 |
| | TOTAL | \$1,290,000 |

7. CROWN EMPLOYEE HOUSING

Because of the reduced demand for housing in the Gladstone area, expenditure on housing for Crown employees has been below the expected figure. As housing demand increases it is expected that expenditure on this item will increase. Actual and expected expenditure up to 1984/85 on this project are:

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Actual expenditure | 1981/82 | \$737,000 |
| | 1982/83 | \$839,000 |
| | 1983/84 | \$43,000 |
| Expected expenditure | 1984/85 | \$160,000 |
| | TOTAL | \$1,779,000 |

8. RESIDENTIAL HOUSING

As promised in the original program, \$1.5 million was made available to the Urban Crown Land Development Fund in 1981/82 to allow development of residential land in the Gladstone area. However, with the fall in demand for land and housing, less than one-third of the available amount has been needed to date. The funding is still available for this project, so that development can occur as the need arises.

Actual expenditure on this item is as follows:

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| 1981/82 | \$252,900 |
| 1982/83 | \$120,100 |
| 1983/84 | \$63,900 |
| TOTAL | \$436,900 |

9. CONCESSIONAL LOANS

\$6.25 million in concessional loans has been advanced to the two local authorities as planned. The breakdown of these loans is as follows:

| Advanced to: | Gladstone City Council \$ | Calliope Shire Council \$ |
|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1981/82 | 1,000,000 | 200,000 |
| 1982/83 | 2,000,000 | 419,200 |
| 1983/84 | 2,000,000 | 630,800 |
| TOTAL | \$5,000,000 | \$1,250,000 |

The loans have enabled these local authorities to undertake roadworks, sewerage schemes, water supply works, community buildings and other essential projects.

The wide range of facilities provided under this program has meant that the serious backlog of infrastructure work which arose from the extraordinary rate of growth in the area has been overcome. The urgent need for schools, medical facilities, land and housing and other services has been met and the original objectives have been achieved. The position will be kept under

review with a view to reactivating the program if necessary to ensure the maintenance of current standards.

I trust that this information satisfactorily answers your questions.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) Joh Bjelke-Petersen

(J. Bjelke-Petersen)
Premier and Treasurer.

Mr PREST: The letter shows that \$31,218,700 was spent or was proposed to be spent in Gladstone and district. Of that amount \$6,250,000 was in loans that had to be repaid with interest. So the actual figure was not \$50m, but \$24,968,700. That money was the total capital works spending in the area and was not a special allocation. It was \$24,968,700 of ordinary capital works money that had not been spent in the area at a time when the region urgently needed funds by way of infrastructure loans, and that was when the initial development in the area was taking place. That was when the population of the Gladstone district was growing from the original 6 000 to the 1981 figure of approximately 23 000.

I will tell members a little more about that comical conference. When addressing it, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) read word for word a speech that had been given 12 days earlier in Alice Springs by the Federal Liberal back-bencher, Mr Paul Everingham. A newspaper article stated—

“Mr Hinze gave his speech three days ago in Gladstone, at the Local Government Association annual conference.

Mr Hinze’s speech was 38 pages long, but the first 13 pages, or 46 paragraphs, matched Mr Everingham’s.”

Imagine the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing addressing the important State conference of the Local Government Association and reading a speech by the Federal Opposition spokesman on local government.

I will tell the Chamber still more about the conference. The Minister read his speech, and it went over like a lead balloon. The next speaker at the conference was the National Party Federal member for Kennedy (Mr Bob Katter, senior). He said that local government must have constitutional recognition. He could not have been aware that, at the Constitutional Convention held in Brisbane between 29 July and 2 August 1985, only five weeks earlier, the National Party members and the Liberal Party members representing Queensland voted against a motion to grant such recognition to local government. They were: the Honourable W. A. M. Gunn, representing Somerset; the Honourable N. T. Harper, representing Auburn; Mr K. R. Lingard, representing Fassifern; Mr G. Alison, representing Maryborough; and Sir William Knox, representing Nundah. The Labor members of the Queensland delegation, that is, Mr N. Warburton, representing Sandgate; Mr T. Burns, representing Lytton; and Mr E. Casey, representing Mackay, voted for the motion. That was written up in the July-August issue of the *Loggov Digest*. The digest listed who was fair dinkum and how the Liberal and National Party delegates would not give constitutional recognition to local government in Queensland.

On 5 September, the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni), by way of ministerial statement, said that my speech in the Matters of Public Interest debate on 4 September was untruthful and that I did not know what I was talking about when I spoke of stage 2 of the State fire services levy. He said that I was absolutely wrong when I said that he, and not the local authorities, which he had tried to blame, was totally to blame for the bungling. The Minister knew the feeling of the local government conference. When addressing it, he said that he had to accept and publicly accepted, that he was responsible for the bungling and the increased costs involved in rectifying stage 2 of the fire services levy. My statements in the House were correct and the Minister should be replaced as the Minister in charge of fire services.

A press report of the Minister's comments on the introduction of the second stage of the fire services levy, is in these terms—

“Speaking at the Queensland Local Government Association conference in Gladstone yesterday, the Minister assured delegates he had no intentions of ‘ducking’ his responsibility for the problems associated with levies to commercial and industrial premises.

He promised councils a very high priority would be given to overcoming the problems associated with stage two of the levy as quickly as possible.”

The Minister recognised that problems still existed. It was a hit and miss affair, even after he introduced a different category and different charges.

The article continued—

“But to questions dealing with extra compensation to be paid to local authorities for administering the levy in face of complications, Mr Tenni would not budge.

‘You will be compensated for what we have offered you and that is all you will get and no more,’ Mr Tenni said.”

The Minister put local authorities in Queensland to unnecessary costs, but he said that they would get nothing from him.

Mr John Moore, the president of the Liberal Party in Queensland and Federal Opposition spokesman on local government—he won that position from Mr Paul Everingham after losing in his attempt to become Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Federal sphere—when addressing the Queensland Local Government conference, told the delegates that local government should raise its own finance by its rates and charges and not expect financial hand-outs from other Governments. If that is the policy of the Liberal Party in government, or in coalition government, local government will have to paddle its own canoe. But that is nothing new. Local government has always been more favourably treated by a Labor Government even though, at election-time, all parties make promises of assistance to the local authorities but, after the election is over, those promises are somehow forgotten. Mr Moore told the local authorities that they would not get financial assistance from his party if it became the Government.

That is virtually the position in Queensland. The Government takes away huge subsidies from local government, hands back a little money—a pittance—and thinks it is doing a wonderful job. Promises, promises and promises, but none is ever kept. That seems to be the pattern of the National and Liberal parties. One is no better than the other.

I will talk about only one more topic discussed at the local government comical conference, and that is the price of fuel and the way in which that conference blamed the Federal Labor Government for increased costs. Let me again remind honourable members of the position. It is on record in *Hansard* that it was the policy of the National Party to increase the price of petrol beyond the capacity of the user to pay, thus saving a dwindling commodity.

Mr Elliott: Where is it on record?

Mr PREST: That statement was made by the member for Flinders and present Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter). He made that statement when the Fraser Government was in office in Canberra and his father was a Minister in that Government. The only promise kept by the Liberal-National Party Government was the one to increase the price of fuel.

For delegates to the local government conference to try to blame the Federal Labor Government for fuel price increases is ironic. The Local Government Association, at a conference of the Australian Council of Local Government Associations held in Brisbane only in November 1984, supported a proposal to ask the Federal Labor Government to place a new petrol tax levy of 1.25c a litre on fuel and to index that levy. Under that

proposal, about \$260m would be raised in the first year and handed to local authorities for local and arterial roadworks under the control of local government. So, in one breath the local authorities are asking the Federal Labor Government to increase the price of fuel and give them that extra \$260m, and in the other breath they are condemning the Federal Government for increasing fuel costs. That is enough of the local government conference at this stage. An article headed "New petrol levy proposed for roads" appeared in the *Locgov Digest* of December 1984. That levy was proposed by the Australian Council of Local Government Associations and had the support of the local Government Association of Queensland.

Let me move on to another broken promise, this time by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze). In April 1982, a meeting was held between the Government, the Gladstone City Council and the Gladstone Turf Club. After lengthy discussions, the Minister promised \$1.7m to the Gladstone Turf Club for the redevelopment of the Ferguson Park Racecourse. Plans and tender documents for the associated facilities for the new race-track have been in the Minister's office for some time.

On Wednesday, 11 September this year, the Gladstone Turf Club met again with the Minister. He said, "I'll give you \$1m for your track." Without any grass being planted or any soil being moved, the Minister has come down from \$1.7m to \$1m. That is a drop of \$700,000. It now appears that he wants to forget the facilities for the public, the stables, etc.

At the meeting with the Minister in April 1982, all parties agreed that they would not renege on the verbal agreement made. It appears that the Gladstone Turf Club is the only party that has not wshed on the agreement. The Gladstone City Council now has its roundabout and access road to the industrial area. For the last 12 months, the council has endeavoured to delay the redevelopment of the Ferguson Park Racecourse on its present site and has offered an alternative site that is yet to be reclaimed. That reclaimed land may be available in 10 to 15 years.

The Gladstone Turf Club is not at all interested in the council's proposal. It wants a racecourse and facilities now at a cost of \$1.7m, not a promise of a new course and facilities in 15 to 20 years, and at God only knows what cost.

Now the Gladstone City Council is considering the demolition of the present horse stalls at the course. So what has the Gladstone Turf Club got for its efforts and for its co-operation with the other authorities to allow part of the racecourse reserve to be used for road purposes? A promise, and nothing more. The Gladstone Turf Club has been the meat in the sandwich. The Gladstone City Council has got what it wanted, so beggar the Gladstone Turf Club.

The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing has made a promise that he has not kept. The Government received great publicity from the proposed \$1.7m redevelopment of the Ferguson Park Racecourse in the publication *Queensland Million Dollar Projects*. Tourist brochures state that Gladstone boasts an extensive range of sporting facilities, including an Olympic swimming-pool, bowling greens, squash courts and a first-class racecourse called Ferguson Park. To say that Gladstone has a first-class racecourse is a laugh. The promoters of that tourist brochure should be charged with fraudulent and misleading advertising.

The Minister for Racing made a promise to the Gladstone Turf Club. It has played its part and has done everything requested of it. The Minister has stated that he never breaks a promise. However, as time goes by, the members of the Gladstone Turf Club could be forgiven for thinking that he has taken them for a ride.

The newspaper articles about the Gladstone racecourse are numerous. The headlines read, "Go-ahead for road—grass racetrack"; "Club moves ahead with \$17m plan"; " 'We're ready to go now,' says turf club"; "The great race wait"; and, "Hinze comes to party on race stables" The last-mentioned article appeared in February 1985, and now,

in September, the headlines read, "Hinze will put \$1m racecourse plan to State Cabinet". After only three and a half years, the Gladstone Turf Club is back to square one. A tourist industry publication stated that development of the Ferguson Park Racecourse on the Dawson Highway, Gladstone, would include the upgrading of the race-track, the construction of stables for 100 horses and the construction of new bar facilities and a function-rooms complex at the Gladstone Turf Club at a cost of \$1.7m, commencing in December 1983.

When I spoke in the debate on the Address in Reply, I expressed concern at part of the chairman's report in the annual report of the Queensland Chamber of Mines, particularly his statement about Government costs and charges to the mining industry and the effect that those charges have on placing coal on the overseas markets and on the competitiveness of Queensland mines with other suppliers.

Mr Keith Peterson, managing director of Queensland Alumina Ltd, when speaking at a luncheon hosted by his company, outlined the problems within the industry today and said that his plant had reduced daily production capacity from 7 000 tons a day to 5 000 tons a day. Mr Peterson blamed the plant production cost on a reduction in the world-wide demand for alumina from Queensland Alumina Ltd, but he also said that the plant's inability to keep costs at a low level had been a major contributor.

Outlining the changing relationship between industry and Governments at all levels, he said that in the boom days, emphasis was placed on encouraging projects by removing obstacles. However, today, projects were delayed, sometimes by years, because of the now necessary Government approvals, legislation requirements and red tape. Mr Peterson blamed Governments for burdening industry by imposing costs simply as a revenue-raising effort, and by adding to the industry's already increased running costs.

That is another instance in which a major company in this State, which employs a large work-force, has openly stated that Government charges are placing the industry in a situation in which it cannot compete on the world market. So much for a Government that boasts that it does not impose State taxes! Without doubt, this Government applies charges that are far in excess of charges in other States and in other countries. Because of criticism from companies such as Queensland Alumina Ltd of its charges, the Government should sit up and take notice.

I could go on for ages pointing out the areas in which the Government has done little, despite its boasts. In my electorate, the maternity wing of the local hospital, which has been built only for about nine years, is to be demolished. A need exists for a geriatric ward in which aged people can be placed on a temporary basis while the family is on holidays or when there is sickness in the family home. However, the Minister for Health is so inconsiderate that he would rather knock a building down than convert it into a ward in which geriatrics can be accommodated.

Mrs CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers) (4.5 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to have an opportunity to support the Budget delivered by the Premier and Treasurer. I commend most heartily the State Government's sound financial management, as evidenced by current economic indicators, which flies in the face of blatant Federal Labor Government discrimination.

Queensland has recorded the highest annual increase in retail sales, at 14.1 per cent, compared with the Australian average of 11.4 per cent. Queensland has the lowest annual inflation rate, the highest population growth and falling unemployment. Since 1983-84, exports have increased by 20 per cent; over the same period, mineral production has increased by 21.6 per cent; and, for the March quarter of this year, housing commencements have increased by 24 per cent.

This Government's ability not only to live within its means but also to compensate for the funds withdrawn by the cohorts of members opposite makes a mockery of the shallow cries of economic mismanagement from Labor members. It is no surprise that the Federal Government has done all it possibly can to choke off Queensland's funding.

It does that out of jealousy. The Federal Treasurer can barely convince his own party to have confidence in his preferred taxation proposal, let alone convince the electorate, an electorate that paid for an expensive public relations exercise, called a summit, in July of this year. What was the benefit—absolutely nothing! That summit clearly demonstrated that the tax system is in a mess and that reform is imperative. Current policies encourage evasion and restrict growth in the public sector. Encouragement of the public sector is the nation's only hope for sound economic recovery.

The share market reaction to the Claytons Federal Budget of 20 August, when the all ordinaries index fell 12 points, served to show that that Budget was not accepted. It created a justified nervousness about Labor's September tax package. The night prior to the delivery of that package, the market tumbled 16.3 points.

Because Federal taxes have killed initiative, enterprise and entrepreneurs, Australia has fallen behind the rest of the world. National support for a single-rate taxation system is rapidly mounting.

Mr Davis: Oh!

Mrs CHAPMAN: I wondered where the honourable member for Brisbane Central was. I miss him if he is not here when I am making a speech.

That single-rate taxation system was proposed recently by the Premier and Treasurer, and has been supported by the former secretary to the Treasury, John Stone.

Mr Davis: May I ask you a question?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order!

Mr Davis: I'll get back to you.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I will give the honourable member time. I realise that it takes a long time for those on the other side of the Chamber to get their thoughts together.

It is pertinent to note that Senator Lady Florence Bjelke-Petersen has promoted a flat-rate tax for many years.

Mr Milliner: And hasn't she made a fool of herself.

Mrs CHAPMAN: She has made no fool of herself. The honourable member should mark my words and wait and see.

Last week, in Brisbane, approximately 700 people attended a luncheon to hear details of the flat-tax proposal, which, incidentally, does not include a consumption tax or a capital gains tax, both of which have been talked about by that lousy so-and-so leader in Canberra.

In an endeavour to refresh the memories of members of the Opposition, I state that it was in February 1983 at the Sydney Opera House that the Prime Minister delivered his apple-pie election promise in which he gave the commitment that no capital gains tax would be introduced. That is just one broken promise. Who knows what is on the agenda for the future? Hawke can never make up his mind. He has had two or three summits. He is absolutely amazing. Evidently the past statements of the Labor Government cannot be trusted.

Australia is labouring under a complex taxation system that lacks widespread community understanding, let alone support. The time is nigh that the nation opted for a more equitable alternative that incorporates substantial real benefits for low-income-earners, provides the necessary incentive for increased effort and, most importantly, strikes at the root cause of tax avoidance and evasion.

In a shoddy attempt to portray itself as a Government of fiscal responsibility, the Commonwealth reduced its Budget deficit—at the expense of the States, most notably Queensland—but did not even attempt to limit its own expenditure. Federal Budget

payments to Queensland from all Commonwealth sources increased by 5.3 per cent, compared with an increase in Commonwealth discretionary expenditure for its own purposes of almost 12 per cent.

Over the past two years, Commonwealth tax collections have increased by nearly 32 per cent. Had the former tax-sharing formula of a percentage of tax collections being allocated to States, instead of any figure that the Commonwealth desires to nominate, remained in place, Queensland would have received an additional \$137.6m this financial year.

Mr Davis: Untrue.

Mrs CHAPMAN: It is true. Government members tell the truth more often than Opposition members do. One does not have to tell much truth to be more truthful than Opposition members, especially that fellow Comben. Where is he today? He is usually here screaming more lies. He is a chicken, if ever there was one.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to address other honourable members by their correct title.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I will refer to him as the member for Windsor, who speaks with forked tongue.

Coupled with the Grants Commission recommendations, the effective reduction in identified health grants and the Medicare discrimination will shortchange Queensland by \$362m in 1985-86. That is scandalous.

Despite the ramifications of these Federal decisions, the National Party State Government has still balanced its Budget and upheld its commitment not to introduce new taxes or increase existing taxes more than to maintain their value. The Queensland economy, and thus the Government's fiscal policies, have passed the test of strength in the eyes of world financiers, as is shown by Queensland's excellent credit rating. Queensland authorities have been able to borrow, on favourable terms and conditions, in a number of prime overseas and domestic markets, for the construction of productive capital works.

According to *Rydges*, one of the most respected financial magazines in the world, Queensland investment activity is staggering, and the quality of projects even more so.

Mr Davis: Why don't you stand up to your leader and say, "I don't want to read this rubbishy brief"?

Mrs CHAPMAN: It may amaze the honourable member to learn that these are my own words. I repeat for the third time that Government members tell the truth; Opposition members tell lies. Members of the Opposition speak with forked tongues.

Mr Lee: And tell fibs.

Mrs CHAPMAN: As the honourable member for Yeronga says, they tell fibs.

With gearing-up and planning for capital works projects well advanced, many more jobs will be created.

Mr Davis: I had better leave.

Mrs CHAPMAN: If it is too hot in the kitchen, get out.

Essential services will be maintained, and the task force's employment recommendations of this year will be implemented.

In recognition of the hardships experienced by the sugar industry, the Queensland Government has given \$31m in assistance, with an additional \$20m allocated in the 1985-86 Budget. In the same period, the Federal Government contributed a miserly

\$10m. The same Federal Government will cause further hardship to the rural sector by its cut-backs to local government, forcing it to increase its costs to maintain services.

In a recent report from doctors servicing outback areas, it was found that, in recent times, stress-related diseases suffered by farmers have increased markedly owing to the mounting financial problems that they are facing. Burdened with an inequitable assets test, excessive Government tax on fuel and a new capital gains tax, it is inevitable that the toll on the community will be more than just financial.

The 30 000 disgusted farmers who demonstrated earlier this year in Canberra showed that they were totally fed up with the Federal Government's anti-rural policies.

Thanks to the additional funds allocated in the State Budget for the Eton Irrigation Project, the Mackay region will not suffer as a result of withdrawal of Commonwealth assistance of \$2.7m.

The campaign for the eradication of brucellosis and tuberculosis has been boosted by \$21.4m.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: It is a pity that they did not use a bit on the honourable member for Windsor, who is the Opposition spokesman on nothing.

Inland and northern Queenslanders will benefit greatly from additional funding for the Australian Flying Arts School.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: If the honourable member for Windsor stood in 10 feet of soaking wet concrete, he would not even make an impression.

The rural sector will also gain from the \$5m allocated to buy ground equipment for the State's satellite-based telecommunications network and the base of a transponder on the Aussat domestic satellite. Our National economic lifeline depends on such scientific and technological development, together with the creation of a more competent level of technological literacy within the community, so that individual inventive talents can carry creative ideas into the market-place. Such development will be aided by the Government's recognition of these needs, supported by substantial funding towards the telecommunications network and the Small Business Development Corporation.

The most significant initiative taken in this Budget is the formation of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation, which will operate on a commercial basis to fill a gap in existing capital markets and will assist farmers, manufacturers, small-businessmen and other entrepreneurs. Further assistance to the private sector will be in the form of major pay-roll tax concessions to increase the maximum annual pay-roll tax exemption level from \$270,000 to \$300,000. The Queensland Government's proven fiscal policies encourage the private sector, which is a far cry from Labor's bungling taxation philosophy designed to kill individual initiative.

The Federal Labor Government has introduced a capital gains tax, increases in company tax and taxation on non-cash benefits, which the Restaurant-Caterers Association of Queensland has estimated will cost 15 000 to 18 000 jobs in Australia, in addition to the effects felt by manufacturers and potentially the beef and fishing industries. This is the Government that said that it would create jobs. The introduction of such taxation measures will destroy jobs and will certainly destroy incentive.

The system of personal identification cards is the most abhorrent attack on personal freedom that this country has ever witnessed, and from a party that claims to protect civil liberties. What a laugh! It is small wonder the electorate cannot accept a State Labor Government as a serious alternative. The Labor Party's lack of economic management ability, coupled with being at the beck and call of the trade union movement, would lead us down the fast lane to ruin.

Clearly, the Australian public perceive the trade union movement to be a group in which only a small minority of people are eligible to vote, although it claims that it is democratic, which serves the interests of only its group and which enforces its views on the majority. The trade union movement denies individual freedom and does not care what it does to the country or the people to get its own way. Curiously, it is to such a group the Opposition is inextricably tied. Yet Opposition members wonder why they do not have the confidence of the people.

The State Budget has kept the confidence of the electorate by living up to its promises. It provides no petrol tax, no tobacco tax, no financial institutions duty and no extra pay-roll tax on small firms.

The Queensland Government has compensated for withdrawn Federal funding on numerous projects. The Federal Government ought to be ashamed of itself. I do not understand how Opposition members can claim to be part and parcel of the Government with all the stunts that it has pulled since it came to power. The honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) should be ashamed of the Federal Government. It is absolutely amazing that he can praise that Government. It is a terrible Government.

Of particular importance in the Pine Rivers electorate, which has a large population of young families, was the State Government decision to boost its assistance to kindergartens to replace Federal Labor Government aid. Opposition members should tell the Committee about people who have to place their children in care. What did the Labor Party do? It took away the money that it was providing for those people and caused them to suffer.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: The honourable member for Windsor would not know. He speaks with forked tongue all the time. I would not believe him in a fit.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. My tongue is not forked. I find the remark made by the honourable member for Pine Rivers objectionable, and I ask that she withdraw it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! The honourable member for Windsor finds the remark offensive. Will the honourable member for Pine Rivers withdraw it?

Mrs CHAPMAN: The honourable member for Windsor does not have a forked tongue.

Such a shameful denial of block grant funding for pre-school education caused a loss of revenue of a massive \$6.6m a year. The honourable member for Windsor is proud of that, but he ought to be ashamed. The Government of Queensland has been commended by countless kindergarten and community organisations for its contribution of \$2m that will enable the groups to remain viable.

Approximately 22 schools will be built throughout Queensland for 1986. In Pine Rivers, the Pine Park School will be completed, and it is to be hoped that the Pine Rivers High School will get its music block. A project that will generate 254 man-weeks of employment is the erection of the library block at the Albany Creek High School.

Mr Comben: You are doing a lot better than schools in my electorate.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I will have the honourable member know that my electorate has better representation.

The Pine Rivers area will benefit greatly from the building of a railway station at Bray Park. In addition to that, the Bald Hills Hospital will be completed this year, providing 50 beds to be used principally for paraplegic and quadriplegic long-stay patients. An additional \$10m has been allocated to welfare services, and \$2m for special employment programs.

The Queensland Government will also contribute \$1.8m towards the Commonwealth/State program associated with the national campaign against drug abuse. It is a shame that the Opposition should promote decriminalisation of drug use that causes a multitude of social problems. Imagine decriminalising something that is causing so many problems in the community. How the Opposition could possibly back a Government that wants to decriminalise illegal drug use absolutely amazes me, and members of the Opposition should be ashamed of themselves.

It is clear that the National Party Government in Queensland has provided concrete proof that it is a Government that has the competence to encourage development, create jobs, live within its means and care for Queensland's most valued natural resource—its people—despite the hardships imposed by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (4.22 p.m.): The Liberal Party is disappointed about many aspects of the State Budget, and perhaps nowhere is this more so than in the field of health. In the debate on Estimates this year, in which Ministers must justify their actions and activities and answer to the Parliament for what they have done or failed to do, health will not be considered. That is unfortunate, because it is the area in which the Government has failed most spectacularly.

In the Budget, much was made of the fact that an additional 270 hospital employees would be on the State pay-roll by the end of this year. However, what the Budget did not show was that that represents an effective decrease in nursing strength in the hospitals of this State.

Honourable members have just heard the member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) waxing eloquent about a new 50-bed hospital that will be opened at Bald Hills. In addition to that, a new 200-bed hospital will open at Southport, hospitals will open in Nambour and Townsville, and hundreds upon hundreds of new hospital beds will be provided, which is to be commended. But where will the nurses and other hospital staff come from to man the hospitals? Surely the State Government does not expect the people of Queensland to believe that these hundreds of additional beds and hospitals will be fully and adequately manned by the provision of 270 extra people. I point out the figure of 270 does not represent additional nurses alone; it is made up of additional nurses, wardsmen and clerks.

Far from improving the standards of care that is presently being offered in Queensland's hospitals for public patients, the Budget that has been presented by the State Government gives a clear warning to the people that their health care is declining in standard, and it also gives a clear warning to nurses that they will be even more over-worked in the next 12 months because of inadequate staff levels that have resulted from bad planning and bad leadership at the very top of the health portfolio.

In Queensland's public hospital system, the people are fortunate to at least have the very best doctors, administrators and nurses that can be found anywhere in the world. I do not think that honourable members should have any argument with those people. However, what is drastically wrong with the health service in this State is the standard of leadership that is to be found at the top. Everything is there to give the people of this State the best services, including the best health care of any State in Australia and possibly the world, but they are not getting it, because of the bureaucratic, ham-fisted and dictatorial styles that have been adopted in the management of the health services of this state. Queenslanders are getting second-class care, and it will get worse, as is clearly exemplified by the shortage of nurses. Only 270 additional people are to be employed. That is not enough to serve even the new beds that are coming on stream. Inevitably, the standard of nursing care offered in the hospitals of this State will drop.

A similar crisis exists with respect to medical staff. Why is it that, when there are places for six radiologists at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, the State cannot find more than two who are willing to take on the job? Why is it that the position of Director of Psychiatry at Southport Hospital, following the resignation of the present incumbent, is

not able to be filled? Ward 15 will be forced to close in the near future because a replacement has not been found, and probably will not be found. Why is it that the morale of the full-time doctors, nurses and administrators in the State's hospitals is so depressed? It is just not good enough, and drastic measures have to be taken to ensure that the staff are given the opportunities, the encouragement and the facilities to do what they want to do, that is, provide first-class, caring health services to the people of Queensland.

The present system is not good enough; the present leadership has failed. Let me look at a couple of examples of how that leadership has failed. Only a few weeks ago, those highly-trained specialist personnel, the doctors who are capable of delivering such excellent care, had their terms and conditions of employment changed. One would think that it would be logical, when dealing with such highly trained professionals, that the leadership would at least talk to them and discuss with them the terms and conditions of their employment—the rules of the game. That did not happen. Out of the blue, they received a unilateral instruction from the Minister saying, "Your terms and conditions are changed." Is it any wonder that, when they are treated that way, staff often cannot be found to man Queensland's hospitals?

Let me look at our nurses, about whom the Minister seems to have such a fixation that he will not even talk to the Queensland Nurses Union any more. How are they treated by this system? Is it a coincidence that there are 17 courses offered throughout Australia to train a theatre nurse so that she receives a certificate—it takes one year—but not one in Queensland? Why? Is it any wonder that the morale of the nurses is low when they look outside and say, "Our accreditation does not reach the level of that provided in other States. We won't be able to be employed if we go to other States"?

Look at the fiasco that covered the introduction of the nursing degree course at the Queensland Institute of Technology, a morass out of which the Government only managed to winch itself yesterday when the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) announced that the money would be provided to run that course in 1986. Why was that announcement necessary? Nearly two years ago the Minister for Health, standing on his stump, announced that the course would go ahead. What he did not announce was that no application had been made for the Federal funds necessary for it to go ahead. The application had not been lodged when the Minister made his statement and it was not lodged until months afterwards, too late to be considered in the triennial funding program. The State Government, finding itself backed into a corner, again because of this example of incompetent leadership, has had to produce the money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That money should have been provided by the Commonwealth for tertiary education but now, because of this incompetence, it has to come from the State. And that is supposed to be good management.

Undoubtedly the same Minister will come to this House in the near future and complain bitterly about the raw deal we are getting from the Federal Government. Probably that is about the only thing on which I will agree with him. We are getting a raw deal from the Federal Government, but that is no excuse for our having to meet additional payments out of State revenue because of incompetent handling of the portfolio. Again, that is a symptom of the bureaucratic centralisation and dictatorial style that we are becoming so used to in the administration of health in Queensland.

I do not have to look much further to see other failures in leadership. Scattered throughout the State are expensive bricks and mortar in hospital and health facilities that are not being used. Why is that so? Because of incompetent planning at the top, which means that there is no staff for them. I invite members of the Government to inspect the thoracic subintensive-care ward at the Prince Charles Hospital. It is a beautiful, brand new ward, which has not been used for two years, simply because it has no staff. I invite Government members to look at Ward C1, the eye ward, at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. It is an amazing, wonderful ward. The problem is that it is used as an office and storage area simply because no staff is available for it. Yet the Minister tells us that the Government is providing adequate staff levels!

I look now at some of the other areas that desperately need attention. Rationalisation of the health services is given nothing more than lip-service by the Government. That is just not good enough. Again, the Minister has said that the rationalisation committee is working. Why is it that, as Dr Golledge reported in January or February 1984 on trauma management and what to be done about it in this State, nothing has yet happened? Not a thing has happened between February 1984 and now. I must correct that; something has happened. Every three months, in *The Sunday Mail* a story from the Minister appears telling how he supports trauma centres, how wonderful rationalisation is and how everything is working. The problem is that Queensland still does not have trauma centres. People are suffering and dying because of that situation. There is no excuse for it.

I again invite Government members to go to the Princess Alexandra Hospital and look at its trauma management centre. It is dingy, undignified and disgusting, yet we are told that rationalisation is working. At this time, 18 months after the report was lodged, no action has been taken by the Government.

To refer once more to the problems in our public hospitals with specialist staff, I point out that the Government has refused to even acknowledge that a problem exists. For example, it refuses to acknowledge that the terms and conditions of employment offered to specialist staff in our hospitals are markedly less than those offered in southern States. Is it any wonder that specialists will go to the southern States to practise and not come to Queensland?

I could go on and on. The real failure of this Government is that it talks about free enterprise, it talks about rationalisation and it talks about decentralisation; but it has failed at the ministerial level to produce any plans, any substantive methods of change or any vision of the future of our hospital system. It is now too late for bandaid measures. The problems run too deep.

It is time to step back and look at the system we have got and to come up with a concise and consistent plan to make our health system consistent with the political philosophies that this Government supposedly espouses. For example, the Government talks a lot about privatisation, but what has it done about it? Absolutely nothing!

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member opposite seems to think that nothing ought to be done. Does he support private enterprise? A simple "Yes" or "No" will suffice.

Mr McPhie: Of course I do.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member says that he supports privatisation.

Why then does his Government totally prohibit private hospitals from providing casualty care centres in this State? That is privatisation. Why does not the Government do it? Do Government members maintain that private hospitals are not efficient? Time and time again private hospitals have shown that they can give caring, concerned treatment to patients at a far less cost to the patients and to the system than public hospitals can, yet the Government, which the honourable member says supports private enterprise, refuses to allow the private sector to compete. If Government members believe in privatisation, why is it that the Government health system wraps unto itself such strangely socialistic notions as the provision of out-patient general practitioner services at our hospitals? If there had to be a piece of political and financial lunacy in our present system, that would have to be it.

The Government again complains about how little Queensland gets from the Commonwealth, yet this Government pays out of State revenues for out-patient general practitioner services in public hospitals when the clear alternative is for those patients to go to their own doctors and have Medicare pay for it; the Federal Government will pick up the bill. The Minister says that he has no money for extra nurses. There is a quick and easy way of getting at least another \$5m a year.

If the Government believes in privatisation, why does it offer out-patient specialist services at our public hospitals? I talk here quite clearly of the larger metropolitan institutions, because the situation in the country can be quite different. But, in the larger institutions, why is it that the Government spends vast amounts of the tax-payers' money on providing sessional payments to specialists and on large and complex banks of equipment to be used by those specialists for out-patient specialist care when, quite clearly, those patients could be sent to practitioners in private practice where they would pay for the equipment and the Commonwealth Government would pick up the bill under Medicare? Why does not the Government do that? That is not only privatisation but rationalisation in the truest sense of the word. If the Government does not believe in centralised socialist bureaucratic controls, why is the Health Department in this State the most centralised bureaucracy-ridden department of them all?

Significant progress has been made in some other departments, and I must acknowledge the efforts and success of the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern), who is presently in the Chamber. I only wish that some of his efforts and success would rub off onto his colleague the Minister for Health, because the most lunatic things are happening in the Health Department.

Mr Henderson: You don't like him, do you?

Mr GYGAR: It has nothing to do with whether I like or dislike the Minister for Health, although I must admit that I am not his No. 1 fan. At the same time, can the honourable member tell me whether he likes a system under which every decision on the purchase of equipment above \$2,000 has to go from the hospital to the Health Department to be approved and then back again?

Let us talk about the wonderful efficiencies that occur there! At present, a certain piece of equipment at the Royal Brisbane Hospital would cost \$3,500 to replace. It appears that, for the last three years, the hospital has been applying to get a new piece of equipment but, because it costs more than \$2,000, the application has to go to the Minister for Health for approval and he will not approve it for reasons best known to himself. However, at the same time, the hospital is allowed to spend \$2,000 for repairs. For each of the last three years, the hospital has spent \$2,000 to repair this piece of equipment to a substandard state when it could have bought a new piece of equipment for \$3,500. I challenge any Government member to say that that is rational or good management. Again the Minister says how little money Queensland has received and how it is all the Commonwealth's fault.

The degree of centralisation in the Health Department at present militates against economy, cost-effectiveness and efficiency in the treatment of patients. Honourable members must never lose sight of what the bottom line is: quality health care. The sole aim in life of literally thousands of people in the Queensland health system—doctors, nurses and other allied health professionals—is to give quality health care to their patients. The role of the Health Department ought to be and should be to encourage them, to support them and to provide them with assistance in achieving that objective. Instead, they are obstructed, overridden and overregulated in a manner that seems antipathetical to the supposed aims of a health system. It is just not good enough.

This Government could find good alternatives if it would only listen to the people involved in the provision of care; but it will not listen. The Queensland Nurses Union is shut out. The Minister for Health and his departmental officers will not even talk to the union. The specialists at the hospitals are not consulted when terms and conditions are changed. The only means of achieving the proper level of service in the work-place is talking to the people. There must be free and open consultation with them. That does not mean that the Government has to do everything that they suggest, and for economic and other reasons, the Government will not do that. However, at least the Government and the people providing the care should be talking. The first undertaking that the Liberal Party gives is that, in charge of health, it will talk to the people who are involved

and will not bolt the doors or throw them out and maintain that all wisdom and all knowledge resides in the ministerial office. It does not, and that is plain to anyone.

We in the Liberal Party will do more than just talk about privatisation. We will do something about it because we recognise that the State must act in some areas, but that, in other areas, it need not act, because the private sector can do it more efficiently and more competently. The Government should be involved in health as it is in other areas in which the private sector cannot or will not provide the service. The private sector certainly could and would be delighted to provide many of the services that are currently reserved exclusively for the public health system.

More than lip-service must be paid to rationalisation. There must be more than a committee on the treatment of trauma and on trauma centres, which met for over 18 months and did nothing at the end. If the system is to be rationalised, the first thing that must be done is to streamline the process of rationalisation. The decisions are fairly obvious. All that is needed is the will to do it.

Decentralisation decisions are obvious, too. Why is it that, with all the skill and training available right throughout the health system, all of the lines of communication and approval on such minor things as \$2,000 worth of new equipment have to flow back into the Minister's office? Either people are appointed to a job and are allowed to do it or they are sacked. If these people who supposedly run the State's hospitals do not have the wit, the intelligence or the trust of this Government to spend \$2,000 in a budget of hundreds of millions of dollars, I suggest that they be sacked, because that is the only alternative that is open. Either they are allowed to do the job or they are replaced by someone who can.

The present system does not work. There is a crying need to decentralise the decision-making process of the health bureaucracy to the people who have to make it work on the ground. It is an easy task that would take no more than a week to achieve, but, firstly, the Government must want to achieve decentralisation, not just to talk about it.

This Government pays lip-service to objectivisation, but does nothing about it. Part of the great fight in this State about nursing levels and other staffing levels has occurred because the Government refuses to institute objective tests of what is required and of what is not required in the work-place.

The Government even refuses to have its hospitals examined and certified. Unless it is ashamed of the State's hospitals, what has it got to lose? I am not ashamed of the State's hospitals. Why should not the Australian Council of Hospital Standards be allowed to look at the State's hospitals and certify them? Why is it that the Health Department resists to the utmost the idea of introducing patient/nurse dependency studies? If they were conducted, everyone would know the truth of whether Queensland does or does not need more nurses. Every day the Minister says, "We don't need more nurses." Why, then, won't he do the one, simple, single act that would prove to everyone whether or not Queensland needs more nurses? He should make the decision to introduce patient/nurse dependency studies. If he had had the courage to make that one decision, two and a half years ago he could have pulled the rug out from under this entire dispute. Why not? Isn't it logical? Isn't it reasonable? Isn't it sensible? Why can't it be done?

Objectivisation goes much further, too. In such things as radiology, the teaching hospitals have a role to teach specialists and newly qualified doctors in areas of specialist application. The claim is that the equipment is not there. Again, it is fairly simple. If the Government is prepared to objectivise its training courses and say, "This is the job that has to be taught and this is the equipment that has to be provided for it," it should then go out and see if it is there. But the Government refuses to do that. Through its Health Minister, it refuses to take these simple steps to ensure that the State's hospital system, and its entire health system, is operating efficiently and effectively.

The great shame of this is how good it could be. I do not mean how good it could be if the State poured millions upon millions of additional dollars into it. I do not believe in the "more dollars" solutions—the socialist solutions—that is, when a problem occurs, throw money at it and it is bound to go away. The reality is that in the foreseeable future health budgets will remain steady in real terms. That is the reality of funding, but with a proper approach to the supporting services to be offered by a ministry and by a department, Queensland could have right now the best health system in Australia. It has not.

The solution has nothing to do with money, it has nothing to do with the public service, it has nothing to do with the quality of the doctors, the nurses and the allied health professionals—they are all the best that could possibly be asked for—it has to do with one thing: leadership, combined with a will at the top to make the decisions that are necessary, to give the leadership that is needed to make sure that the people of Queensland get what they deserve and what they can have—the best health care in this nation.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (4.49 p.m.): I rise to speak specifically on the education aspect of this 1985-86 Budget as presented by the Premier and Treasurer. Honourable members should note that in this financial year a record sum of \$1,174.8m will be spent on education. That is an increase of \$102.2m, or 9.5 per cent, on last year's Budget. The Education Department's allocation is the largest single item within the overall Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget. Not only has the National Party allocated to education the top priority but also it has the most efficient and cost-effective education system in Australia.

The new types of buildings that the Education Department is constructing in this State probably rate as the cheapest in Australia. However, they are extremely efficient. They include carpets and fans and are linked by excellent covered ways. One does not get complaints from Queensland's teachers about the standard of the new buildings, but one does hear complaints from the Queensland Teachers Union and the Labor Party, which compare only the costs of these buildings with the costs of those in other States.

The provision of additional funds has enabled the implementation of many new programs to ensure that education keeps pace with technological and social advances as we approach the twenty-first century.

I have already spoken about *Education 2000* in this Chamber. Those people who regard the blue and grey *Education 2000* booklets as discussion papers, which they are intended to be, look forward to the final report of the review committee that began its deliberations last week. The committee will look at all of the comments and papers that have been presented. I trust that the final report will be used as a guide—I stress "as a guide"—to the way in which the State's educational system should move in the next 15 years.

The Government's first commitment in the Budget has been toward the class-size program. An additional 1 087 teacher positions have been provided. This is in addition to 982 additional teachers who were employed following the last Budget. They will go towards the stated Government class-size program, which was a four-year plan to reduce class sizes in accordance with the recommendations of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Education.

Last year's Stage 2 figures show that primary classes were down to an average of 25.9. The Government's program has decreased from 42.7 per cent to 32.7 per cent the classes that were above the recommended sizes. Of those 1 087 teachers, 35 new positions have been allocated to pre-schools, 396 to primary, 422 to secondary and 234 to special education; 28 of the new positions will be used for staffing new pre-schools, and the activities of the pre-school correspondence school will be extended.

I, personally, have had children involved in the pre-school correspondence school, and it is a magnificent scheme. It has excellent tapes that are prepared by its teachers.

There is great personal contact with those teachers, and there is certainly enough finance to cover the costs of the people who are living in isolated areas.

Nine primary advisory teachers will be appointed to provide advice to teachers on appropriate teaching strategies for smaller classes. A further six mathematics advisory teachers will be appointed to ensure continuity within the mathematics curriculum, and 36 teachers and administrators will be appointed to staff new primary schools to be opened in 1986 as a result of the regular and Special Major Capital Works building programs.

Enrolments in State secondary schools in Queensland are higher than ever before, with preliminary figures indicating that 65.4 per cent of students progressed from Year 10 in 1984 to Year 11 in 1985. That is where the greatest problems will arise in the future. A number of students continuing on from Year 10 now are not entirely academically capable or desirous of higher academic studies. Many are either continuing until they find a job or are remaining at school because their parents believe that it is better to do that than join the long line of those who are unemployed. There is no criticism of that; but the education system and, in particular, the teachers are faced with massive teaching difficulties as they try to cater for students wanting to go on to tertiary studies, those who want Year 12 studies only, and those who are there because they have nowhere else to go.

Massive discipline problems must be faced. The latter group are virtually adults, and they face the social problems of young adults. They are very strong-willed and generally disillusioned with school life. The problems that the Government faces in that respect will be the greatest difficulties that it will face in the next decade.

Provision has been made for 49 teachers and administrators to staff new schools to be opened, and an additional 314 teachers will be appointed to cater for enrolment increases and to continue the class-size reduction program.

An additional nine instrumental music teachers are to be appointed, and ten teachers will be appointed to enable expansion of the personal development program.

From January 1986, the Government will assume full responsibility for schools operated by the Endeavour Foundation. An additional 135 teacher positions have been provided for that, together with 45 positions for teachers specialising in remedial or resource support, guidance, communication and special education visiting and advisory services.

I point out that \$8.58m has been allocated for the employment of temporary teachers to replace staff taking long-service leave.

The Government has found that a difficult problem to resolve. Clearly, teachers are entitled to their leave at a time that is satisfactory to both the employer and the employee. However, at all times a competent teacher must be placed in front of a class, and the cost of providing temporary teachers is astronomically high.

The 1985-86 Budget will provide a further \$5m for the computer education program. The allocation of \$2,941,000 for this the second year of a three-year program will ensure that the majority of secondary schools receive some allocation of computers by June 1986.

In general, microcomputers will be provided to secondary schools on the following criteria: schools with an enrolment of more than 1 000 students will receive two networks, each of 15 microcomputers, one network to cater for junior students and one more expansive network to cater for senior students; schools with an enrolment of fewer than 1 000 students will receive one senior-level network of 15 microcomputers. The Education Department has been developing its computer education program with a view to ensuring that students understand the impact of computers on society and have the necessary skills to function in an increasingly technological world.

Other activities to be supported within the computer education program will include the continuation of the scheme to provide assistance to primary and special schools to purchase computer equipment, the development of curriculum materials to support the introduction of computers into secondary schools, studies and inquiries to support curriculum revision, development and implementation of computer education, support services for computer education activities in special schools and, finally, the development and support of regional computer centres and advisory services. The role of computers can be seen by anybody who has visited the Mount Gravatt College of TAFE, where students have specialist computer equipment worth almost \$1m. It is a magnificent program.

I turn to kindergarten education. As the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) has said, until now the policy has been that kindergartens affiliated with the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland and approved by the Education Department under the extended services program have been eligible to receive approximately 80 per cent of approved staff costs, with approximately 25 per cent from the Commonwealth and the balance from State sources. However, the Queensland Government will dramatically boost its financial assistance to kindergartens to replace the aid withdrawn by the Federal Labor Government. As the honourable member for Pine Rivers stressed, the Federal Government's decision to withdraw block grant funding for pre-school education will mean a loss in revenue to Queensland of a massive \$6,605,000 a year.

There are three Budget initiatives involving technology education. Clearly, the Queensland Government has recognised the central role of education in the State's technological future. The recently created technology services unit will provide an integrated co-ordinated approach to the use of modern technology in education. The Budget allocation for the operation of technology services for 1985-86 will total \$170,000. The unit will concern itself with two major areas. It will be concerned with the application of technology in improving the educational process and an investigation into the role of education in the development of technology.

Initially, the major focus of the unit will be on issues related to the applications of satellite and computer technology to the educational process. The Government has announced plans to establish a State-wide network of electronic learning centres, which will offer learning programs through various information and technology systems and devices. One of the main features of the electronic learning centre is its facility to cater for both individual and group learning demands. The use of powerful computer systems, sophisticated communication devices, access to large and varied information sources and the use of personally designed learning programs will enable the centres to speedily respond to both the current and future demands of Queenslanders.

During the 1970s, a new range of initiatives to improve the education of isolated children was introduced. These initiatives included mobile class-rooms, mobile manual art workshops, the loan video scheme and the isolated children's special education unit. By 1979, the three Schools of the Air were all helping to provide an education for almost 600 children living in isolated areas of Queensland. With the Aussat satellite trials for isolated children just round the corner and the new schools of distance education already on the drawing board, the department's commitment to the education of children living in remote areas is quite apparent.

Schools of the Air now operate from Mount Isa, Charleville and Cairns. Advances are continually being made in correspondence lessons, and the Priority Country Area Program (PCAP) provides special facilities for isolated country children. All these schemes have played a vital role in distance education in past years and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future.

In 1983, the Government confirmed that it supports fully the right of parents to educate their children in a school of their own choice. It stated that it would support

the Queensland non-Government schools against any attempt by the Federal Government to undermine this section of the Queensland education system.

The State Government announced that it would increase the current per capita grants for non-State schools by 14 per cent for the year 1983-84, which represented a real increase of 4 per cent. This level of real increase was repeated for the year 1984-85. The State Budget contains an increase of \$2,691,000 for per capita grants for students in non-Government primary and secondary schools. That followed real increases of approximately 6 per cent in the 1984-85 State Budget. Per capita grants for primary and secondary students in non-Government schools will increase as follows: for primary school students, from \$384 per annum to \$411, and for secondary school students, \$621 to \$666. The increases will be effective from the beginning of the third term in 1985.

It is noteworthy that the cost of the per capita grants scheme has increased from \$22,527,000 in 1979-80 to an estimated \$58,880,000 in 1985-86. That commitment reflects the high priority that is given to education by the State Government and its recognition of the right of parents to educate their children in the school of their choice.

I now refer to the amounts granted for remote area allowances in the Budget. Most remote area allowances for students have been increased. The sum of \$3.7m has been allocated to cover the payment of remote area tuition allowances, hostel allowances and travel allowances, compared with last year's allocation of only \$3.1m. At the beginning of 1985, a new scheme of living away from home allowances was introduced to rationalise assistance that is available for isolated students who must live away from home in order to attend school. Remote area tuition allowances are available to assist parents whose eligible children incur tuition costs at a boarding-school. The assistance is designed to complement State and Commonwealth per capita grants, and to relate to the level of fees paid.

Under the 1986 tuition allowances, students will receive up to \$945 for primary education and \$1,261 at a secondary level. Remote area hostel allowances of \$369 for each eligible student will be available in 1986 on behalf of students who board at student hostels. Remote area travel allowances apply to all eligible isolated students, and the amount of the assistance varies according to the location of the home and the distance that is travelled to reach the boarding facility. Assistance to students will range from \$53 to \$475 in 1986.

The schools grants scheme, which in last year's Budget was increased by 33.3 per cent to keep pace with rising costs of education material, has been further escalated by 5 per cent in this Budget so that the grants will maintain their purchasing power. This Budget has allocated significant resources to the largest area of schooling in the State education system, that is, the primary level. The Budget allocates \$11.6m to a building program which includes new and replacement primary schools. Eight new primary schools will open in 1986, and they will be located at Kelso, Northview, Kurwongbah, Rainbow Beach, Beachmere, Macleay Island, Collingwood Park and Yugumbir. Replacement schools will be constructed at Gilston, Ormeau and Merinda. A special budgetary allocation of \$122,000 has been made to allow for the purchase of replacement radio transceivers for the School of the Air centres at Mount Isa, Charleville and Cairns.

The printing of a new syllabus for the new mathematics curriculum for Years 1 to 10 and the provision of additional teacher support material will also be a major project in this financial year. Secondary education is experiencing a period of significant growth, not only in student enrolments but also in teacher numbers and the provision of secondary school facilities. The Budget recognises this growth and provides a range of enhancements directed at this rapidly expanding area of State education. Six new high schools will open in Queensland in January, 1986. Three of those schools will be located at Coombabah, Pioneer and Runcorn, and will open with education for Years 8, 9 and 11. In previous years, new high schools have opened providing up to Year 8 only. This new concept will allow for considerable cost savings to be made in the building program.

As well, the use of whole-school facilities from the commencement of the school year will be a major advantage.

The Budget also provides an additional \$200,000 to continue initiatives that will broaden the curriculum and increase the applied studies and work-related components in schools. The rapidly increasing number of students undertaking Year 11 and Year 12 studies have substantially increased the need for in-service education of teachers in new techniques and approaches required to implement new curriculum initiatives.

The Budget also announced the allocation of \$260,000 for the first stage of a program to replace progressively the existing manual typewriters in high school class-rooms with electronic typewriters.

I also note with great pleasure that music in State schools has hit a high note this year with the appointment of more instrumental music instructors. Instructors are taking music into 32 schools in four new districts in a substantial expansion of the instrumental music program this year. There are now 447 schools, that is, 337 primary and 110 secondary, in the program throughout the State.

Many schools have now implemented a textbook hire scheme, which I support completely. It is assisted by the textbook allowance scheme. The State Budget provides a full \$530,000 for increases in the textbook allowance rate for students in Years 8, 9 and 11.

The new rates of allowance are—

| Year | \$ |
|------|----|
| 8 | 48 |
| 9 | 58 |
| 10 | 35 |
| 11 | 98 |
| 12 | 40 |

That increase has followed an average increase of 12 per cent on last year's Budget. The total cost of the textbook allowance in 1985-86 is estimated to be \$10,522,000.

It is accepted by all people that Queensland leads in the area of pre-school education. During the 10 years since State pre-school education was established, new facilities have been established throughout the State at a rate of slightly less than two per school week. In 1982, new regional pre-school officer positions were created and, in 1983, the pre-school curriculum project was launched. This State Budget reaffirms the Government's commitment to the expansion of pre-school education. The Budget has allocated funds to staff, equip and operate the additional 92 pre-school units and 19 early education centres that were being constructed in the period from January 1985 to June 1986. This building program clearly reflects the Queensland Government's policy to extend access to free pre-school education of the expanding pre-school population. The Budget also makes provision for the development of special curriculum guides for use in State pre-school centres.

In 1983, this Government announced that the policy of providing guidance and special education services at a district level will be continued, and it is pleasing to note two significant developments which have resulted in the need to expand and enhance special education services in the Budget. The Education Act Amendment Act 1984 gave ministerial responsibility for two new groups of students. They are children from 0 to 5 years of age and handicapped students from 15 to 18 years of age. The Division of Special Education now undertakes to provide educational services to more severely handicapped children. The Department of Education has negotiated the transfer of responsibility for the school programs conducted by the Endeavour Foundation.

During 1976, the Division of Special Education will implement that transfer of responsibility and integrate the programs of the Endeavour Foundation into the total range of programs currently offered by the Department of Education. I am sure that all

people will applaud those initiatives and support the expansion of special education services.

In support of that move, the Budget announced the provision of \$750,000, which will allow the introduction of a new transport scheme for special education. The Budget also provides for increases in the rates payable under the kilometre-based and the conveyance allowance schemes. The new special education scheme provides for the transport of intellectually handicapped pre-schoolers to special education development centres.

In a State such as Queensland the commitment to school transport is massive. The cost of school transport is an aspect often removed from the overall cost per student when Opposition members are quoting what they believe to be relevant figures.

Any member who has travelled through the Torres Strait islands area will admit that there is a great need to upgrade the school facilities in that area. The Education Department has taken over that responsibility. Those members who have been to Saibai and Boigu islands will know that the services there are not sufficient, but that those provided at Yorke and Sue islands, where the people have taken a real interest in their schools, are excellent. However, this State Budget includes a program to upgrade facilities at schools on the Torres Strait islands and on Aboriginal communities.

The Education Department, in conjunction with the Works Department, has developed a program which will involve an estimated \$15.5m in works. The move follows the Government's decision, in May last year, to transfer responsibility for education in Aboriginal and Torres Strait island communities from the Department of Community Services to the Department of Education. The department has already assumed control of the recruitment, placement and management of teachers in all Torres Strait island schools, with full responsibility to be assumed by 1 January 1987. The transfer involves 13 State schools and one former Anglican mission school on Moa Island.

The upgrading program is to be undertaken in stages, with completion in 1989. It is proposed that it will be jointly funded by the Commonwealth and the State, with the State bearing approximately two-thirds of the cost. Already \$3.1m has been committed to provide a replacement school at Mabuiag Island, and 11 houses for qualified teachers on 10 islands. A further 10 houses are planned for construction in 1985-86. That will enable the posting of appropriate numbers of qualified teachers to all schools in 1987.

In addition, work on five more replacement schools is proposed for 1986. It is planned to have at least a qualified principal in every Torres Strait island school by 1987. At present, only six principals are provided, but a total of 14 is planned. The number of qualified class-room teachers will be increased from the present two to a total of 20.

The Budget contains details of the formation of a special unit on Thursday Island to support and develop the provision of educational facilities in schools on the Torres Strait islands and in the Cape York area. The sum of \$300,000 has been allocated towards establishing this far-northern development unit. It will be responsible for the development and dissemination of a range of curriculum materials for use in schools on the outer Torres Strait islands. It will include curriculum officers and additional advisory teachers, and will be managed by a supervisor and a deputy supervisor under the control of an inspector of schools located at the Peninsula Regional Office in Cairns.

I have spoken already about TAFE colleges. It is to be noted that, under the Budget, major advances will be made in provision of new TAFE facilities. The most recently completed colleges at Emerald and Kingaroy will have their first intake of students in the 1986 year. Growth will continue at the newly established college at Grovely and the College of Tourism and Hospitality at South Brisbane.

Other major capital projects currently under construction at Rockhampton, Townsville, Ipswich, Mackay, South Brisbane and TAFE House are expected to become operational during this financial year.

I am also pleased to note that \$150,000 has been set aside for the final stage of the Review of School Based Assessments, that is, the ROSBA scheme. This will mean that, for the first time, every secondary school in Queensland will be included in the scheme. I believe that ROSBA has been very successful. It has given teachers the ability to prepare their own curriculums based on the needs of the students and of the community.

Finally, I believe that the concept of regionalisation has been magnificently successful and, with the formation of the region at Cairns, the needs of the far north have been recognised. As well, the regionalisation of sport has led to a very well-organised sporting structure. Students have the opportunity to participate in their local zone fixtures. If they have the ability, they move on to regional fixtures. They participate in intrastate sports and can go on to interstate and international representation. Undoubtedly Queensland sport will eventually reap the benefit of this organisation.

I have much pleasure in supporting the motion to approve the Budget allocation for His Excellency the Governor—Contingencies.

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (5.14 p.m.): In rising to speak in the concluding stages of the Budget debate, I wish to speak on a number of general issues and on some particular issues relative to my electorate of Salisbury. I have now had the honour of representing that electorate for two years and it has been my pleasure and that of my family to be resident there for the past three years. In a way, I suppose, this second part of my contribution in the Budget debate could be regarded as a report to the people in my electorate concerning the Government's Budget strategy generally and the way in which the Government's administration has an impact on a typical electorate such as Salisbury.

Mr Lingard: I suppose we will get the same in the *Southern Times* this week.

Mr GOSS: That is another outstanding contribution from the member for Fassifern. Having heard his efforts today and on previous occasions in this place, I now know to whom George Bernard Shaw was referring when he said, "He knows nothing, he thinks he knows everything and that clearly points to a career in politics."

The electorate of Salisbury is a diverse one geographically, culturally and in socio-economic terms. It covers a wide spread of southern suburbs, including Salisbury, Coopers Plains, Acacia Ridge, Algester, Calamvale, Sunnybank Hills, Sunnybank, Runcorn, Runcorn Heights, Fruitgrove, Kuraby, Stretton and part of Woodridge.

I suppose that, when it comes to the kind of services that Government at all levels provides to the community, there will always be more suggestions about services and facilities that could be provided. Although it is clear that a Government cannot do everything for the community—it cannot meet every need and it cannot provide every service—I think it is fair to say that this State Government is failing not just the people of Salisbury but the people of Queensland when it comes to providing a reasonable level of services and a reasonable standard of competence in terms of the administration of the State's affairs for the benefit of the whole community, as opposed to the benefit that seems to accrue in this State to a small privileged group of people who either are able to establish a close relationship with influential members of the National Party or are influential members of the National Party, such as the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze).

As well as talking about some of the suburbs and organisations in my area and the way in which they are affected by current State issues and problems, I will later make reference to more general issues that I have pursued in my role as a member of the Opposition front bench over the last two years. I will refer to the revelations that I made last year in relation to child pornography, the cheap sell-off by the Government of a large tract of north Queensland coastal land known as Silver Plains, the unanswered questions in the Hinze Oxenford TAB scandal, unjustified police transfers, the general shortage of police in my own electorate and in Queensland, and so on.

Beginning with the suburb of Salisbury—I am pleased to say that I have found here, as I have in so many other parts of my electorate, many people with goodwill to their fellow-man and a cheerful good nature when it comes to the affairs of their own community.

For example, the Salisbury and District Senior Citizens Welfare Association is a great success story in my electorate, providing not just a wide range of interesting activities for people but a real warmth and genuine community spirit. I have had some involvement in pursuing the goal of a home for aged persons, and I hope that the club will have eventual success in its dealings with the Government and the Brisbane City Council in achieving that goal.

At the other end of the scale in Salisbury, a pre-school is needed. A lot of young families live in the Salisbury area, and I think that that will always be the case. The Government has let us down in that regard, but we will continue to press in that direction.

The Salisbury Community Kindergarten and Pre-school does an excellent job and enjoys a high reputation. However, the people in the suburb of Salisbury are entitled to higher priority in that area.

I move down slightly to Coopers Plains, in which is situated the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital. It provides an excellent service to the south side of Brisbane. It has been the subject of some unfortunate limitations in terms of Government funding and staffing, but that is reflected in hospitals across the State. It is unfortunate that Queensland's health system is not what it should be but, with the resources provided, the staff and the auxiliary at the QEII Hospital really do an excellent job. I am fortunate to have been associated with the auxiliary of the hospital on a number of occasions. It is always very refreshing and pleasing to attend the annual general meetings and to see the reports of the very considerable work that has been done throughout the year by a hardy and tireless band of volunteers who not only raise a great deal of money to provide much-needed equipment to the hospital but also help to generate a very pleasant atmosphere.

In the near future, the Government Health Laboratory will be established at Coopers Plains, on vacant land next to the hospital. I am pleased to say that I have sought, and obtained, from the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) certain assurances in relation to the nature of that development, including provision for adequate parking and landscaping, and a general assurance in relation to the high quality of the development and the eventual physical appearance that the establishment should present to the local area.

My electorate also takes in part of the suburb of Acacia Ridge and, in particular, the former site of General Motors-Holden's Ltd at Acacia Ridge. It is very sad to see this great source of employment in Queensland and in my electorate close down completely, with the company relocating its activities in Victoria. We hear a lot from the Government about the terrible administration of the Labor States, but certainly General Motors-Holden's was happy enough to relocate and concentrate its efforts in Victoria under the John Cain Labor Government. Similarly, in my electorate, Commonwealth Engineering (Queensland) Pty Ltd, another great industrial institution and source of employment, is winding down because of the economic mismanagement of this Government.

The manpower and facilities at the Acacia Ridge Police Station should be increased and improved to service this rapidly growing area of Brisbane, which does not really have a reasonable level of police protection, even though the officers at Acacia Ridge do the very best that they can.

Moving further south in my electorate, I come to the very pleasant and well-planned suburb of Algester. I acknowledge that the Government has been quite helpful in the establishment of new facilities, including buildings and, particularly, a library at the Algester State School. My representations on the need for certain drainage work have

also met with a positive response from the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) who, I note, is in the Chamber.

Although a new high school has been opened to the south at Browns Plains and next year another high school will be opened some distance away at Runcorn, Algester and the surrounding area are growing at such a rate that it is inevitable that a high school to service the area will be needed in the future, and planning should start now rather than later.

Another issue that will be of great importance to Algester in the very near future is the question of a new sewage treatment plant. I understand that the previous Brisbane City Council administration stipulated that it would be necessary to construct works to remove sewage waste from Algester to the main treatment plant at Rocklea. However, I have been informed that discussions are being held with the new Liberal administration with a view to establishing a sewage treatment plant in Brookbent Road, in the Willawong/Pallara area. If so, I am very disturbed about the consequences for the environment of Algester and the surrounding suburbs. Insufficient detail has been made available by the council, and I certainly hope that action will be forthcoming on that front so that residents can make an informed decision and have an opportunity to object to this particular development if the plans leave any possibility of chemical or odourous pollution. I am also concerned about proposed amendments to the Local Government Act that will take away from my constituents in Algester the right to object, but that remains to be seen.

In the centre of my electorate are the suburb of Sunnybank Hills and part of the suburb of Sunnybank. Recently it was very pleasing for me personally to have a role in Sunnybank's centenary celebrations, particularly the centenary of the establishment of the railway line through the area. Travelling in one of the original steam trains to the huge fun-fair and the celebrations organised by the Pinelands Lions Club at Runcorn was fascinating. The success of this occasion was a real credit to the organisation and the tireless efforts of the members of that club. Many local charitable and community groups participated in the fair, with the consequent generation of revenue for those very worthwhile organisations. I acknowledge the assistance that I received from the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) with a submission that I made for assistance with the cost of the steam-train operation on that particular day.

On the other side of the ledger, my electorate suffers, as do many other outer Brisbane suburbs, from a low level of police protection, particularly after hours and on week-ends. That is not assisted by the fact that, in many parts of Sunnybank Hills, the street-lighting program of the South East Queensland Electricity Board seems to be delayed. The lack of this basic facility, to which people are entitled, has an obvious effect on the security of the area and makes it more attractive to the criminal element. I have made a number of requests to SEQEB officers and there has been some response, but the program could have been further along the track by now. Of course, the Government must accept a large part of the responsibility for this delay, given its gross political interference in the operation of SEQEB earlier this year, with consequent disruption of the smooth running of the board.

The comments that I have made about Sunnybank Hills and Sunnybank, particularly in relation to the problem of inadequate police protection, apply with equal relevance to Runcorn and Runcorn Heights. I inform the Committee that, recently, I attended a very substantial public meeting at Runcorn concerning the lack of police protection and the high rate of break-ins of local businesses and homes. Another meeting will be held next month. At one point, it was disconcerting to see that, when one of the residents asked for a show of hands to indicate whose property had been broken into, nearly half the audience raised their hands. I hope to continue working with a local action committee which has been established to pursue this issue. Hopefully, we will be successful in getting more police allocated to the area and, in the long term, a new police station.

I make reference to the efforts of the Runcorn Heights Parents and Citizens Association, which for some time has been seeking, with my assistance, to have certain

drainage works carried out at the Runcorn Heights State School and also to have accommodation established for the janitor/groundsman. That basic facility was not originally provided and it is high time that the Minister for Works and Housing considered that matter favourably. I note that he is in the Chamber, and I implore him to consider again the correspondence that has come not just from me but also from the p. and c. association and local residents, which points out that, although previous indications have been given about the allocation of funds for this facility in draft capital works programs, it never seems to turn up. However, I do acknowledge the recent approval by the Minister in relation to the drainage work. Hopefully, that will not take much longer.

In this regard I pay credit to all the parents and citizens associations, and parents and friends associations, in my electorate which, without exception, do a very good job and work very hard to make up the gap between what is provided by the Government and what the pupils need.

One pleasing development to report in this area is the opening next year of the new Runcorn State High School, with three grades commencing in the 1986 academic year. For nearly two years, other local residents and I have campaigned for a new high school and, although it appeared for some time that our pleas were falling on deaf ears, eventually the announcement was made and the work is virtually completed. I would sound a note of warning, however, in relation to the need for kerbing and channelling, footpaths and extensive drainage works in the area. Without them, in wet weather parents and pupils will have to slosh their way to school through a quagmire. I have drawn this matter to the attention of the Minister for Works and Housing, the Minister for Education, the Lord Mayor and the local alderman. Hopefully, before not too long I will be able to see some action rather than buck-passing.

Once again my comments about a reasonable level of police protection apply in the neighbouring suburbs of Kuraby, Fruitgrove and Stretton. Any medium or long-term solution to this problem will benefit these areas as well. I would also like to see boom gates at the Kuraby railway level crossing, as a substantial number of accidents have occurred there and a substantial number of schoolchildren use that crossing every day. I have raised the matter with the Minister for Transport, but, at this stage, I am told that it is not considered that boom gates at this crossing are necessary. Hopefully, they will come eventually. I will continue to press for them.

Part of the suburb of Woodridge is in the south-eastern corner of the electorate of Salisbury. That area is entitled to a great deal of Government attention in the provision of basic facilities and services. I really feel that the Government established Logan city and left it pretty much to its own devices without providing the necessary funds and infrastructure to establish the basic level of services and facilities that operate in more established areas. The Logan City Council is working hard under a tremendous load. I have no hesitation in calling on the Government to give greater priority to Logan city, not only in the provision of services but also specifically in unemployment programs.

I could mention many other issues that concern my electorate, which would be common in other electorates. However, this brief review of my electorate points to some of the deficiencies that have occurred because of the Government's overall budgetary strategy and administration.

When it comes to Government failures and deficiencies, fortunately my electorate has a wide range of community groups and organisations which are prepared to step into the breach and do what they can to make our community a better one. In this debate I do not seek to set out an exhaustive list of those organisations and individuals but, off the top of my head, I refer to such organisations as the Archer Districts Scouts of which, for the last couple of years, I have had the honour to be president. That role is largely a formal one, but I have been very pleased and impressed with the association that I have had with the group over the last couple of years and would like to recognise the very considerable work done by all the people associated with the group and, in particular, district commissioner Peter Barter and district chairman Peter Clifford. In

my electorate alone, there are dens at Sunnybank, Algester, Coopers Plains, Salisbury, Warrigal and Acacia Ridge.

Another organisation is Sunnybank Family Support Inc., of which my wife is president and which does a marvellous job given the limitations of funding. Once again, it relies heavily on the hard work of a small number of paid staff and a large group of volunteers. Other organisations are the Sunnybank Community Group, the Salisbury Probus Club, the Sunnybank/Coopers Plains Country Women's Association, the Sunnybank and Pinelands Lions Clubs, Archerfield Rotary, Griffiths Jaycees, the Salisbury Boys Brigade and the swimming clubs at the Salisbury and Runcorn schools. The list of organisations in my electorate is endless.

All these groups and people provide a wide range of beneficial activities, whether it be in relation to fund-raising for charitable purposes or simply providing healthy recreational and educational activities for the youth of the area.

For the aged in our community, rest homes are located at Trinder Park and Carramar, both of which are not only extremely well run but also provide a pleasant and healthy atmosphere for the older citizens of our community.

I turn now from local issues to State issues that I have raised and pursued, I believe, in the public interest. The most current of these issues relates to the ongoing scandal of the attempt by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) to secure for his family company the Oxenford TAB subagency licence. I remain convinced, as do most of the community, that a couple of decent, hard-working Queenslanders, Mr and Mrs Frith, were denied the Oxenford subagency, despite the recommendations in their favour by board officers, so that it could eventually go to the Hinze family company. Eventually, of course, the licence did so. Fortunately, because of the matters that I was able to raise in this House, where the grant of the licence to Junefair Pty Ltd was first exposed by me, the Minister has been forced to give back the licence.

So, for the first time in a long time, the Opposition has been successful in enforcing proper standards of conduct on Ministers of this Government when it comes to the question of conflict of interest. Members of the Opposition feel that the matters raised and proved have been so serious that Mr Hinze should be removed from Cabinet. That he has not been so removed up to the present time does not demonstrate any weakness in our case; rather, it demonstrates that the Queensland Government has no standards at all. It further demonstrates that this Government sits here to represent the interests of a rich and powerful few over the interests of the average Queenslanders when it comes to a wide range of dealings between the citizens and the Government, whether it be TAB agencies, other Government licences, Government contracts, tenders, or whatever. It is a very sad state of affairs.

I note that published in this morning's *Courier-Mail* is a very long letter written by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing in relation to an editorial in *The Courier-Mail* on 23 September. That editorial was very critical of Mr Hinze and made it quite clear that the judgment of the widest range of the community is that Mr Hinze is guilty of a very serious conflict of interest and that he has not answered important questions in relation to this issue.

I point particularly to the tactic that Mr Hinze adopted in the letter that is published in today's *Courier-Mail*. His reply is careful and selective and superficially plausible. However, I do not think that it would convince those who have followed closely this fairly complex matter. Important questions remain unanswered by Mr Hinze. Until he responds directly to those questions, his role in the affair will remain unclear.

Mr Alison: Rubbish!

Mr GOSS: The honourable member for Maryborough may say that, but it is about time that National Party back-benchers stood up for average Queenslanders, such as Mr and Mrs Frith, instead of sitting quietly by in fear of such persons as the Minister for

Local Government, Main Roads and Racing and in fear of disrupting the National Party. The honourable member should put the people first instead of persons such as Mr Hinze.

The basic question that Mr Hinze avoided in the letter is the very question that he avoided three times in Parliament last week, namely, "Did you attend a meeting of the TAB where there was a discussion about the Oxenford TAB agency and your family company's application?" Surely a Minister with nothing to hide can answer "Yes" or "No" to such a question.

What Mr Hinze did in yesterday's letter was not to deny that he attended such a board meeting, but rather deny expressing a particular view at such a meeting.

Why is Mr Hinze so reluctant to admit that he attended a board meeting at which his family company's interests were discussed? Perhaps it is because even he understands that such conduct on the part of a Minister would be most improper and would force the Premier to ask for his resignation.

Why is Mr Hinze reluctant to deny in Parliament that he attended a board meeting at which his family company's interests were discussed? Perhaps it is because he fears that this would be contradicted by certain board members and then, having been seen to mislead Parliament, he would again leave the Premier no honourable alternative to removing him. Can there be any explanation apart from those two alternative propositions?

The question as to precisely what views were expressed by the Minister at such a meeting is an important yet separate question that arises after he has addressed the primary question. There are other matters. What about the political interference referred to in the board memorandum of 13 July 1982? The Minister denies involvement in relation to that. However, if he is not involved, surely the responsibility falls on the board to clear the air. I believe that Mr Callinan and the other board members have a duty to the public to respond to this and other questions, and thereby restore public confidence in the administration and integrity of the TAB.

As to the third allegation of interference in 1981—the Minister agrees that he conveyed instructions to the general manager not to proceed with an agency at Oxenford, but he says that that intervention was responsible, innocent and based on his intimate knowledge of the area. If his intervention four years ago was innocent and for legitimate reasons, why did the Minister not inform Oxenford newsagents Mr and Mrs Frith accordingly in response to their personal approach to him for assistance? The Minister kept them in the dark. Why did the Minister inform his Cabinet colleague the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Gibbs), who wrote to him on behalf of Mr and Mrs Frith, that he would give their application consideration when he had already given his instructions to the contrary to the general manager? Why did the general manager deliberately "evade"—to use his own term—advising Mrs Frith of the decision in respect of her application if that decision was innocent and legitimate?

The Minister's defence in Parliament so far has relied on a combination of red herrings, carefully drafted answers to selected allegations and a dash of humourous bluff. Yet, as Shakespeare cautioned us, "One may smile, and smile, and be a villain."

It is significant that the Premier has still not been prepared to issue a statement indicating his support for the Minister. I have no doubt that the Minister has sorely tested the Premier's patience but survives because of the precarious position in which the Government finds itself. The Minister still has many questions to answer, and until he does so, he is not by any means in the clear.

I turn to an issue that I raised last year, that is, the exposition of the scandal relating to child pornography and the involvement of certain prominent people in that sordid business. Last year I did not name any of those people and I do not propose to do so now. I cannot speak much further about that matter because of the fact that certain people are still before the court. However, it does disturb me that it is almost a year since the Government announced its inquiry and honourable members have yet to

see a report tabled in this House, or new legislation, as promised, brought in to deal with the problem.

Earlier this year, I raised the scandal of the Government's offering prime north Queensland coastal land at \$5 per hectare to American property speculator Rick Rand. I believe that that property, known as Silver Plains, is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the sale of our birthright to overseas interests who are not really investing in a way that will be beneficial to the long-term interests of Queensland but are investing for short-term speculative profit. The Premier continues to rant about land rights. What about land rights for the average Queensland—the right to know who is buying Queensland land, in what quantities and for what price?

Another matter that concerned me very much last year was the question of the unjustified transfer of Detective Ross Dickson from Mareeba. I accept that the Police Department, like any other State Government department, will need to transfer officers from time to time to ensure that the whole State is adequately serviced. However, Detective Dickson was transferred prematurely and no satisfactory explanation of the Dickson affair has ever really been made. He was eventually boarded out and paid a substantial amount of superannuation. But Detective Dickson as a person is not the issue. The issue is the entitlement of Queensland police officers not to be subjected to arbitrary premature transfers because they object when they are told not to investigate certain matters or because a senior officer takes a personal dislike to them. That is not in the best interests of the morale of the force, nor is it in the best interests of the community in the long term.

At about that time, I raised also the issue of the department transferring a young Stock Squad detective by the name of Hurrell from Charters Towers because in his investigations he was pursuing certain prominent members of the National Party. That scandal resulted in another inquiry by the Police Complaints Tribunal. That was well over a year ago, and honourable members still have not seen the findings of that inquiry tabled in the House.

In all those inquiries, in all those scandals, it would seem that the first priority of this National Party Government is to avoid political embarrassment for Government members rather than give the Queensland public a full explanation and a full and honest disclosure of what is happening.

In the limited time available to me in the concluding stages of this debate, I have not been able to canvass exhaustively all the issues in which I have been involved, affecting my electorate and affecting Queensland as a whole, but what I have endeavoured to do is raise what I regard as a representative cross-section of the issues and problems facing my electorate and this State. I think it is plain that although some things are happening there are many fields in which the Government has been guilty of mismanagement, impropriety and failing to deliver certain essential services and facilities to the community. I can assure honourable members that I will continue to raise these issues and highlight these problems wherever and whenever I can, in the hope that, eventually, both Salisbury and Queensland will get a better deal—the kind of deal that the people would be entitled to if they had a responsible, competent and honest Government.

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (5.41 p.m.): I rise to comment on a number of aspects of the Queensland State Budget and as an opening remark, I repeat what I said in my speech in the Budget debate last year, when I commented that credit should be given where credit is due.

Mr Comben: It seems as though I have missed out.

Mr McPHIE: The honourable member certainly does miss out.

Because that was simply not done in any way, I intend to make a comment about the speeches made by Opposition members. Before I do that, however, I give credit

where credit is due. I give credit to the previous speaker, the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss), because I thought that his speech, especially the first half, was a most interesting one. It was one of the fairest speeches that I have heard from the honourable member in this Chamber, and as the honourable member went through various aspects of his electorate, commenting on what has been done and what needed to be done and making fair comment on what the honourable member felt should be done, I found it quite interesting. I realise that no two people would agree on what should be done with a Budget or a program, because many versions, each of equal value, could be given of what should be done. The comments made by the honourable member were most valid, and I would like to see his suggestions implemented in the electorate of Salisbury.

In dealing with the State Budget, I must point out that it is very easy for any speaker to take the Budget item by item, and destroy it item by item; but no Budget should be read as a collection of single items. A Budget should be read as a whole, and I must congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on a job that has been exceptionally well done. Despite tremendous difficulties, he has produced a balanced document which is a credit to him and the Government.

Although I have touched on this subject before in an Adjournment debate, when I referred to the difficulties that are manifest in the operations of the State's financial resources, I turn now to consider the rules under which the Queensland State Government receives revenue from the Federal Government sources and which have been changed.

From my farming days, I know very well how difficult it is to prepare a budget for a year. Income is estimated, and a program for development and expenditure is prepared on the basis of that expected income. It is true that in my case, because of the vagaries of the weather, I did not end up with anything like the income I expected. The whole development program that I prepared had to fall by the wayside. In the case of the Budget prepared by the Queensland Government, the Government was expecting over half a billion dollars more——

Mr Vaughan: That is rubbish.

Mr McPHIE: No, it is not rubbish, and the honourable member for Nudgee knows that very well. I will give the honourable member the facts and the figures that have been taken from the existing agreements and regulations that were in place 12 months ago.

Under general revenue funding, the Queensland Government could have expected \$137.6m more. Under the Commonwealth Grants Commission recommendations, Queensland could have expected \$134.7m more. Under the health agreement, Queensland could have expected \$8m more from the Federal Government, and under the Medicare agreement, if an equitable share of the money in terms of payment on a per capita basis had been the foundation of the agreement, Queensland could have expected to receive an additional \$82m. The Queensland Government could reasonably have expected to receive those amounts, because that was the position at the beginning of the year for funding for the coming year. The amounts I have mentioned total \$362m.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr McPHIE: Would the honourable members opposite like to hear again the Medicare figures on a per capita basis? Perhaps the honourable member for Windsor could give them to me, because the Labor State of New South Wales gets \$67 per capita; South Australia goes one better and gets \$81; Western Australia and Victoria each get \$63 per capita; Tasmania gets \$75; and Queensland gets a miserable \$29 per capita.

Mr Vaughan: That's not true.

Mr McPHIE: It is true on the Medicare figures. I believe the figures that I have been given; I do not for a moment believe the figures that Opposition members make

up. The figures for the Australian Capital Territory are not divulged, but, if the Federal Government is running true to form, they would be in excess of the \$81 per capita that South Australia is getting.

Members heard a great burst of grunts from the honourable member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) on hospitals. He referred to the shortcomings, but at no stage did he mention the shortage of money for Queensland's health and hospitals program, and that is where the trouble lies. If Queensland was getting fair treatment, it would be able to do a far better job than it is doing.

Mr Vaughan: Would you rather our share were on a per capita basis?

Mr McPHIE: Yes. If Queensland received about \$67 per head—as New South Wales does—instead of \$29, the Government would be a heck of a lot better off.

I have listed four areas in which Queensland has been discriminated against. There is no tax-sharing any more. It is a case of the Federal Government's deciding the amount it will give, and that is it. Because it is not an ALP State, Queensland is discriminated against, and the figures back up that statement.

To the \$362m can be added an amount of \$160m of specific purpose funding reductions that were made earlier in the year in the areas of education, housing and roads. In May, when the Queensland Government was working on its Estimates, it found that the Federal Government had reefered \$160m back——

Mr Comben: Why?

Mr McPHIE: I will tell the honourable member why. It is because the Federal Government is going broke trying to find the money to fund its massive debt. The Federal Government is increasing taxes at a great rate. As from Thursday last, the Australian people will pay even higher taxes so that the Federal Government can attempt to pay its debts.

Mr Vaughan: Would you agree that 46 per cent of our consolidated revenue funds come from Federal Government funding?

Mr McPHIE: To press on—\$362m and \$160m add up to \$522m, or half a billion dollars, that Queensland should have received from the Federal Government. The honourable member for Nudgee asked me whether I agreed with his statement about the amounts Queensland receives. I will give credit where it is due. In the past two years, the total Commonwealth funding coming to Queensland has been increased by 14.5 per cent. In the same period, the total amount spent by the Commonwealth in comparative areas has increased by 29.4 per cent while, in the same period, taxes have increased by 32 per cent.

Mr Vaughan: So what?

Mr McPHIE: It means that Queensland has again been poorly done by. The Federal Government is receiving 32 per cent more in taxes but has increased Queensland's allowance by only 14.5 per cent. There is no tax-sharing at all. The Federal Government can change the rules any time it likes.

The point I am trying to make is that this Budget has been produced in most difficult and adverse circumstances because the Queensland Government had programs in train for which it will now not receive the money it had a right to expect. The money is not there, so this Government's programs have to be cut, and the cut is to the tune of half a billion dollars.

Mr Comben: How much have your fees and charges gone up?

Mr McPHIE: The Government cannot budget without reasonable stability of income estimates. The Government has done exceptionally well in this case in most difficult

circumstances. I am not prepared to debate the figures used by Opposition members, because they make them up as they see fit. I am using the Government's statistics, and they were compiled from the actual agreements that existed and under which the Grants Commission people and the tax-sharing arrangements operated. They are the agreements that have been busted.

Opposition members have been releasing misleading information. In most cases they are just grandstanding. A prime example of that is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton). In dealing with the Works allocation he said—

“There is no mention of a normal capital works program and no figure is nominated for it.”

All that that sort of comment does is show what most people already know, that he has not done his homework. In his Budget speech the Premier said that one of the Budget objectives was—

“to maintain the State's normal Capital Works effort.”

Reference was also made to that program in the Budget documents that were tabled. I know that Opposition members received copies, because I saw the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) give a copy to the member for Kurilpa (Ms Warner). She made probably the only useful contribution she has made so far to the working of the Assembly, by then taking it outside, no doubt to give it to members of her party hierarchy so that they could tear it to bits. They missed the point, namely, that the Leader of the Opposition said there was no mention of a capital works program. It is there to be seen, and the Premier mentioned it. The figures are in *The State Capital Works Programs* booklet.

Page four of the booklet sets out the Special Major Capital Works Program. For example, \$100m is listed for education buildings. In 1984-85, \$17.2m was spent, and \$64.6m is to be spent in 1985-86. The total expenditure on water resources is shown as \$100m, of which \$12.6m was spent in 1984-85 and \$42.2m is to be spent in 1985-86.

Page 10 of the booklet outlines the 1985-86 Capital Works Program. That is the normal program, the one that the Leader of the Opposition could not find. He did not know that it was there. Under the heading “Education”, a total of \$189.6m has been made available for capital works. The amount of \$64.6m relates to the Special Major Capital Works Program, which leaves \$125m in the normal program. Blind Freddy, the mate of Opposition members in Canberra, could find it. It is here to be seen.

On page 32, the total expenditure in 1985-86 by the Water Resources Commission is shown as \$161.9m, of which \$42.2m relates to the Special Major Capital Works Program. That leaves \$119.7m in the normal works program.

Mr Vaughan: How much of that comes from the Federal Government?

Mr McPHIE: Opposition members argue that the money comes from the Federal Government. They will not accept it as an entitlement that Queensland gets from the Federal Government in line with what was thrashed out and agreed to at the time of federation. It is not that the Federal Government is generous. If it was left to its generosity, it would not give us a damn thing. It is given to the State because the Federal Government has to give it under the agreement for federation. There are tax-sharing, Grants Commission allocations, revenue allowances, money for main roads, bicentennial program money for main roads and so on. The honourable member knows perfectly well that Queensland is not getting its fair share of that.

The figures are there to be seen in the booklet titled *The State Capital Works Programs*.

Mr Prest: You are not spending it in the right area.

Mr McPHIE: If the member for Port Curtis would open the book relating to work planned by the Minister for Works and Housing for 1985-86, he would see all the figures.

The Special Major Capital Works Program lists six areas for attention, namely, education buildings, water resources, Crown employee housing, hospitals, roads and public buildings. The total expenditure is to be \$600m in three years. The sum of \$94m was spent in 1984-85 and \$305.8m is scheduled for expenditure in 1985-86. The remaining \$199.2m will be spent in 1986-87. That will give the State one of the greatest development and works programs it will ever see. It is a credit to the Minister.

In 1985-86, the State is also spending thousands of millions of dollars on normal works, as listed in *The State Capital Works Programs* booklet and is continuing with the \$700m rail electrification program in central Queensland.

The Leader of the Opposition did not do his homework, otherwise he would not have made his silly comment. He is a cream-puff leader. He does not give credit where it is due. If he is worried about Beattie coming in and taking over, I predict that Beattie will not win pre-selection. He will not be here. That is one thing that the Leader of the Opposition does not have to worry about.

Opposition members have been very critical of the increases in establishment. As honourable members should know, the increases involve 104 additional policemen, 270 additional nurses, 1 108 additional teachers (which, incidentally, follows an increase of 1 155 last year), and an additional 134 prison officers. Those increases are not as large as the Government would like, and they are not as large as the unions and the ALP demand. The unions and the ALP demand anything. They do not have the responsibility of providing or funding the increases. If they ever came to power, honourable members on this side of the Chamber would hold their statement against them. That is not likely to happen in my time. Opposition members will be old and gone and the Government will still be in power.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr McPHIE: The Government will still be presenting Budgets like this for years. The honourable member for Port Curtis knows that it will be here for ever.

The responsibility for making decisions in the manpower area rests clearly and correctly with the departmental officers. They are experienced and they have the knowledge. They are best able to determine what can be done in the manpower area. In this area, the ideal must be balanced against the practical. Tax-payers' money cannot be wasted on the appointment of hundreds and hundreds of additional people. The Government has to produce a balanced Budget that meets the costs of the developmental programs, keeps industry ticking over and creates employment opportunities.

Have Opposition members stopped to think for a moment about the cost of employing those extra 1 616 people in the work-force? They say that the Government should employ about two or three times as many extra staff. If we take an average salary of about \$13,000 a year, we see that the cost of employing those 1 616 additional staff is about \$21m. That is a big amount, particularly when half a billion dollars is ripped off Queensland by the Federal Government in Canberra.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr McPHIE: If the member for Port Curtis keeps quiet, I will give him the cost of the hidden charges in employing that extra staff. Office accommodation, uniforms, leave, superannuation and so on have to be provided. In some cases the provision of office accommodation will involve the construction of new buildings. The bill for employing those extra 1 616 people in those four areas will be not \$21m, but more likely \$40m. Those new numbers are sensible. In the circumstances under which the Budget was formulated, they are appropriate to meet the needs.

I have already agreed with the honourable member for Port Curtis that, ideally, the Government would like to employ more people if it was in a position to afford them, but manning levels must be balanced against the establishment levels. First, a post is established and then it is manned as best as possible.

We shall gain, and gain significantly, if we reduce the number of administrative personnel and increase the number of operational personnel. If we can get policemen out of their offices and onto the street, that will be a gain. If we can get prison officers who are doing administrative tasks to go outside their offices, that will be another gain. The same comment applies to teachers and nurses.

The maximum number of people must be provided in the field, and there are ways in which that can be done. One way is to reassign people. The overall establishment can be maintained by reducing the number of administrative posts and increasing the number of operational posts. Training in the reassignment program would be necessary.

We have already seen the success of the reassignment program in the railways. The Railway Department got rid of a number of non-productive jobs. The men doing those jobs were reassigned to operational areas. That program has been undertaken most successfully by the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane). That is a more effective way in which to use the manpower. The number of administrative people can be reduced by natural attrition. When they leave, operational staff can be hired and put into the field.

Mr Prest: The Railway Department just appointed an assistant commissioner. He could not get a job in Queensland and he went to Western Australia. They brought him back.

Mr McPHIE: An assistant commissioner has been appointed to look after the \$700m worth of projects that are on the go.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr McPHIE: I have already given the Committee examples of the extraordinarily good job that the Premier and Treasurer has done with this year's State Budget. Let me now turn to the other side of the coin.

Last Thursday, the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) made some alterations to the Federal Budget. He introduced new taxes galore, but the Queensland Premier and Treasurer did not. New impositions were placed by the Federal Government on every sector of the community, whereas the Queensland Government has actually given relief to a number of sectors. I acknowledge that a number of State charges that are indexed to the inflation rate have automatically increased this year, as they have in every State, but the Queensland Government has not increased any charges, such as car registration fees. In fact, Queensland will actually collect less this year from the pay-roll tax system that the States inherited from the Commonwealth. That decision was made under most difficult circumstances, which I have already outlined.

Mr Keating has thrown thousands in the hospitality industry out of work. They will go onto the dole and become a drag on the community whereas before they were productive, working people. That means that more people will be brought under the thumb of the Federal Government. That is a pure socialist tactic to make the workers subservient to the State. I condemn the Federal Government roundly for that.

A capital gains tax, which the community was told would not be introduced, has been introduced. The tax on expense accounts is really a form of double taxation because not only will businessmen or their companies have to pay tax on lunches, but they will also have to pay tax on the deals that are organised or concluded over those lunches. I do not know how on earth such a tax will be administered. To ensure that the Federal Government gets its pound of flesh, a special man will have to be stationed in just about every restaurant round town to spy on the people who are lunching.

Another thing that I noticed about the tax package brought in by Treasurer Keating last Thursday was that, without exception, the new taxes will apply from day one, or from 30 June or 1 July—whichever date it is—next year. However, the benefits to taxpayers by way of reductions in personal income tax are two years off. I have a summary of the figures showing the net gain of this package to the Federal Government, which honourable members may care to look at. For the financial year 1986-87, the net gain

will be \$705m and, in the year 1987-88, the gain will be \$1,348m. That is additional revenue from more taxes, yet the Government is spreading the story that it is reducing taxation. In fact, by diverse means, it is taking more money from the people of this country to prop up big government—to pay for its excesses and to enable it to spend more. That Government stands condemned because it should be reducing spending.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr McPHIE: The member for Port Curtis knows very well that the only way in which this country can be saved is by reducing spending.

Mr Prest: It wouldn't be because of the deficit that your Government left this country in?

Mr McPHIE: It is all very well to sit back and blame somebody else, which is what the member for Port Curtis is very good at doing. Mr Keating and Mr Hawke have been in office long enough to have taken corrective measures, but they have not. In fact, they are doing more damage. They are making a bad situation a heck of a lot worse. They are increasing the national debt and have reduced spending on defence to such an extent that they are destroying the defence forces. The Federal Government should be reducing its spending and should be getting out of areas in which there is duplication of function or in which it does not have responsibility.

The number of employees in the Commonwealth Public Service should be reduced. Since the Labor Government came to power, the percentage of the work-force employed by the Commonwealth has become the largest in the Western World. Approximately 26 per cent of Australian workers are employed by the Federal Government. It is not taxing the people for any reason other than to pay for its excesses.

Mr Palaszczuk: Do you believe all this?

Mr McPHIE: I do believe all this, and the sooner Opposition members believe it and bring pressure to bear on their cohorts in Canberra, the sooner this country will halt its downward slide.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr McPHIE: The honourable member for Port Curtis is good at interjecting, but he will not stop to look at the facts.

The money that is raised by the Government is being spent on social security—welfare and the dole. ID cards that do not contain photographs, that will cost millions of dollars and that will be of no use are to be introduced. For the benefit of the honourable member for Port Curtis, I will read, from an article in today's paper, the remarks of a Mr Roger Clarke, who is a computer systems academic at the Australian National University. He said that the Government's planned ID card system will not work, that it will not save money, that it will cost a great deal more than the Government's published estimates, that it will disadvantage the average Australian in his dealings with Government agencies and that it will have no effect in catching criminals and cheats.

According to Roger Clarke, the Government's estimates of the benefits to be derived from the introduction of identification cards are pure guesswork. That is the way the Federal Government operates. The introduction of ID cards is a fiasco. Mr Hawke's yearly taxi bill is greater than the annual expenses of one Queensland Minister. The Federal Government is not spending money on defence, on employment-generating projects, on development, on roads or on reducing the national debt. Honourable members may mark my words: The Federal Government's excesses will destroy it. What I am worried about is the possibility that the whole country will be destroyed. I cannot stress enough that, in any country, higher taxes cannot be levied simply to pay for the excesses of the Government. That is what Mr Hawke and Mr Keating are doing.

The member for Windsor (Mr Comben) stood in this Chamber and claimed that the Queensland Government is not spending enough on welfare. I do not know where or when this country adopted the cargo-cult attitude that welfare is everybody's right and entitlement when a large proportion of the population is sitting back and doing damned-well nothing. Welfare payments do not come from an open cheque-book. The Queensland Government's approach to welfare is balanced. It is helping with welfare in a reasonable way where it is absolutely necessary. The Queensland Government does not sit back and hand out money willy-nilly to any ratbag organisation or other group of people who want money, which is what the Federal authorities do.

Mr Prest: Are you saying that people on welfare benefits aren't entitled to them?

Mr McPHIE: I did not say that, and the honourable member for Port Curtis knows only too well that I did not say it. He should not try to twist my words. He knows very well I did not say that. He should pay attention and listen to what I say.

I now turn to the sugar industry and refer to the sanctimonious statements made by Mr Hawke in Townsville that the Queensland Government should meet half the bill. However, he will not explain to the Queensland Government why, when the Federal Government granted financial assistance to the steel and car industries, it footed the total bill. When the Federal Government takes \$76.4m out of the sugar industry in excise duty and more than \$700m up and down the coast out of the related industries in various taxes, Mr Hawke cannot explain why the Queensland Government has to pay half. Why will not the Federal Government, on its own, support the sugar industry as it did both the car and steel industries? I would say that it is solely because of discrimination against the man on the land, which has been displayed so often by the Federal Government. All the Labor Party is interested in is the worker. It is not interested in the entire community. Mr Hawke will not answer that question. Although the members of the media are not presently in the gallery, they are probably listening in the press-room. I say to them that that would be a damned-good question to pose to Mr Hawke. If honourable members opposite know why, I would like to hear from them, too.

Mr Eaton: I told you the other night in my speech about the difference between the cane industry and the steel industry.

Mr McPHIE: I do not have much time left tonight. I cannot speak to Opposition members all night. They do not take any notice, anyway. They make up the facts and figures at the drop of a hat.

I wish to speak about the latest statement from Mr Keating, and deal with the fringe benefits tax that he has introduced. He has said that that tax will not apply to Mr Hawke; he will not have to pay it. Everybody else in the nation will have to pay a tax on fringe benefits but our gallant leader, Mr Hawke, will not have to pay it. If that is not crooked government, I do not know what it is. He should be made to pay it the same as everybody else, or the whole concept should be scrapped. In my opinion, its administration will be so difficult that it will have to be scrapped. The Federal Government will backtrack again. Because these new taxes will be impossible to police and because they are unfair and unjust, the Federal Government will backtrack again. Mr Keating says that the workers will get their tax cuts in two years' time. Would any member of the public trust Mr Keating or Mr Hawke? Consider what Mr Hawke said about the sacking of Dr Armstrong from the Australian Bicentennial Authority! About three weeks ago, both on television and in the press, Mr Hawke is recorded as saying that he had nothing to do with the calculation of the severance payments to Dr Armstrong. About a week ago the Prime Minister said that he gave Mr Reid the guide-lines and knew of the way that the amount was to be worked out. He is not honest and should not be the Prime Minister of this country.

In the very brief time that I have left tonight, I should say that Queensland has a proposal that will overcome many of the financial maladies in this country—a single-rate tax.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr McPHIE: Listen to the laughter from the uninformed over there. They are the ones who know all about it! They are the ones who speak about the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer from a single-rate tax. They are the ones who do not do their homework. They are like the Leader of the Opposition, who did not do his homework with the Capital Works Program. Opposition members do not do their homework and do not examine these matters.

If they care to look, they will learn that if they earn 10 times as much as I earn, they will pay 10 times the amount of tax that I pay. Single-rate taxation is a way of giving people incentive to work. It has nothing to do with the Opposition's socialist programs that would kill incentive and stifle effort. The Government is encouraging incentive. Through adjustments, controls and a tax threshold, everyone will benefit. There will be gains for everyone and the low-wage-earners will be better off.

There is a great deal of good in Queensland's balanced Budget. It hands out fair treatment right across the board. It provides for continuing works programs, railway electrification, roadworks, construction of buildings, work on the Burdekin Falls Dam, the Tarong and Callide power stations, the Southport Bar, the Gateway Bridge, the Toowong and Roma Street Railway Station developments, and the DPI programs. The programs go on and on. There are projects in the tourist industry. The largest single amount spent by the Queensland Government ever, \$1,175m, will be spent on education. The honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) cited good examples of what the Government will be doing. The Queensland Government had the guts to pick up the \$6m to support pre-schools after the Federal Government reneged on its funding. The Budget contains good programs for Aborigines and Islanders.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (7.27 p.m.): Before commenting on the Budget, I congratulate Souths on their magnificent win on Sunday. I extend my condolences to my colleagues the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) and the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns). I congratulate two of my constituents, who have completed a magnificent football season. Firstly, I congratulate Mal Meninga on his eight great years with Souths. I wish him well in Canberra. I congratulate Gary Coyne, my next-door neighbour, who played so brilliantly with Wynnum/Manly and who was named player of the year.

Having studied the Budget documents, I have come to the conclusion that the Budget is not only a non-event but also a very uninspiring document. Honourable members were treated to the usual claptrap of a balanced Budget. However, as my leader has pointed out, that is only partly true. The Consolidated Revenue Fund was easily balanced by salting away \$60m in the Trust and Special Funds.

In his Budget speech, the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh-Bjelke Petersen) once again told us how the Queensland Government looks after the welfare of all Queenslanders. I am sure that the cane-farmers would have a different impression. The Premier and Treasurer has publicly instructed the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) not to co-operate with the Commonwealth to rescue the sugar industry. The "low-tax State" gets another run from the Premier and Treasurer. However, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) pointed out recently, over 5 000 taxes and charges have increased in the last year. Many of those have increased at a rate that is far in excess of the inflation rate.

One of my constituents recently drew my attention to a nice little revenue-raiser in the Titles Office. It appears that if documents are lodged over the counter at the Titles Office, only the usual fee applicable to the transaction is payable. However, if documents are lodged by mail, an opening fee of \$10.50 is charged. Yes—\$10.50 to open a letter! When one considers the number of documents that are lodged by mail, this is a nice little revenue-raiser in this low-tax State.

My constituent complained to the Ombudsman. The Deputy Ombudsman wrote and told him that there was nothing that he could do. The letter makes very interesting reading. Firstly, the fee is approved by the Governor in Council, so nothing can be done about it legally. Secondly, how many other Government departments charge for opening an envelope when documents are lodged by mail? Thirdly, and most interestingly, is the paragraph in which the Deputy Ombudsman says that the fee comprises a postal charge component for the return of the documents. Has the stage been reached in this low-tax State at which every time a person writes to a Minister or to one of the Queensland Government's hundreds of quangos, a stamped, self-addressed envelope must be enclosed?

Mr Davis: Shame on them!

Mr PALASZCZUK: As the honourable member says, shame! I agree totally with him. \$10.50 to open a letter is a rort.

I turn now to primary industries, particularly the dairy industry. I refer to the question asked by the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) about the activities in the Beaudesert shire. I have thought long and hard about the reason why the honourable member for Pine Rivers should ask a question about the dairy industry in Beaudesert. I know that the honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) was quite stropky when I made my speech during the Address in Reply debate on 3 September. I must admit that I did him a disservice when I thought that, as I got such a favourable response from Beaudesert, he was not game to dispute my remarks. He may be guilty of many things, but hiding behind the skirt of the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) is not one of them.

The real answer lies in the presence of Dayboro, which is adjacent to the electorate of the honourable member for Pine Rivers. Dayboro is the home of the president of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation, Pat Rowley. That is a nice old closed shop.

I will examine that organisation. Dairy farmers are compelled to belong to it—yes, compelled! How about that from a Government that talks about not belonging to unions! The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) should put his own National Party house in order before telling other people that they should not belong to a union. As the Minister well knows, if a dairy farmer speaks out about being in that National Party front organisation, he is very smartly pulled into line.

I turn to Dayboro and the oncer from Pine Rivers. I know that my colleague the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) will agree that Pat Rowley was involved in some nice old rorts. Mr Rowley is now the president of the Australian Dairymen's Federation, and, in Canberra, he is again pressing for a national entitlements scheme—the same scheme which members of the National Party have so openly and blatantly rorted in this State and that has given Queensland the highest priced milk in Australia. So much for the consumer, as long as the National Party is protected!

While Rowley is away playing president, and enjoying the good life in Canberra, his secretary has been minding the store, or, perhaps I should say, the dairy. It seems to me that when one buys a litre of milk, one makes an involuntary donation to the National Party.

For years, the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation has sat idly by while leading members of the National Party, including a Minister, have been acting well and truly against the spirit of the legislation. The whole industry smells to high heaven. It is about time the Minister took some action. However, the Premier and Treasurer has given the Minister his riding instructions on the sugar industry, and I cannot see him acting to expose some of the leading lights in the National Party in the dairy industry.

I turn now to the Minister's answer to the question from the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) on 17 September. The Minister took up a great deal of question-time, and almost five pages of typing, to tell me that I was talking through my hat.

I will not accuse the Minister of misleading the House, because he is a good bloke personally, but he takes his riding instructions from the Premier and Treasurer. He is not noted as being a leader among men.

The Minister said there would be no unemployment in Beaudesert. That is a load of rubbish. The amalgamation at Beaudesert means resettling the jobs. Has the Minister spoken to the Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce, which estimates that this will cost Beaudesert almost a quarter of a million dollars a year? Surely this issue must cause him concern.

I lay upon the table an article from the *Logan and Albert Times* of 28 August entitled "Chamber Contacts Minister Over Dairy Factory".

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

I seek leave to have the document incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Chamber Contacts Minister
Over Dairy Factory

The following is the text for a letter sent to the Minister of Primary Industries by the Beaudesert and District Chamber of Commerce:

Dear Minister,

At a General Meeting of Chamber members held on July 17, 1985 concern was expressed at the possibility of Beaudesert losing its dairy factory (presently operated by the Logan and Albert Co-op Dairy Association).

Concern was voiced specifically in relation to the probable loss of employment in our District. It was resolved that the Chamber write to you expressing its concern.

Whilst the Chamber is not in a position to predict the total economic effect of a substantial winding-down of the Beaudesert Dairy Factory, the Chamber nevertheless wishes to place on record the following comments:—

1. The dairy factory presently employs approximately 30 full time employees, of whom about 20 are married persons resident in Beaudesert.

2. A substantial winding down of operations, whether the winding down is effected by a merger of operations, closure of the Beaudesert Factory, conversion of the factory to receiving-depot status; would be expected to reduce employment numbers in Beaudesert from 30 persons to 10 persons.

3. At assumed average weekly wages of \$360 per week per person, and assuming disposable weekly income of 65% of gross earnings, loss of consumer spending in the local economy is estimated at \$240,000 annually.

4. Such a loss of consumer spending will have a substantial effect on the town of Beaudesert as a regional centre, in as much as the town has a population of approximately 5,000 people.

5. This estimate does not attempt to quantify the "multiplier effect" arising from such a loss of employment in Beaudesert.

To conclude, this Chamber appreciates that it is the right of individual member dairyfarmers to make commercial decisions within the regulatory framework of their industry. However, the Chamber recognises that the government has a significant influence on that framework. That influence should be tempered by the economic needs of the district from which the milk production is drawn.

Yours faithfully,
Norman Johnson
Hon. Secretary

Mr PALASZCZUK: Even Mr Hollindale, a close friend of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) has admitted that there will be only a few jobs for key staff. How many? Will they have to be card-carrying members of the National Party?

What was most interesting in the Minister's five-page reply to the question from the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mrs Chapman) was his total inability to address himself to the matter of the avoidance of payment of Commonwealth levies. It is an open secret that the South Coast Dairy has not been paying its levies.

In his answer, the Minister went on to criticise the Kerin plan. He failed to mention that the majority of dairy-farmers in south-east Queensland support the 1.5c a litre all-milk levy that is an essential feature of the Kerin plan.

The Queensland industry fears a takeover from New South Wales. Yet the 100 per cent transferability in Beaudesert has meant that the New South Wales firm of Norco may end up owning part of a Queensland dairy co-operative.

The Minister alluded to the over-supply in Victoria. He knows as well as I do that that was created by the Bolte Liberal Government. Perhaps he should take a quick trip to Noosa and have a chat to Sir Henry Bolte.

The Minister should have a good look at his oath of office and clean up the milk industry. However, I hold little hope of that because the signed letter of resignation in the top drawer in the Premier and Treasurer's office will stop the Minister from acting. The only way to get to the bottom of the rorts in the milk quota system is for the Government to order a royal commission of inquiry. I realise that that is a pious hope, but it is the only way the truth will be told.

I have been appalled by the attitude adopted by the Queensland Government because it has not co-operated with the Federal Government in support of the sugar industry. As at 30 June, the Queensland Government had accumulated \$38,824,000 in the Rural Adjustment Fund and the Rural Reconstruction Fund. It has always been my understanding that these funds were set up to help farmers in need. Notwithstanding that, according to the Estimates the Government expects to receive \$29,718,000 from farmers and expects to spend \$32,480,000.

Mr Randell: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I know what I am talking about.

This so-called farmers Government will simply dip into its massive reserves to the tune of \$2,763,000. It is high time that the Government emptied out the huge sums of money it has salted away in hollow logs and came to the aid of the people in need. The Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) should contact the highly successful Premier of Victoria (Mr John Cain) and ask him about the hundreds of millions of dollars that he found hidden away in the strangest places when he came to office. It would be naive of me to suggest that, perhaps, the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation could come to the rescue of the sugar industry and repay the farmers the donations they have made over the years.

The most outstanding feature of the problems associated with the milk industry and the sugar industry is the deafening silence of the so-called, non-political National Farmers Federation. If it is non-political, where is it now? It is nothing short of a mouthpiece for the National Party. If a conflict arises between the interests of its members and those of the National Party Government, its members get very short shrift.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The honourable member for Mirani does not like what I am saying.

The National Party Government comes first. The National Farmers Federation is just a lap-dog of the National Party, as is the Local Government Association. While watching the antics of the sugar-cane farmers on television last night, I was reminded of the farmers' performance in Perth in 1974 when they physically assaulted the then Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam. If any other group of citizens so much as thought of performing in the way that those people performed in Townsville yesterday, half of the Queensland Police Force would be mobilised. That is an example of good old National Party double standards.

Mr Randell: I will get a copy of your speech.

Mr Casey: It will read well.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Yes, it will read well.

The Budget tells us that 264 pensioner units will be built in Queensland this financial year. That is only a drop in the ocean. In the last few weeks, several fires have occurred in the residential areas of inner-city suburbs. A number have resulted in loss of life. Many of the properties destroyed were tenanted, and the occupants lost most of their possessions. It is unfortunate that that type of accommodation is all that can be afforded by most pensioners. The provision of 264 pensioner units for the whole of Queensland will not solve a problem such as that.

Although the program of offering single persons, such as widows or widowers, single-unit accommodation when they move out of a home is commendable, the building of only 264 new units will achieve very little. As I have said before, many elderly people are willing to move out of their Housing Commission homes into a unit because of the hardship involved in mowing and in the general upkeep of the home. Notwithstanding that, they want to stay in the community in which they have lived for so many years. On numerous occasions I have pointed out that a number of very suitable blocks exist at Inala which would be ideal for pensioner units. The blocks are close to shops and, more importantly, they are close to transport. Unfortunately, Acacia Ridge, which is in my electorate of Archerfield, has no land available for pensioner units.

However, a number of years ago, a very desirable block of land owned by a church group, which would have been ideal for pensioner units, became available. My predecessor, the late Kev Hooper, wrote to the Housing Commission and pointed out the land was for sale. He suggested that a religious organisation would no doubt be sympathetic to a proposal that the land be used for pensioner units.

After some months, a reply came back from the commission, saying that it could not meet the church's price for the land. It went to a developer. So much for Christian charity and compassion! The same denomination also owns a block of land in Inala that is ideally suited for pensioner units. At present the land is overgrown and unused. I am waiting for the local minister to come to see me about the housing needs of the aged. He will get a lesson in Christianity that he may not like.

I commend the commission on its policy of mixing the sexes in pensioner unit blocks. The block in Osprey Street, Inala is an excellent example. However, in another part of the electorate there is a block occupied by 16 elderly ladies. To say that there have been some personality clashes is to put it mildly.

The Budget states that the Housing Commission will build pensioner units in the \$30,000 to \$35,000 range for pensioners who do not qualify for State rental accommodation. I will be very interested to see how that scheme operates. How much deposit will be required and what length of time will be allowed for repayments?

I am sorry that the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) is not in the Chamber. I wish him a speedy recovery from his illness. Although I am very pleased by the Budget allocation of \$456,000 for bus-car interchanges at Inala and Acacia Ridge, I am still not happy that the Minister saw fit to bar the Cityxpress bus service from operating to Inala.

As I have pointed out previously, the Federal Government gave the Brisbane City Council \$7m for the purchase of buses to expand the Cityxpress service. The service was extended to Acacia Ridge, with a provision in the timetable for an extension to Inala by the King Avenue extension. That extension is soon to be named O'Sullivan Way, in recognition of the work of the former alderman for the area. However, after the election of the new Liberal council, something went wrong. The Minister refused the council permission to operate into Inala. The reasons given for that refusal were pretty weak. The bus now sits at the Watson Road terminus for up to 25 minutes because it cannot come across to Inala.

I may be wrong, but I have a sneaking suspicion that the Minister for Transport found in this issue an opportunity to give his former colleagues in the newly elected Liberal Party Brisbane City Council one "up the chutney" for their very rude remarks when he defected to the National Party.

I only hope that in the next few months the parties will stop acting like spoilt children and sit down and resolve this problem.

Mr McPhie: Are you talking about the ALP?

Mr PALASZCZUK: No, I am not; I am talking about the National Party and the Liberal Party.

I note with interest that a sum of \$335,540 is to be spent on the upgrading of various parts of the Kingaroy Hospital. I congratulate the local member on being able to get Cabinet to approve that work. I do not begrudge Kingaroy, a town with a population of close to 6 000, its hospital. However, I point out that the satellite suburb of Inala, with a population of 20 000, has to make do with a community health centre which operates from 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday to Friday. Inala is an area with a high incidence of welfare cases, numerous children and an indifferent transport system.

Mr McPhie: Where is the nearest hospital to Inala?

Mr PALASZCZUK: I am coming to that. I will keep the honourable member in suspense. He should keep his ears open.

The Acacia Ridge section of my electorate has access to the Princess Alexandra and Mater Hospitals via the city council bus service. Inala residents going to hospital by public transport face a journey of Bourke and Wills proportions. That is why the Cityxpress service into Inala is vitally necessary. It has a stop at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. The Inala Community Health Centre does a marvellous job for not only Inala, but also Darra, Oxley, Richlands, Carole Park, Redbank Plains and the Wacol Migrant Hostel.

Mr Mackenroth: That is almost all of your electorate.

Mr PALASZCZUK: It is, just about.

It is very hard for residents to confine their medical needs to office hours and face a three-week wait for an appointment at the nearest hospital.

I know that my colleague the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) will agree that the south-western and western suburbs are very poorly served with hospital services. If it is Government policy for the Queensland Housing Commission to put large numbers of welfare families into these suburbs, surely the Health Department has an obligation to provide adequate hospital services.

I must say that I was waiting for such an interjection from the member for Toowoomba North, and I shall now answer it. I felt sure that he would refer to the QEII Hospital at Nathan. I point out to him and other Government members, as I have mentioned previously in other speeches, that as far as the people in Inala are concerned, it might as well be on the other side of the moon. I understand why the former member for Salisbury (Mrs Kyburz) gave it heaps. I understand that she intends to make a determined effort to win the redrawn seat of Pine Rivers.

Surely the Health Department must have a forward-planning section. I suggest that the Health Department spend a few cents and telephone the Queensland Housing Commission, the Bureau of Statistics and the Real Estate Institute to ascertain areas of population growth before it builds another white elephant.

Mr Casey: The Health Department would rather concentrate all the health services at Royal Brisbane Hospital. It is a monolith that is nowhere near where the people live.

Mr PALASZCZUK: That is right. It is of no use to the people in my area. They want a hospital there.

I have a few comments to make on the quite outrageous remarks of the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) that single parents are deviates.

Mr Fouras: Do you know that he repeated the comment three times on the ABC radio program and is now trying to deny it? He said it three times and he is now writing letters all over Queensland trying to deny it.

Mr PALASZCZUK: If it is on the record, he cannot deny it.

That type of statement from the National Party makes the clergy in this State shudder. It is a classic example of compassion, National Party style.

We all know that the Minister, to cover his ministerial incompetence, takes every opportunity to toady to the Premier and Lady Flo. My colleague the honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras) has caught him out many times.

I point out to the Minister that single-parents are not all females. Quite a number of men are struggling to bring up their families in a safe, loving and responsible environment—something that is foreign to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs. I have a couple of men in mind who will be delighted to discuss, with the Minister, his claim that they are deviates. I suggest that it will be not an effigy of the Minister that will be hanging from the flag-pole in the Inala Civic Centre, but the Minister himself. He will be hanging not by this thumbs, either, but by a more tender portion of his anatomy.

Last Saturday, I spent a pleasant afternoon at the Rocklea trots. It is an excellent venue. I commend a visit to honourable members who wish to enjoy a pleasant Saturday afternoon. I do not begrudge the upgrading of Albion Park at which Silks Restaurant is located, but I remind the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing that Rocklea has always been regarded as the cradle of trotting. If Rocklea is not given more financial support, Albion Park will become a white elephant.

Sunday was the centenary of the Rocklea State School. I was delighted to meet so many of my old pupils at the celebration. Over 500 people attended, and a great day was had by all. The principal (Graham Tainton), his staff, the students and the hard-working committee are to be congratulated on their efforts. The school was damaged in the 1974 flood and a fire. A suggestion was once made that the school be closed and the children taken by bus to Salisbury. Naturally the parents resisted the suggestion and the school lived to celebrate its centenary. One of the concerns expressed to me by parents last Sunday was that, if the school were to be closed, the Government would amalgamate the land with the land used for the Rocklea trots, and flog it off as an industrial estate. Thankfully, the proposal for a new trotting complex opposite the Brisbane Markets has now been scrapped and the Rocklea that we all know and love should be able to survive for another 100 years.

Mr Lee: It is not a real good track.

Mr PALASZCZUK: It is the only trotting or racing track on the south side of the river, and it is about time that something was done about it.

In conclusion—after reading the Budget and looking at the ministerial benches, I have come to the inescapable conclusion that on the Government benches there are yesterday's men, with yesterday's ideas, presenting yesterday's policies. That is tragic when it is realised that we are so close to the year 2000. Under the present Government, the outlook for Queensland is extremely grim.

Mr NEWTON (Caboolture) (7.51 p.m.): I congratulate the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) on this year's State Budget.

Mr Davis: Why?

Mr NEWTON: I will come to that. The Budget will provide the blueprint for continued economic growth and give private enterprise the incentive needed to transport this State into the twenty-first century.

The honourable member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers), who is in the Chamber, has labelled this State Budget a "non-event". I assume from his comments that he would prefer a headline-grabbing Budget, full of hand-outs and excessive Government spending. This National Party Government frames its Budget for the good of all Queenslanders and provides incentives for the private individual, thus encouraging business to flourish. All sectors of the economy will benefit.

The tourism industry is a perfect example of a growth industry. Queensland is blessed with the natural beauty and climate that make it the perfect holiday venue. In my electorate, the Pumicestone Passage is, I believe, another wonder of the world. Not only are the Golden Beach and Bribie Island areas holiday venues; they have been settled by many people wishing to spend their retirement in the warm climate and enjoy the life-styles that they have worked so hard to achieve throughout their working lives—without being burdened by death duties.

The Government has encouraged private individuals and companies to invest in the tourism industry. During the 1984-85 financial year, tourism again confirmed its position as one of Queensland's leading growth industries. By encouraging that industry, we attract the tourists from overseas, interstate and intrastate to visit our resorts, and all sectors of the economy enjoy the resulting benefits.

Mr Randell: It will get bigger and bigger.

Mr NEWTON: It will.

Queenslanders have also enjoyed increased employment opportunities. The Premier and Treasurer, in tabling the Budget papers, included a comprehensive summary of economic conditions in Queensland in 1984-85, which was compiled by the Treasury Department. The section on tourism is very interesting. It reads—

"In the year ended 31st March, 1985, full-time employment in licensed hotels with accommodation facilities, guest houses and motels in Queensland grew by 12.3 per cent. The comparable figure for the rest of Australia was a decrease of 0.3 per cent.

Between May 1984 and May 1985, employment in the restaurant, hotel and accommodation sector grew by 11.4 per cent."

Mr Randell: It will go down with the capital gains tax.

Mr NEWTON: It will. The summary continues—

"The major projects currently underway throughout the State are providing many employment opportunities for Queenslanders during the construction phase. Also, many permanent full-time and part-time jobs will be created when these projects become operational.

The tourism industry in Queensland has excellent growth potential. The growing levels of international visitors, improved airline services and the development of new and innovative resort and accommodation establishments all suggest that this potential will continue to be realised."

Yet, despite all these benefits and the optimistic predictions for the future, the socialists in Canberra can only see this industry as having a potential for increased taxation revenue.

Firstly the Federal Government mooted the 12.5 per cent services tax that would have crippled this vital industry, and now it has introduced a capital gains tax and has

disallowed deductions for all entertainment expenses incurred after 19 September 1985. What an incredible situation! As Sir Frank Moore said in yesterday's *Daily Sun*—

“The tax package is a vicious anti-business package of dis-incentives to investment, development and growth.”

The capital gains tax will severely affect the rental market. It is the low-income-earner who will suffer, because houses for rent will not be available. The majority of these houses are owned by people for investment purposes. Again, it will be the State Government that will be expected to provide even more low-cost accommodation.

Tourist resorts will also suffer. Because a property-owner cannot be sure of how much tax he will pay when he sells property, the holiday house by the sea will not be an attractive investment.

The Federal Government has also put a stop to negative gearing, which is yet another nail in the coffin for middle-income Australians.

The restaurant industry has gone into a state of shock as a result of the tax package. It is unbelievable that the Government has sought to blanket all business expenses for entertainment. To be sure, this particular area of taxation caused problems; but why has the Government chosen to cripple business and throw away young people's jobs? One can only thank goodness that Queensland has a Government that is prepared to evolve a Budget to give incentive and not to discourage the tourist industry.

Many other areas of development, however, will assist the tourist industry. The development of transport links will benefit commuters and tourists alike, and this State will have efficient transport networks, such as the four-lane highway to the Sunshine Coast, which will remove a bottle-neck and will take interstate visitors to the beautiful north coast.

I have spoken before in this Chamber of the electrification of the Petrie to Caboolture railway line. This service will commence in June 1986. I know that many residents and businesses in my electorate are on a countdown to the commencement of this service. That shows how important it is to them.

This year's State Budget revealed that, during the 1985-86 financial year, \$27m will be expended, and a further \$1.07m will be expended in 1986-87 to complete the electrification project. This work is another example of the Government's providing essential services to encourage growth in a particular area. That is how to encourage growth in the economy. The taxing of businesses and of individuals more and more is a recipe for disaster.

The Caboolture area does have a major problem.

An Opposition Member: Yes, it is the member for Caboolture.

Mr NEWTON: No, Caboolture has good National Party representation; but the region does have problems, such as the traffic generation in the central business district. It is such a major problem that I hope that the council and the Main Roads Department can sit down and try to work out some solutions. Unfortunately, time for procrastination has passed and action has to be taken now. Caboolture is similar to many towns throughout Queensland that sprang up round the railway, but it has the added boundary of the river, so, today, the rail line and the river serve to compound the problems.

The solutions could be worked out immediately if the local councillors recognised the problems and if the Government arranged expert advice. I have given this problem priority, and I hope that the local authority and the Main Roads Department can work it out.

The Housing Commission provides an essential service by building houses and flats for low-income-earners. As I have mentioned, the Federal Government, by the abolition of negative gearing and the introduction of a capital gains tax, will cripple the private

rental market. Despite many warnings from those within the industry, the Federal Government has gone ahead and will have to face up to increased demand for public housing. Unfortunately, as is usually the case, the Queensland Government will have to foot the bill.

During 1985-86, the National Party Government in Queensland has provided funds amounting to \$85m for construction or purchase of welfare housing and purchase and development of land. A further 264 pensioner units will be provided during this financial year, including a number of units to be built in the Deception Bay area in my electorate. The town of Caboolture now has 36 pensioner units providing a vital service to the town. A number of new, two-bedroom and three-bedroom homes have been approved for the town, and they will assist families affected by the Federal Government's short-sighted policies.

Mr Randell: Shame!

Mr NEWTON: That is right.

Mr Randell: Opposition members back their Federal counterparts.

Mr NEWTON: They back them, all right.

The Housing Commission's home-ownership finance schemes are also a great success. They provide families who would not normally qualify for finance with an avenue to own their own homes. This financial year up to 3 500 families are expected to obtain finance through the Housing Commission.

Other honourable members have spoken on the effects of a record \$1,174.8m to be spent on education this financial year. In his speech this afternoon the honourable member for Fassifern mentioned that the electorate of Caboolture will gain a new school. One of the 23 new schools that the Government will construct in the State this year will be built at Beachmere at a cost of \$1.3m. The increase in funding will result in school curriculums being kept abreast of current technological and social advances.

I congratulate the Government for stepping in and providing to community kindergartens the funds heartlessly cut by the Federal Government. I was approached by the Caboolture Kindergarten as the parents were very concerned by the effects of these cuts in funding. It was an enormous achievement of this Government to be able to maintain the levels of subsidy to these kindergartens despite the withdrawal of Federal Government aid.

Mrs Chapman: The Federal Government has cut it right back and we had to step in.

Mr NEWTON: That is right.

The increased population in the growth areas of this State has necessitated the Government's upgrading of police facilities. Two such growth areas in the State are Caboolture and Bribie Island. I stress "Bribie Island" because one member of the Opposition suggested that I had never been there. Yesterday I welcomed the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police to my electorate when he officially opened the Bribie Island Police Station, which was constructed at a cost of \$280,000. The Caboolture Police Station, which will be a magnificent building when it is completed, will be opened later this year.

Only two weeks ago, acting in his capacity as Minister for Forestry, he was again in my electorate. On that occasion he was not opening a new Government building, but was viewing the progress of the rebuilding of the Wilco sawmill, which was burnt down in late 1983. However, as Wilco believes the economic climate is right, it has decided to invest. The new equipment being installed in the sawmill includes some of the latest high-technology automated equipment as well as some traditional hands-on equipment for grade sawing.

Mr Casey: Who owns the mill now?

Mr NEWTON: The honourable member well knows the new owner of the mill has been featured in the press. He is Mr Skase, who is bringing all of his business to Queensland because he can see the potential created by good government. The honourable member for Mackay knows that.

Wilco plans to complete stage 1 of the rebuild in January 1986. At that time the sawmill will operate on a single-shift basis, employ 110 people on site, employ 24 people in logging and timber haulage, cut 1 840 logs a day and cut 67 000 cubic metres of logs per annum.

For Stage 2, which will be completed in January 1987, the figures I have just quoted will double.

Firstly, Wilco is investing a great deal of money in Queensland because of the economic conditions in Queensland and because of its good National Party Government. Secondly, it is investing in Queensland because of the success of the reforestation programs adopted by the Forestry Department. I congratulate that department on the good work that it is doing on the reforestation program.

The Caboolture community will benefit from the mill's operations and the whole State's economy will also be a beneficiary. Royalty payments in 1986 are expected to be in excess of \$2m. In 1987, the estimated royalty payments will be in excess of \$4.5m. That is good free enterprise development. One can see how it works out as the State develops. That is but one company investing in Queensland. The resulting benefits will be felt throughout the community.

The Queensland Government's astute financial management of the State's resources will assist Queensland's stable growth and development.

I congratulate the Government on its presentation of a most sensible Budget.

Mr McLEAN (Bulimba) (8.6 p.m.): Mr De Lacy—

Mr Prest: That's a hard act to follow.

Mr McLEAN: It sure is.

Mr De Lacy, I welcome the opportunity of entering the debate. In doing so, I support fully the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) and his well-documented and well-delivered attack on the Budget.

This debate gives all honourable members an opportunity to examine the accounts that have been presented. It is good to see that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) is in the Chamber. Unfortunately, only half the story was told. The documents that Opposition members have had an opportunity to examine are inconclusive and misleading.

Mr Casey: Do you think that you ought to tell the Minister that winter is over and that he can take his jumper off?

Mr McLEAN: He has the flu.

I listened with amazement to Government members who proudly boasted that the Budget is balanced. It would be hard not to balance a Budget based on the documents that are delivered to Opposition members. Once again, I ask Government members to show me where in the Budget documents I can find details of how, and the areas from which, income is raised in this State. Later in my speech, I will touch on that matter further. I ask Government members who are present in the Chamber to tell me where in the Budget documents I can find detailed the 3 800 charges that have increased in the last 12 months. That cannot be done.

Federally, the charges are at least set out in a manner in which the general public can make a fair estimation of the state of the economy of the country. That is not done

in this State. The Opposition has not been told how many charges have increased above increases in the Consumer Price Index. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) pointed out, the Budget is a deceitful document and one that intentionally hides the taxes and charges that have increased in the last 12 months. That has not happened by chance; it has been done intentionally.

Two typical items that come to the attention of most people are car registration fees and electricity charges. They are items that most persons must face every time they receive a bill, and that matter has been referred to by most members of the Opposition.

In an earlier debate during this session, I referred to electricity charges. An average Queensland electricity-consumer pays \$520 a year, compared with a Sydney family, who pay \$344. That is a difference of \$176. That is quite considerable and quite marked, and at no stage has it been mentioned by one Government member.

On many occasions during the last 12 months, the Opposition has tried to move motions for disallowance of certain regulations. Of course, many others have slipped through. It is high time that the Premier and Treasurer and the Government came clean and told the people of Queensland the true story. The true story is that Queensland is in a mess. The rot has set in. Queensland is suffering from a tired old Government, a Government that has had 28 years in which to get its policies working. However, those policies have not worked.

It is well known by economists throughout Australia that Queensland has the sickest economy in Australia. Although Government members try to hide it, the fact is that Queensland has the highest unemployment rate in Australia, and has had for the last nine months. It will have the highest unemployment rate in Australia for the next 10 months. Queensland has the highest charges——

Mr Newton: All those blokes come here because of the climate.

Mr McLEAN: I will take that interjection. Opposition members listened to the honourable member for Caboolture make a fool of himself. If I were the honourable member, I would sit down and be quiet. The honourable member for Caboolture is the village idiot in this Parliament; his colleagues laugh at him and Opposition members laugh at him. If I were the honourable member, I would shut up.

Queensland suffers from the highest industrial disputation of any State in Australia, despite the propaganda spread by the media in Queensland and the rantings and ravings of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs about the Government's wonderful answer to this State's industrial problems and the way in which it was going to fix the terrible plight of the Queensland economy. As Queensland now has the worst industrial disputation figures of all time, it is obvious that the Government's policies have not worked.

Queenslanders must also endure the lowest wages. The average male wage in Queensland is \$403 a week, or approximately \$26 less than the average male wage in the other States. The average female wage is \$324, or approximately \$12 a week less than the average female wage in the other States. That is nothing to be proud of.

I will recap on what I have said. Queensland has the proven sickest economy, the proven highest unemployment, the proven highest charges, the highest level of industrial disputation and the lowest wages of any Australian State. That is nothing for Government members to hold their hands up about.

This National Party Government stumbles from one crisis to another and from one scandal to another. Small groups of National Party members are getting ready for the kill. Opposition members see them standing in the hallways of Parliament House like vultures waiting for the kill. This State has endured the Lyons affair and the Hinze affair, and it is now enduring the hospital scandal. Ministers have been reprimanded for saying things that are contrary to some of the statements of the Premier and Treasurer

and other very upstanding people in the community. In fact, the Government is ready to crumble.

The truth is that the Government has not got the answers, and it is time for a change. Government members have tried desperately to hide the fact that Queensland has by far the highest unemployment figures in Australia. If one listened to a few of the Government members who have spoken, including the Minister, who is giggling away to himself, one could be forgiven for thinking that Queensland has no unemployment and that Queenslanders live in Utopia. However, unemployment does exist. Queensland has the highest unemployment in Australia, and has had the highest unemployment in Australia for a long time. The frightening part to myself and other Opposition members is that the situation cannot improve with the Government's present policies. If I am given an opportunity later, I shall emphasise that point.

Honourable members will realise that the disastrous industrial relations course that Queensland has adopted can only lead to untold, long-term instability in this State. The latest figures that have been released show that, in Queensland industry, the number of man-hours lost rose by an enormous 120 per cent, whereas every other State except New South Wales recorded a drop. That must result from the agreement and co-operation demonstrated among trade unions, business and Government in every other State except Queensland. The figures for New South Wales have risen by 1 per cent; the figures for Queensland have gone up by 120 per cent. In contrast to that, as I have said, the figures for every other State in Australia have dropped, and that must be due to the understanding and co-operation adopted by the other States in following the Federal Government's attitude in its preparedness to sit down, get round a table and talk. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) is not prepared to do that, and it shows. Industrial relations in Queensland can only become much worse.

Mr Casey: That means that the Minister is the biggest industrial relations disaster in the country.

Mr McLEAN: That is beyond doubt. Any sane, thinking person, who would follow the path taken by the Minister and the Premier and Treasurer, would stop and think as soon as the figures became known. The figures will get much worse.

Many people round the world have tried the course adopted by the Queensland Government: that course has not worked before and it will not work now. Enlightened countries in other parts of the world have tried the course adopted by the Minister and they have failed. Because of the uncertainty in this State at present, industry has been held back. As a consequence, many tens of thousands of workers are faced with the trauma of unemployment. If it were not for the policies implemented by the Minister, those workers could be employed.

I put it to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs that southern States are laughing all the way to the bank because no business leader in his right mind would consider expanding, by establishing premises in Queensland, because of the policies that have led to uncertainty and a volatile industrial relations situation here. People in Queensland are sitting on a time bomb and anyone who really thought about the industrial situation in Queensland would agree that the bomb is about to go off.

Mr Lester: If the honourable member for Bulimba will take one small interjection, I would point out that Queensland has practically led Australia, with the possible exception of South Australia, in expansion of business activities.

Mr Kruger: Oh! What is wrong with him?

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr McLEAN: We will rattle the can in a moment and give this fellow a go.

There is no room for the hatred and conflicts that exist in Queensland today, and I direct my remarks particularly to the Minister because the Government of which he is

a member is adopting that course of conduct. The Queensland Government is anti-Australia and it is anti-everything that the average Australian stands for.

As I see it, the worst aspect of this Government's administration is that it maintains conflicts and hatred on most occasions to ensure that the National Party survives. I have said "most occasions" but, if I had to put a percentage on it, I would probably say that it occurred more than 90 per cent of the time. It is a survival tactic adopted by the National Party. All of the members of the Opposition are aware that the Minister conducts regular surveys, and it is feasible that the Minister is following the results of his surveys. It is therefore quite easy to understand why the National Party Government fosters anti-union feelings.

Mr Lester: Not one long-term industrial dispute in Queensland has been initiated by the Government.

Mr McLEAN: The Queensland Government has initiated every dispute in Queensland. If the National Party Government has not initiated every dispute, its actions have either exaggerated or prolonged the dispute for its own political ends.

Mr Lester: Your people defied the Industrial Commission.

Mr McLEAN: It is impossible to legislate to achieve good industrial relations. It is a pity that the Minister does not listen to some of his departmental officers, because they would probably say the same thing. It is a fact that the Minister does not realise.

Mr McPhie: Who wrote this for you?

Mr McLEAN: No-one; but if anyone had, the honourable member would not be able to read it, because he is an idiot. The bloke sitting behind him at least had the guts to stand up and say something. The honourable member is the dead-set clown of this Assembly. He is an idiot.

Mr Newton: You're not too bad yourself. Keep going.

Mr McLEAN: Have a look at it, will you? Fair dinkum!

Mr McPhie: This is another bit of the speech that nobody has written.

Mr McLEAN: If only every voter in Caboolture could be brought to this Chamber to have a look at the honourable member's effort! He would be the greatest clown ever to enter this place. I do not know how he even has the hide to open his mouth. As for the idiot in front of him, the member for Toowoomba North—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr De Lacy): Order! The honourable member will return to the debate.

Mr McLEAN: I am under extreme provocation, Mr De Lacy.

Mr NEWTON: I rise to a point of order.

Mr McLEAN: Oh, I have upset him.

Mr NEWTON: I would like the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

An Opposition Member: Which one?

Mr NEWTON: He knows—"idiot"

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member finds the remark offensive. I ask the honourable member for Bulimba to withdraw it.

Mr McLEAN: I will withdraw the part that the honourable member finds offensive.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr McLEAN: Yes, I called him a clown.

I repeat that a working partnership must be formed between business and the unions. All parties must co-operate. Unfortunately, co-operation is something that is lacking in this State. Like so many people in the community, I feel that the excesses of the Minister and this Government in the area of industrial relations prove beyond doubt that there must be a better way to handle industrial relations than the way in which this Government presently handles things. I will give the Minister a rap-up in a moment because he did attempt to do just that. It is a shame that he does not do it more often. A constructive and conciliatory approach is needed to build unity, stability, trust and a willingness to understand the problems and not expand them.

Mr Borbidge: Appeasement!

Mr McLEAN: Perhaps the honourable member would like me to talk about 24-hour shopping on the Gold Coast.

In the document titled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective* one finds that funding for the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs has been increased by 14.1 per cent on the previous year. At face value that sounds quite good, but the truth is that in the 1984-85 Budget total disregard was shown for the department in that it received only a 2.6 per cent increase in funding over that of the previous year. The responsibility for the Weights and Measures Branch was removed from the department, otherwise the figure would have been a little higher, so I will not continue with that point. However, the fact is that the department did not receive an increase in funding anywhere near that given to other departments. For instance, the Education Vote increased by 15.7 per cent; Housing by 12.6 per cent; Justice by 15 per cent; Local Government by 16.7 per cent; Forestry by 23.7 per cent; and Primary Industries by 17.6 per cent. In the 1984-85 Budget there was a very small increase in allowances for apprentices attending block release, and the department's activities included an engineering work-force study, a review of the Industry and Commerce Training Act, an investigation into traineeships, publicity and promotion, including Training for Industry Month, an inquiry into youth unemployment, a publicity campaign for Safety Week and a review of premium rates for workers' compensation. So last year in all there were two reviews, two publicity and promotion campaigns, one study, one investigation and one inquiry. There was no easing of the staff shortages that have existed in the department for so long. In fact, they were pointed out by a former Minister, now a back-bencher, Sir William Knox. A number of years ago, he said that staff shortages in the department handled by the Minister were nearly unbearable. Very few improvements have been made.

Mr Lester: That's not right.

Mr McLEAN: It is right.

Mr Lester: I have put on 60 additional people since I've been Minister. That is not bad.

Mr McLEAN: They are not in the areas in which they are needed. They are not in the industrial inspectorate and other essential areas. No positive and meaningful attempt has been made to attack the unemployment problem. Honourable members are now seeing the results of ignoring a very serious and obvious problem. Workers' safety and other areas controlled by the Minister have been disregarded in the Budget.

It seems to be accepted that something should be done this year, because the Minister has promised a \$2m special grant, which is to be spent on a number of projects. I should probably say that that is very generous. If it was invested for four years, the \$2m might buy a jet for the Premier.

Mr Lester interjected.

Mr McLEAN: That comment was made seriously. The Minister deals with unemployment, workers' health and industrial health. He controls matters that affect thousands of workers in Queensland. When he can provide an additional \$2m, he is very proud of it.

Mrs Chapman: Let us talk about the ETU.

Mr McLEAN: I will come to that in a minute, if I have time, but I have more important things to deal with.

As to how that money is to be spent—it should be noted that the special provision of \$2m has been made available in 1985-86 to enable the recommendations of the Employment Task Force to be put in place.

Reference is made to a self-employment venture scheme. In relation to that scheme, the following statement appears in the booklet *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*—

“This scheme has been extremely popular with over 300 phone calls/inquiries being received each month.”

That would be about 3 000 to 3 500 phone calls last year. In all, in 1984-85, a total of 41 applications were approved. Out of 3 000 to 3 500 inquiries, 41 applications were approved! The 41 approved included hairdressing, garden refuse collection and handyman services, photography, white-water rafting, import/export, refrigeration mechanic and advertising.

Later in the booklet, the following appears—

“In addition to the above, during 1985-86 the Department will direct a total of \$140,000 of the additional \$2.0 million to the following new programs . . .”

Relative to the private sector employment training scheme, an amount of \$70,000 has been allocated for 1985-86. It is envisaged that the scheme will build on the existing Innovative Employment and Training Programs Scheme. That \$70,000 is probably \$10,000 less than the Minister's expenses for the year.

With reference to the local government training scheme, \$70,000 has been allocated for 1985-86. Queensland must have about 130 local authorities.

Mr Cooper: There are 134 local authorities in Queensland.

Mr McLEAN: If the \$70,000 is divided among the 134 local authorities, it represents little more than \$500 a council for a local government training scheme. What the hell can be done with \$500 a council for a local government training scheme? It would cost more than that in stamps. I put it to the Minister that the whole thing is a joke—another publicity gimmick.

Under the heading “Approaches to Retraining”, the following appears—

“The report of the Task Force on Employment in Queensland highlights increasing incidence of redundancy, technological restructuring and industrial restructuring, which will require an increased emphasis on training, further training and retraining.”

Another \$50,000 is to be provided for that scheme. The Premier's aircraft costs \$1,290,000 to run each year, yet the Minister has the hide to provide \$50,000 to overcome the problems associated with redundancy and technological restructuring. That \$50,000 would not be enough to pay the taxis each year to get the Premier to his aircraft.

A Government Member: You are making it up.

Mr McLEAN: If the honourable member wishes, I shall go a bit further.

For 1985-86, the Minister has provided \$153,600 for promotional activities. He is spending \$153,600 to promote a scheme for which \$50,000 has been provided. Does that show any brains?

Mr Lester: What about giving me a go?

Mr McLEAN: The Minister has plenty of time to speak. He gets plenty of time to speak during question-time. As I say, he will spend \$153,600 to give people \$50,000.

Mr Casey: It defies all logic.

Mr McLEAN: I will tell the honourable member what the Minister has done. Among the major activities, he has included industry and commerce training inter-church services. Being a good religious man, that would make the honourable gentleman happy.

I will go a bit further and refer to the review of field services. Another major review is to be undertaken this year. What happened last year? There were two reviews, two publicity promotions, one study, one investigation and one inquiry. This year will be similar.

There is a special grant of \$96,000 for an industrial accident research study. The Federal Government will give the Minister that money, anyway.

Mr Lester interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The Federal Government will give the Minister the lot.

The Minister is to license demolishers, and I agree with that. He is also providing for sewerage and trenching maintenance, and I give him credit for that.

I turn now to the Industrial Inspection Branch. This is a ripper! The booklet states—

“This Branch performs an important role contributing to industrial harmony by providing an independent advisory service, and a supply of current information on the provision of various State Industrial Acts, Regulations, Awards and Industrial Agreements.”

Mr Lester: That is helpful.

Mr McLEAN: It is very helpful!

I come to the Industrial Affairs Advisory Unit, the setting up of which was the Minister's star act last year. The booklet states—

“The Industrial Affairs Advisory Unit, established on 27th September, 1984 provides information aimed at solving problems arising in the workplace to both employers and employees.”

Mr Lester: We have inquiries every day.

Mr McLEAN: I have asked questions about the members of the unit, the number of inquiries that they have received and the results of their investigations. The Minister has not answered my questions. Last year, that was supposed to be the wonderful cure-all. In all honesty, the Minister must agree that it was one of the con-acts that honourable members have become used to in this Chamber.

Turning to the Workers Compensation Board of Queensland, I note that the Minister has made a very generous grant of \$1,500 to the Australian Brain Foundation for research into head injuries. The booklet states—

“For any compensation scheme to be successful it must include a positive rehabilitation facility.”

I agree with that. It is one area in which the Government and the Minister—he has not been Minister for very long—

Mr McPhie: He has done a good job. He will be there for a long time.

Mr McLEAN: I am sure that the Government can do without him.

The problems associated with workers' compensation and occupational safety need a lot more attention and consideration than the Government, through the present Minister and through former Ministers for Employment and Industrial Affairs, has given to them. Long-term industrial injuries are a serious matter, and although the Government has now decided to spend money in that field—it should have done so a long time ago—I feel that not enough emphasis can be put on it. Given the nature of the workplace today, problems associated with shift work and industrial diseases, in particular, are not being investigated fully and workers who are honest and fair dinkum about their problems are not being treated fairly by the system. If the Minister carries out this program to its full extent, I will give the Government my support.

Mr Lester: We will invite you to the opening.

Mr McLEAN: If the Minister does, it will be the first thing that he has ever invited me to.

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (8.37 p.m.): It was with interest that I listened to the debate, if that is what it could be called, of the honourable member for Bulimba. I appreciate his giving us the benefit of his understanding of industrial relations.

Mr Borbidge: His speech showed that his experience was on the wharves.

Mrs HARVEY: Yes, I think that is probably where it did come from.

My interpretation of the honourable member's understanding of industrial relations is that it amounts to a policy of surrender to union rule. Honourable members were also treated to some selective statistics, and I was particularly interested in those that the honourable member suggested denigrated the work of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. As the Minister pointed out, the careers market is very worthwhile, so perhaps the member for Bulimba could take the trouble to visit it one day and recommend it to high school students in his electorate. He asked what benefit is derived from expenditure on the careers market, and if he took the trouble, he would be pleasantly surprised to find that it enables high school children to establish very firm goals for their future based on the information supplied at the careers market.

Queensland State Opposition members tend to forget that, sadly, they were elected to represent the people of Queensland. They spend all their time defending the reprehensible policies of the Federal Government. Of course, they are Canberra puppets first and Queenslanders second. If they really cared about Queensland, they would have made representations to Bob Hawke to give Queensland a fair go in his allocation of funds to the States. However, they insist on claiming in this place that puppeteer Hawke is a very fair man. The cane-farmers' demonstration this week showed that they do not think that Mr Hawke is a fair man; nor do the pressured business sectors, both large and small, consider the recent Federal Budget to be a fair deal. Australia's unemployed youth, who are being wooed heavily by Mr Hawke, do not find much in the Federal package other than rhetoric.

In its 1985-86 Budget, the Queensland Government is providing for the people. It takes care to ensure that the well-being and quality of life of the people of this great State are maintained, despite the efforts of the Federal Labor Government to destroy it by a lack of funding.

Mr Prest: Tell us about that child abuse committee.

Mrs HARVEY: I am pleased that the honourable member for Port Curtis is interested in it, and I will tell him all about it outside this Chamber, should he care to ask at any time.

The undisguised attempt by the Federal Labor Government to punish the people of Queensland for daring to be different by holding fast to their conservative values and ideals will be repaid in kind by the electors of Queensland in a massive vote against

Labor at the next State election. The lack of Federal funding has placed great strains on the finances of Queensland, but in the interests of the future prosperity of the people of this State, the Queensland Government has refused to follow the socialist Governments of the other mainland States down the primrose path of deficit budgeting.

This responsible approach will ensure the continued prosperity of this State. Queenslanders are astute and have chosen to stick with the proven management of the Bjelke-Petersen Government. I am amazed that anyone could choose a business manager who would run him into heavy debt. That is precisely what the people in the southern States have done with their choice of Labor State Governments.

In its approach to education, the Queensland Government is providing for the people. It has always placed a high priority on the education of the children of this State. It shares the concern of parents that children be given the best possible education to equip them to take their place in today's modern society as they grow into adulthood. To achieve that goal, the Queensland Government has consistently allocated a larger proportion of total expenditure to education. This financial year, a record amount of \$1,174.8m, which is an increase of 9.5 per cent on the amount spent last year, will be expended. Part of this increase in funding will allow for the employment of an additional 1 087 teachers and the employment of temporary teachers as well.

Mr Borbidge: We have picked up the pre-school funding that the Federal Government ratted on.

Mrs HARVEY: Yes. I do not know how the Federal Government can live with a decision like that. As I pointed out in a previous speech, not one member of the Opposition moaned about it. They moan about all sorts of other things, but they are more interested in looking after the unions than in looking after our little children.

As a former high school teacher, I am very pleased that the employment of more teachers has been possible. I am sure that it is welcomed by all teachers in Queensland.

I have found that the Minister for Education is always ready to listen to the needs of the schools in my electorate of Greenslopes. He has been willing to visit the schools to see their needs at first hand. Parents with children at the Coorparoo State High School are grateful that he has recommended the construction of a music block at that school. After all, the school has a large music section and a very competent school orchestra. To cope under the present conditions of having to drag the instruments, particularly the large instruments such as kettle drums and electric pianos, backwards and forwards from the hall to the school building and back has been very difficult.

Whilst I am speaking of schools in the Greenslopes electorate, I should add that I am very pleased that the Minister for Works and Housing has approved the construction of a tuck-shop at the 108-year-old Coorparoo State School. Once again, parents with children at that school are most appreciative. The tuck-shop will remove the need for the primary schoolchildren to cross the busy Old Cleveland Road and Cavendish Road to purchase lunches at the shopping centre.

Mr Henderson: Your predecessor did not do much.

Mrs HARVEY: I must admit that it has taken 108 years to get the tuck-shop. I do not know what other people did. Never mind, we got there in the end.

Through the p. and c. association, the tuck-shop gives parents the opportunity to ensure that their children receive food with the correct nutritional balance that their developing bodies require. That is a very important feature of tuck-shops. As a former teacher, I am aware of the number of children who arrive at school each day without having eaten breakfast. This tuck-shop, as all tuck-shops do, will provide children with the opportunity to obtain the appropriate food for this important meal.

Mr Prest: If they are sent to school without breakfast, would that constitute child abuse?

Mrs HARVEY: As I have already pointed out to the honourable member for Port Curtis, if he wants to have a discussion on child abuse, I am quite happy to clarify the matter for him outside the Chamber.

I spend a good deal of my time visiting the schools in the Greenslopes electorate, and I enjoy observing the little ones at the Coorparoo Infants School trying so hard to master new skills under the expert guidance of devoted teachers. There is more to teaching than merely processing information. It takes dedication and total commitment—attitudes that are so apparent in the schools in my area, whether it be in the concerts by the music department of the Coorparoo State High School or the school fete student bookwork display at St Joachim's school at Holland Park. I am heartened that Queensland has a Government that understands and supports this teacher dedication so tangibly with Budget increases as well as a constant willingness to address the needs of our children.

The Queensland Government is providing more than ever for the education of pre-school children. As has already been pointed out, the Federal Government has once again let down those who trusted it. It has withdrawn Federal block-grant funding for pre-school education. Honourable members will notice that, at the moment, Opposition members are extremely quiet. The Queensland Government recognises that the high standard of pre-school education in this State must be maintained, and to this end it has decided to fill the huge gap left by the withdrawal of Federal funds.

Mr Henderson: They are quiet because when you talk about education, they don't know what you are talking about.

Mrs HARVEY: The honourable member's point is well made.

The State Government will increase from 59 per cent to 80 per cent its contribution towards approved staff costs. Taking up the gap left by the Federal Government will cost \$6.6m a year, but the Queensland Government's concern for education and the well-being of families has made this a necessity. That move is greatly appreciated by parents and kindergartens in the Greenslopes electorate. I have received a letter from the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland expressing its appreciation. I noticed that, last week, the contents of that letter were read out by an honourable member. I am sure that Opposition members have also been made aware of its contents.

Mrs Chapman: We were all thanked for that, because there were going to be women who wanted to go to work and who could not put their children into the service.

Mrs HARVEY: The honourable member for Pine Rivers is correct.

The Queensland Government is providing for the people in the vital area of welfare. The Queensland Government, with a 10 per cent increase in funding over the last financial year, is set to continue its fine record of recent years. The success last year of the Year of the Family initiative by the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz), followed by this year's successful promotion of International Youth Year, appears set to be followed by an equally successful Year of the Parent in 1986. A Budget allocation of \$200,000 over two financial years has been announced, and the State planning committee, chaired by Senator Lady Florence Bjelke-Petersen, has already commenced work to make 1986 a successful and productive year.

It is pleasing to see an increase to \$2.8m in funding this financial year for the Queensland Recreation Council. I have the pleasure of being chairman of the south side branch of that council, and I am well aware of the worthwhile work carried out by the professional area recreation advisers working in conjunction with the voluntary area committees. At the moment, my area committee has taken on board for the three-year term a theme of looking after the recreation needs of the elderly. We are working to that end and already have in place a project for the Week of the Aged, which will be held from late October to early November. Representatives of various organisations in the area will be encouraged to examine camp facilities for the aged. Perhaps they could

visit a camp that will be held at Tallebudgera at that time. Through the Queensland Recreation Council, things are happening in that area. Today, a great deal of attention is focused on the young. However, those who are retired or elderly have not had emphasis placed on their right to recreational facilities and their accommodation in various areas.

The Queensland Government is providing for the youth of this State. All citizens of Queensland will applaud the Youth Employment Support Scheme and the allocation of \$130,000 to Stage 2 of the expansion of that project. The youth of this State deserve every assistance, and employment is fundamental to their future. I was proud to be present at the opening of centres in Cairns and Roma, which is Stage 1 of the expansion of the scheme. I expect that they will be as successful as the initial centres at Salisbury and Zillmere.

The sum of \$200,000 has been allocated to youth leadership training grants. Having spent a day with youth-leaders who were participating in a training school on Magnetic Island, I can assure the committee that it is money well spent. The high standard of training offered must benefit all youth groups who have leaders trained at those schools.

The Queensland Government is providing for the special needs of ethnic community groups, with nearly \$1m being allocated to the Department of Ethnic Affairs. The high regard for that department within the ethnic community is indicative of the value of the work carried out by it.

Unarguably, the most critical area of welfare must be children's services. The Government, by providing \$44.16m, has increased the allocation by 10.8 per cent. The invaluable work carried out in this area requires no further comment. The Government has increased the allocation for employment and industrial affairs by 14.1 per cent to \$21,648,000. The outstanding success of this Government in dealing with unemployment is hidden by the failure of the official figures to take into account the migration to Queensland of unemployed people from other States. During the last three years, 13 000 unemployed people have left other States and come to Queensland. They have effectively lowered the unemployment figure in the States they left and raised the unemployment figure in Queensland.

Mr Prest: You just said you raised it; then you lowered it.

Mrs HARVEY: Yes, I think that I may have mixed something up in explaining. It appears that I was correct. The honourable member for Port Curtis could not have been listening. That is his problem. If this migration of unemployed people had not taken place, the official rate of unemployment in Queensland would be only 8 per cent and would be the third lowest in Australia.

The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) has undoubtedly been instrumental in the achievement of that success. The very successful youth employment program is to be expanded this financial year. Part of the Budget allocation is for special employment programs. Components of this program are self-employment venture schemes, local employment development programs, innovative employment and training programs, private sector employment training schemes and local government training schemes. The work of the Minister in apprenticeship training is encouraging young people to take pride in their trade skills and is improving the future prospects for Queensland industry. The Government's commitment to providing jobs through the development of technology and assistance to small business is evident in relation to industry, small business and technology. It has received a massive funding boost of 53 per cent over last year to \$26.484m this year. The Minister's efforts to develop a strong technology-based manufacturing industry State-wide, the help offered to inventors and innovators, and the expansion and further development of high-technology parks in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast should ensure that more job opportunities are provided for those now training to enter the work-force in the future.

The Queensland Government is providing for the needs of small business. The funds for the Small Business Development Corporation have been almost doubled in

this Budget. The additional service made available will contribute to a stronger small business sector. Small business employs approximately 60 per cent of the nation's private sector work-force so the flow-on to the general prosperity of the State is appreciated.

Mr Wilson: Not if they all go broke. We have the highest rate of bankruptcy in Australia.

Mrs HARVEY: The honourable member for Townsville South obviously did not hear the Minister's recent comments on television. If he had, he would know the answer to that statement.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the Government's plan to provide a community centre in Coorparoo for the residents of Coorparoo, Camp Hill, Holland Park, Greenslopes and surrounding suburbs. The magnificent old Queen Alexandra House is to be restored by the Works Department and handed over to the residents of the area for use as a community centre. That building, classified by the National Trust, has been used as a private home, an orphanage, a temporary girls school and a college. It is most fitting that, in its centenary year, 1986, it be provided, in restored condition, for the use of the community and as a functioning tribute to and reminder of the past citizens of the area who turned the area into the community that it is today.

In this building the community plans to establish a permanent reference point manned by members of local churches and charity groups to direct people in need to local groups and organisations that can provide the health or guidance required. An area will be set aside where local groups and associations can raise funds by selling morning and afternoon teas and provide a focal point for people seeking the company of others or a quiet moment in their otherwise busy day.

It must be remembered that 25 per cent of the Greenslopes electorate is aged over 60 years, and many of those people have been widowed. The centre will give those people a chance to mix with others in similar circumstances, or perhaps with young mothers who have dropped in for a break after having dropped their children at the infants' school nearby or at the primary school next door.

Plans are in train to offer day-care facilities to parents who take part in a parenting program next year. In that project, close co-operation has been offered by the Technical and Further Education College, which is situated next door, for programs that will give students experience in real-life situations at the community centre.

It is planned also that during 1986, the Year of the Parent, seminars for sole parents will be held at the centre to enable sole parents to discuss their needs and provide information to the Government that will enable those needs to be met. Sole parents are increasing in numbers, and they have special needs. Within the Greenslopes electorate alone, 10 per cent of the people are sole parents.

The planned community centre is a magnificent project and is an expression of the concern felt by the Government for the quality of life of all its citizens.

I point out that the Federal Labor Government, by its reduction of funding in Queensland, is attempting to punish the people of this great State for daring to be different, for daring to retain their conservative values and ideals, and for not following the other mainland States down the socialist path. Those same values and ideals will enable this State to continue to grow in strength and prosperity.

Finally, I congratulate the Premier and Treasurer on the presentation of this careful and caring 1985-86 Budget.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (8.57 p.m.): I rise to support the Leader of the Opposition, and I say that this Budget is fraudulent and misleading. It is fraudulent because the Premier and Treasurer has said that it contains no new taxes. However, before dealing with the aspect of no new taxes, I should turn my attention to some of the things said by the honourable member for Greenslopes (Mrs Harvey).

First, the honourable member said that she is very disappointed with the amount of money provided by the Federal Government to the State of Queensland. For the benefit of the honourable member, let me reiterate that although Queensland has only 16 per cent of the population of Australia, 20 per cent of the grants made by the Federal Government have come to Queensland. Let me say also that insofar as the education of children concerns the Queensland Government, Queensland spends on secondary education only 76 per cent of the Australian average and on technical and further education only two-thirds of the Australian average. In other words, the Queensland Government is leaving youth in a pool of unemployment.

Another point I wish to take up was the one made by the honourable member for Townsville South (Mr Wilson). That honourable member said that in the area of small business, Queensland leads in the bankruptcy stakes. Last year, the number of bankruptcies in Queensland went up 26 per cent and reached a figure of over 1 000. That indicates the way in which small business is treated in Queensland, and that treatment leaves a lot to be desired.

Although there are supposedly no new taxes in the Budget, this Government exists on taxing by stealth. The Government taxes by imposing high Government charges on pensioners and those who are on fixed incomes.

Let me now turn to examine some of the charges that are imposed on Queensland's pensioners. In Queensland, it costs a pensioner \$203.10 to register a car. However, a country Victorian pensioner pays only \$98, which is less than half of the amount charged in Queensland. That is the way in which the Queensland Government imposes charges on its pensioner citizens. Registration charges in New South Wales are \$161, which is a substantially lower amount than Queensland's registration charges.

Another service that is required by the aged is the life-saving ambulance service. In New South Wales and Victoria, that service is free. That is what a socialist Government does for the underprivileged and the pensioners; it provides the ambulance service free. In Brisbane, persons would pay \$14 only if they were eligible for full-entitlement health-card benefits. If that is not the case, then a person would pay \$35. In my home town, Bundaberg, pensioners have to pay \$17 a year.

When the premiums for home insurance are examined—one of the essentials involved in owning a home—what are the State Government charges for fire levies and stamp duties? If a Queensland pensioner insures his home for \$40,000, he will be charged \$58.20. In New South Wales, a pensioner is charged \$16 for the same amount, and in Victoria, \$21.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Look at them leaving like a pack of fleas!

Mr CAMPBELL: Perhaps those honourable members do not worry about the pensioners in their electorates, but members on this side of the Committee do.

In fact, the Queensland Government charges three times more for stamp duty and fire levies for the basic requirement of owning a house than does the New South Wales Government. What a caring Government!

I turn to the provision of electricity—the basic light and power needed for the home. How much does this benevolent State Government charge a pensioner for that item? If a Brisbane pensioner paid \$69.93 for electricity, a pensioner in Sydney would pay \$29.80 for the same amount of power—less than half—and a pensioner in Melbourne would pay \$50 for the same amount.

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: I turn now to rates. The member for Pine Rivers is a great believer in local government and in what should be done to reduce local government charges. Does she know that the so-called socialist Governments of New South Wales and Victoria give close to double the rate rebate that is given in Queensland? The

Queensland Government subsidy for pensioner rate rebates is only \$150; in New South Wales the maximum subsidy is \$300, and in Victoria it is \$270. In other words, the Queensland Government gives pensioners less than half the rebate given to pensioners in New South Wales and Victoria.

The ordinary Queensland pensioner pays \$8 a week more for basic services to the home such as electricity, rates, State Government charges on home insurance, ambulance fees and registration fees to keep a vehicle on the road than does a pensioner in New South Wales. He pays \$7 a week more than a Victorian pensioner for similar services.

I turn now to the stamp duty concessions that were introduced last year by the Government. If the landed gentry opposite wanted to give their \$2m, \$3m and \$4m farms to their children or grandchildren, they would pay the princely sum of \$50 in stamp duty. If a pensioner transfers his \$60,000 home to his children or grandchildren and they decide not to live in the home, that transfer will cost him \$1,200 in stamp duty. If the children decide to live in the home, the stamp duty charge will be \$600. Although the Bjelke-Petersens of this world can transfer a \$3m farm to their children or grandchildren for only \$50, this caring Government will charge a little pensioner in my electorate at least \$600, if not \$1,200, to transfer his home to his kids.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Mrs Chapman supports that.

Mr CAMPBELL: Does she?

I turn now to the flat-rate tax proposal—I should call it the flat-earth tax proposal—supported by Government members. By their support of the Bjelke-Petersen flat-earth tax proposal, they agree that farmers, small businessmen, pensioners and lowly-paid workers in their electorates should pay more income tax.

Last week, I asked the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) to deny that the owners of a family farm who have a taxable income of less than \$43,000, and the income is split between the husband and wife, would pay more tax under that proposal. He could not deny that, because it is true. If the family farm income is split between the husband and wife, unless they have a taxable income of more than \$43,000, they will pay more tax. Every family cane-farmer in Queensland will pay more tax under the Bjelke-Petersen flat-rate tax proposal than under the present tax system.

Mrs Chapman: You don't understand it.

Mr CAMPBELL: Do honourable members realise that every small-businessman will pay the same? I will give the member for Pine Rivers two minutes or five minutes if she can provide the figures to prove that I am wrong.

National Party members say that they want to provide incentives for people to earn more. Do honourable members know what the incentives are? They are really disincentives for the pensioner, the lowly paid worker and the unemployed to earn more money. Under the flat-earth tax favoured by the Bjelke-Petersen Government and supported by all Government members, on every extra dollar earned by a pensioner or unemployed person, more tax is paid under the flat-rate taxation system. That is undeniable and I would like any person in the National Party to try to prove that what I am saying is wrong.

National Party members are engaging in donkey economics, the donkey economics of the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. National Party members cannot do their homework. Their proposition will mean that the lower-paid people will be charged more.

Have honourable members ever heard Government members say that they believe in small government, that they intend to cut down the number of public servants, that they are going out of their minds for small government? Do honourable members realise that since 1981 the Queensland Government has increased the proportion of State public servants in the total work-force by far more than any other State in Australia has done?

The Queensland Government is increasing the number of public servants as a proportion of employed people at a rate faster than that in any other State. The socialist States are keeping the numbers down while the Queensland Government is increasing them, supposedly in the name of small government.

In 1981, the Queensland Public Service accounted for 15.9 per cent of the total number of people in employment in Queensland. In 1983 the level increased to 16.2 per cent. In 1985, all in the name of small government and of cutting the red tape, it increased to 17.3 per cent. In 1981, public service employees in Western Australia made up 18.6 per cent of the work-force. That figure decreased to 18 per cent. The Labor Government has maintained the percentage at a level below that which applied under the non-Labor Government in 1981.

In New South Wales, over the same period, the proportion increased from 15.3 per cent to 15.6 per cent. New South Wales has been able to keep the percentage of public service employees down, but Queensland has been unable to do so. Queensland's performance makes a mockery of the Government's saying that it believes in small government.

The Queensland Government is employing more bureaucrats and paying more wages to them than any other State is doing, and the rate at which it is doing so is increasing. They are all going to lap up to the Premier and various departments. In every instance it can be seen that the Government is not living up to its alleged belief in small government.

I shall now deal with the important sugar industry. The information I intend to present has been taken from the Auditor-General's reports and Rural Reconstruction Board annual reports. Do honourable members realise that the 1983, 1984 and 1985 Auditor-General's reports show that, in special payments to consolidated revenue, the Queensland Government took out \$10m in 1983, \$3.2m in 1984 and \$3m in 1985 from the Rural Adjustment Fund? In three years, it took \$16.2m from the rural reconstruction funds and transferred it to consolidated revenue. How much has the Government put in? Once again the Government is skiting about its donkey economics.

According to the annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Board for 1983, the State Government put nothing into the Rural Adjustment Fund in 1982-83. According to the annual report for 1984, the State Government put \$10m into the Rural Adjustment Fund in 1983-84. According to the State Budget figures just released, the State Government put \$5m into the Rural Adjustment Fund in 1984-85. That is a total of \$15m over those three years. Do honourable members know how much the State Government took out of the funds? It took out \$16.2m. In other words, it took out \$1.2m more than it put in. In addition, there were the normal repayments of interest and redemption to the State.

That information is based on the annual reports of the Auditor-General and of the Rural Reconstruction Board. It is there for all cane-growers to see. The State Government has deceived and has lied to every cane-grower in Queensland. Over the last three years, it took more money out of rural reconstruction funds than it put in. That information is now going out to all cane-growers. The deceit will not go on for much longer.

Between the inception of both the Rural Adjustment Fund and the Rural Reconstruction Fund and 1984, the State Government made a contribution of only \$1.5m to bolster those funds. Over the same period, the Commonwealth Government provided \$49.4m. How can the State Government say that it is supporting the farmers when its own papers show that its contribution to farmers through the Rural Reconstruction Board was only \$1.5m compared with a contribution of \$49.4m by the Commonwealth Government?

I now turn to another aspect of the Budget, and that is the Estimates for the Forestry Department. Just over \$50m has been provided for the Forestry Department. I will go through what I regard as a classic *Yes Minister* episode. It should be entitled, "The

Over-pulped Mill". Over the last decade, three mills that have been proposed have not eventuated. The pulp-mill proposed to use the thinnings from south Queensland's massive pine plantations is surrounded by bad political odour. The failure of the proposed pulp-mill on the Mary River exposes a major potential scandal, the implications of which have not begun to be appreciated. This is another phantom project of the Queensland Government. The latest news that yet a third proposed pulp-mill for Queensland has dropped through has multimillion dollar implications for Queenslanders. This is despite an assurance by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) in May 1984 that the proposed \$300m pulp-mill to be established by the Finnish company, Ekono Oy, appeared to be a certainty. Queensland now has a great glut of pulpwood that cannot be sold. The proposed pulp-mill was to process harvested thinnings from south-east Queensland. The problem is that Queensland has the plantations but cannot sell the pulp.

The scandal is based on the following facts. A crop of pulpwood was initially established without any market for the pulp in sight. The Forestry Department subsequently argued that, to sell the pulpwood crop that was growing, it needed more plantations than were initially intended. The cost of establishing the pulp crop plus the sawlog crop is much higher than establishing the select stem crop alone. Therefore, this forestry empire-building has already cost Queenslanders millions of dollars and there is no chance of selling the pulpwood.

Successive Forestry Ministers have misled the public in a multimillion dollar con. There is no proposed pulp-mill on the horizon. So far, three different proposals have been mooted in two decades. Firstly, Woodlands allegedly contracted to build a pulp-mill by 1968. After deferring it for more than a decade, the company finally opted out after selling out to CSR. Then APM was to harvest the Crown's pulp crop as well as its own Caboolture-centred crop at a mill to be built on Bribie Island. That was about five years ago.

The latest consortium, headed by Ekono Oy, was to build its mill at Owanyilla, but that was deferred three times before it finally fell through. A pulp-mill that would have provided employment will not be established, yet there has been large investment in the pulpwood crop that nobody seems to want. The worst part of the problem is that very few people are aware of, much less informed about, this crop, and while there is so much ignorance, the Forestry Department continues its business-as-usual policy.

The further plantings of even more trees are exacerbating the problem. It is ironical that tax-payers pay to destroy more native forest than is necessary, pay extra to plant the pulp crop, and may even have to pay to extract and burn that crop. This is happening because the Forestry Department has not been questioned about its actions. By using selective statistics, the department has misled the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Bill Glasson), in his Clayton's highway patrol, down the wrong road.

The analogy that I draw from that is that it is like driving a car by looking only in the rear-vision mirror. It is all right when one is driving on a straight road, but when one comes to a corner, one does not see the bend, and that is what has happened in the Forestry Department. It is using past trends and past projections, which are blinkered, and it has not seen the corner. Now, the corner has been reached, but, unfortunately, the Minister has not looked at what is happening.

Let us look at the Forestry Department's projections. For at least 70 years, the Queensland Government has been aware that the stands of native hardwood and softwood pine forests remaining in the State will not be sufficient to meet future demands for timber and wood products. For the last 60 years, the Government has embarked upon an ambitious and initially necessary program to plant fast-growing exotic softwoods and native softwoods to make up for the shortfall in the availability of native timbers.

This program has, within the last decade, set as its goal an ultimate plantation on State land of 200 000 ha, supplemented by an additional 50 000 ha on private land. Of the 200 000 ha of plantation on State forest, about 45 000 ha will be planted at the

expense of rain forest and highly productive wet sclerophyll forest. At least another 100 000 ha will be planted at the expense of other native forest and woodland. Regardless of the fact that a pulp-mill will not now be established, this program has not been reconsidered.

I go along with the program inasmuch as it will mean that Queensland will become self-sufficient, but the department is over-optimistic in its projection of demand for sawn timber and pulpwood.

In January 1979, the Forestry Department published its submission to the Senate inquiry into all aspects of Australia's forestry and forest products industries. In that submission, the department provided figures indicating what it believed to be the future demand for sawn timber to the year 2010. It predicted a demand for sawn timber in 1980 of 1.7 million cubic metres and in 2010 of 2.5 million cubic metres. In 1984, the department predicted minimum demands for sawn timber in 1985 of 1.7 million cubic metres and in 2010 of 2.8 million cubic metres. The department claimed that its predictions were based on the best knowledge available on the changes in population growth and expected changes in consumption patterns.

In both cases, the Forestry Department is looking in the rear-vision mirror, and has not looked to the future. Because a pulp-mill will not now be established in Queensland, and unless the department's program is reassessed, millions of dollars will be invested in the planting of timber that is not required.

According to the last annual report of the Forestry Department, Queensland produced 0.9 million cubic metres of sawn timber from native forests and plantation on State forests and on private land. That volume is almost 90 per cent of the volume of sawn timber actually used in Queensland in 1983-84. Only 21 per cent of the sawn timber produced came from plantations, which were planted in 1960. The same applies to the establishment of a pulp-mill. Those demands have been used, but there is no pulp-mill.

Honourable members may ask whether I am the one who is claiming that the demand is not there. I am not. Private entrepreneurs such as Australian Paper Manufacturers have seen the writing on the wall and are selling their private forests. At present, good forestry areas have been sold to land-developers who are now burning the timber and developing the land for residential use. That is what private enterprise thinks of the future of private forestry. In fact, for more than three decades, National Party Ministers have been "Sir Humphrey'd" by the Forestry Department and in this case the Honourable James Hacker MP is Bill Glasson. Until he is prepared to question what the Forestry Department is doing, the State is in trouble.

Honourable members may ask what is happening. Back in 1984, APM sold 20 parcels of land that contained its private forests. That land contained good timber that was probably planted with subsidies from State and Federal Governments. I am sorry that the member for Caboolture is not in the Chamber. In his electorate three major areas of land have been sold. On that land is timber that has been growing for decades. Because APM knows that there will be no paper-mill, it is selling that land.

Mr Casey: And the member for Caboolture is doing nothing about it.

Mr CAMPBELL: Not only is he doing nothing about it, he even wants a prison to be built on that land. He thinks a prison is a tourist attraction.

APM is selling land just behind Beachmere. That company does not want that land any more. Private forests all over the Woodford area are also being sold, because private enterprise has seen that there is no need for them. It is time that the Government's actions were questioned. Unless the Opposition does that, millions of dollars that should be spent in more productive areas will be spent on forestry.

The timber industry does not mind over-production of timber. That does not hurt the industry one little bit. In fact, that simply means that, because the Queensland Government is putting up the money, the industry will get cheaper timber. That is a

scandal. All members of the community—including pensioners—are paying for these things that are not needed. It is about time that the Forestry Department was asked to answer for its actions.

While all these areas have been planted in softwoods, the Forestry Department has not provided for the replenishment of the State's cabinet timbers. Queensland is known world-wide for its beautiful cabinet timbers such as silky oak, Queensland maple, black bean and alpine ash. A special one is yellow-wood, which is a beautiful timber and which has the botanical name of *Flindersia Zanthoxyla*. All the beautiful woodwork in the Legislative Council Chamber was made from that timber. Do honourable members know that last year the only furniture made from that timber was a few handles for some cupboards? That was because no more of that timber was available. The Forestry Department is not directing money in the proper direction. It should consider looking at a development plan that provides more cabinet timbers in Queensland.

I am here not to knock what has been done but to ask what can be done in the future. First of all, from an environmental point of view, the State Government has to seriously consider not logging virgin areas that are ecologically unique. Those areas should be left for study by environmentalists. One such area in Bundaberg is Granite Creek.

Secondly, the State Government should immediately call for a commissioned report on the state of the forest products industries in Queensland. Such a report should include detailed records of existing plantations and expected productivity of these plantations for both pulpwood and sawn timber. The Queensland Forestry Department should be called upon to justify the current and proposed rate of plantation establishment.

The third point is that the Queensland Forestry Department should be called upon to submit detailed environmental impact studies along the lines of the original manual for environmental impact studies, which has now been replaced.

Fourthly, the Queensland Government should, for the land managed by the Forestry Department, establish more specific guide-lines for implementing the intention of the Fauna Conservation Act 1974.

Fifthly, a complete review should be conducted into the clear-felling of native forests and woodlands, the logging of rain forests and the logging of all virgin forests or woodlands.

Sixthly, the Federal Government should re-establish a softwoods forestry agreement among the softwood-producing States to assess the needs and production capabilities of Australia.

Seventhly, the State of Queensland should immediately commission an independent body of forest ecologists to assess the distribution, extent and status of all forest and other vegetation types within the State.

Eighthly, the Forestry Act should be rewritten to incorporate the criteria suggested in 1979 by the American Society of Foresters.

Until forestry practices in Queensland are reprogrammed, funds will be mismanaged. Those funds could be more usefully used to provide services to pensioners, children and other needy groups in Queensland.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (9.27 p.m.): All honourable members who have looked rationally at the economic situation in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, realise that the framing of a Budget in the present economic climate is not the easiest job in the world.

I need refer only to the fact that Queensland has the highest level of unemployment in Australia. That is regrettable. During the last 12 months, Queensland has experienced a 15 per cent decline in dwelling construction. During that time the number of bankruptcies has increased and Queensland has experienced a large number of industrial

disputes. That has been accompanied by an increase in Federal Government cut-backs, not the least of which is the impact of the Medicare system on Queensland's health services.

Although Medicare is much trumpeted by the Labor Party as a great health scheme, it really does nothing to develop a better health service and is directed mainly towards the redistribution of wealth. I find it hard to justify that Queensland is entitled to only \$29 per head from the Federal Government, whereas other States receive substantially higher amounts. Because Queensland has had a free public hospital system for so long, as the honourable member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) has frequently said, Queensland has paid the penalty. Not the least of Queensland's present difficulties are the problems confronting the sugar industry. While Nero is fiddling, Rome is burning. Conflict exists between the State and Federal Governments and, at the same time, sugar-producers are going to the wall.

The first of the matters to which I wish to refer briefly is the matter of regulations or red tape. A reduction in the number of bodies controlling Queensland industries would reduce the cost to industry and, at the same time, cut the red tape that is entangling those persons who are striving today to make their businesses more efficient.

Mr Scott: As far as you are concerned, as a Liberal, are you a wet or a dry?

Mr WHITE: I would have thought that the honourable member would know by now that I am a dedicated free enterpriser, for which I make no apology. At the same time, I point out that I have a social conscience.

Red tape is becoming more and more of a problem. One need look only at the increased problems faced by business. I refer particularly to the small business sector. Every day, businesses are faced with a greater range of regulatory bodies with which to deal. I realise that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern), who is present in the Chamber, has taken some initiative in that regard. It is pleasing that the Government has set up the Savage committee and that submissions have been invited. A number of organisations with which I have had an association over the years have made contributions to that committee. Let us hope that, at the State level, something will be done to get rid of the red tape that is affecting business.

Obviously, some regulation is necessary to maintain orderly production and marketing. However, the present weight of regulation is depressing, and sometimes crushing, in this State. Recently, I reread an article by Black and Burns in *The Australian* of 15 July 1985. It stated—

“The dead hand of Government is the major obstacle to economic reforms, and Government spending, taxation and legislation must be reduced.”

People have been saying those sorts of things for quite some time, yet very little action is being taken by either State or Federal Governments.

In my view, the great need now is to create a climate for investment, growth and development so that the jobs that are so necessary can in turn be generated, particularly in a State such as Queensland. To create that climate, Queensland's resources, the materials used in this State's industries and the people who are employed in those industries must be studied. People are just as much a resource as beef and bauxite. I sometimes think that not enough emphasis is placed on the people themselves.

Honourable members should consider their constituents, many of whom currently are lamentably underutilised or unemployed. It cannot be assumed that because living standards have improved over past years, they will continue to improve in the years ahead, in spite the shackles of production imposed by trade unions, Governments and other regulatory processes.

The essence of any market is flexibility, particularly in the price of products being offered within it. In that context, it is worth noting that in this country at present approximately 25 per cent of young people between the ages of 15 and 19 are unemployed.

It is a disgrace. However, it is not a problem that can be overcome easily. The dreadful part about it is that after a decade of relatively high unemployment in this country, an age-group of people who have never worked and who do not know what the work ethic is all about have almost been institutionalised. That is a terrible tragedy.

Every man and woman in this Chamber deplures the fact that, according to the Commonwealth Employment Service figures for the June quarter this year, 139 824 people in Queensland were seeking employment, of whom 66 850, or approximately 48 per cent, were less than 25 years of age. In other words, the majority of Queensland's unemployed are at a stage where they should be starting their careers or setting up their own homes. Many of those people have become welfare-dependent. If the problem of the young unemployed is not solved, this country may well be faced with tragic increases in the number of broken homes, marriage problems and all of the welfare difficulties associated with that.

However, there is a glimmer of hope on the horizon. I refer to what has happened recently in Western Australia relative to McDonalds food chain, which has been the subject of some considerable discussion in this Chamber. Under the terms of a recent Western Australian Industrial Commission ruling designed to promote youth employment, that company has been able to offer jobs to 20 young people. It is to be congratulated. Of course, a problem exists in that the union movement is contemplating an industrial campaign against the scheme because it regards providing those young people with jobs as exploitation. That is simply a load of rubbish. I find it very difficult to understand what convoluted system of logic turns that offer of work to unemployed youngsters into exploitation.

Today, in my experience, young people want a job. They want to be recognised and to have an opportunity in life. The great tragedy of our time is that although the one saleable asset that all Australians possess is their labour, they are forbidden by a mixture of law and trade union muscle from selling that asset freely in the market-place.

Mr Scott: And the main reason is that your own track record as employers isn't good, and you know that very well.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Cook is very good at being critical. I, for one, recognise that not all the fault is on the side of the trade union movement. I have said that on a number of occasions. For a long time, this country has been pretty slack, particularly in the field of middle management. People have taken it for granted that their companies will be productive and will retain their export earnings. As a consequence, they have not adapted to change, and in the manufacturing industries, there are many examples of that failure to adapt.

However, the facts are that those people are prevented from acting freely because of the various rulings and agreements that have been made relative to wages. The agreements and rulings to which I refer would be more relevant to the days of the industrial revolution than to the electronic age of today. What is paid as wages is very often unrelated to capacity to pay; consequently, employment opportunities are reduced.

To give an example, I remind honourable members that penalty rates are having an alarming impact on Australia's international competitiveness. Their effect on the services and hospitality industry is quite devastating. The irony is that service industries such as tourism are, or should be, growth industries in Queensland. Fortunately, Queensland has experienced growth in those industries, but I believe that the surface has only been scratched.

If one examines the tourism industry, what does one find? A restaurant that is busiest at the week-end in serving the needs of tourists has to pay its permanent staff at rates of time and a-half on Saturdays and double-time on Sundays. On some occasions, staff has to be paid at three times the normal rate. Restaurants and hotels alike are now threatened by the Federal Government's tax on so-called perks. When it is implemented,

that tax could bring about the ruination of the catering industry, a subsequent loss of jobs and a decline in the number of tourists.

It is not necessary for me to remind the House of the other industry that is under threat, the sugar industry, which has fallen victim to the decline in world sugar prices. As I said earlier, it will not be easy to resolve that problem; but the abolition of penalty rates or the development of a realistic, new award system is something that the Government should examine seriously as a starting point for providing more employment for young people.

A further raising of the level of the State pay-roll tax should be given urgent consideration. It is admitted that the threshold has been raised from \$270,000 to \$300,000 in the Budget, but that will be of minimal, if any, impact. I notice that, according to the Budget papers, the Government expects to raise approximately \$477m in pay-roll tax for the 1985-86 year. Of course, that represents an increase of in excess of \$35m. As has been pointed out by my leader (Sir William Knox), 8 000 new jobs could be created in Queensland if the threshold of pay-roll tax was raised to half a million dollars. The great benefit to be derived from such a step is the multiplier effect down the line.

Mr Borbidge: He didn't do that when he was Treasurer.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise refers to my colleague. I remind the honourable member that it was Sir William Knox who brought in the new initiatives in the field of pay-roll tax and who raised the threshold quite substantially when he was Treasurer. I point out also that when the present leader of the Liberal Party was Treasurer of Queensland, this State prospered because it did not have the problem of high unemployment that exists today.

Mr Lee: The threshold is well above the Consumer Price Index.

Mr WHITE: As my colleague the honourable member for Yeronga has pointed out, the threshold is well above the Consumer Price Index. There is no question about it; those reforms are badly needed. If the Queensland Government does not do something about raising the threshold for pay-roll tax, the unemployment problem will continue to exist.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr WHITE: If the honourable member for Surfers Paradise is opposed to raising the threshold level of pay-roll tax, he should let the House know and let the people of Queensland know.

Mr Borbidge: That is rubbish, Terry.

Mr WHITE: It is not rubbish.

Mr Borbidge: The Queensland Government is doing it, and you know that.

Mr WHITE: The Queensland Government is fiddling.

Stamp duty is of increasing concern to the people. There is no question about it: the people of Queensland are being hit by stamp duty. People who make regular bill payments through bank accounts are the victims of this new form of State Government taxation.

The State Government has imposed a \$4 tax on authorities giving banks permission to pay bills from bank accounts. Recently, policy-holders were hit with a 40 per cent rise in the stamp duty paid on household and other insurance policies. Now one finds that the people who authorise regular deductions from their bank accounts to pay insurance premiums, hire purchase repayments and so on have a new \$4 tax slapped on them.

Many people like me, who have been in business for years, particularly in the small business area, know the problems involved in effectively running a cash-flow system. Many businesses pay their insurance premiums quarterly so that their cash-flow situation is laid out in an orderly fashion throughout the year. However, the Government has now seized the opportunity to slap a \$4 tax on each such bank authority when businesses pay their quarterly insurance premiums. I hope that the Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), who is in the Chamber, will have a look at that imposition, because it is quite discriminatory against small business.

Another area of stamp duty in which Queensland is not a very sunny State is superannuation. At the moment, for those about to retire or thinking of superannuation for their retirement, superannuation pay-outs can damage their financial health. A person in line for a lump-sum superannuation pay-out of, say, \$100,000 will be charged about \$2,500 in stamp duty. That is putting Queensland's reputation as the retirement and low-tax State on the line. Under the new rules on lump-sum superannuation pay-outs, taxation will have to be paid on part of the pay-out if the retiree takes the money and runs, as it were. If, on the other hand, the retiree decides to roll over the money into an approved deposit facility or buy an annuity, tax is deferred until the funds are withdrawn. The point of all that is that the retiree has somewhere to park the money while deciding how best to invest it, and earnings in the approved deposit facility are not taxable. However, anyone buying an annuity in Queensland has to pay stamp duty. On a \$100,000 retirement pay-out the duty would be 2.5 per cent. However, I understand that in the southern States of Victoria and New South Wales no stamp duty at all is charged. I made those points because the new rules are affecting a great many people.

Every member knows that since September of last year 123 different Government charges have been increased. However, the average Queenslander who does not read the *Queensland Government Gazette* is unaware of those charges until he is slugged with them. I believe that this Assembly has a responsibility to examine those charges to see that all the relevant figures are clearly presented, because it is very hard to make a judgment on a Budget. This is a Budget that says a lot about how money is spent, but very little about how the revenue is raised.

Before winding up, I would like to comment on the recent Federal Budget as it impinges on this State. One of the most interesting points is the successful way in which the bureaucracy has managed, for the first time, to get a Government to formally endorse a blueprint for organising basic elements of Australian life according to the bureaucrats' whims. Although Mr Keating may be touted round the place as the world's greatest Treasurer, there is no doubt that this Budget is a win for the bureaucrats. The bureaucrats, State as well as Federal, make up the only group in Australian society to come out of the Keating tax reform package No. 3 virtually unscathed.

The so-called fringe benefits that are being abolished are all private sector arrangements. Company cars are exactly that, and it is only Canberra bureaucrats who cannot understand that the vast majority of those cars are there because they are needed to get the job done, to help a business remain competitive, to help create profits and, hopefully, further wealth, and that they cost the private sector a fortune to buy and maintain. The majority of motor cars that are made in Australia by Australians are bought by companies and business entrepreneurs and actually contribute to employment and the national wealth. Employers, entrepreneurs, the corporate sector and the small business area will all be savagely hit.

Attacks more savage than expected on company cars will undoubtedly force the private sector to squeeze its car-buying orders and thus create immense dissatisfaction among employees, with resultant inefficiency. But, for the bureaucracy, with its unlimited access to the nation's largest fleets of motor cars, there is no tax. Even the politicians seem to have allowed themselves to be harmed somewhat by this package. Under the new rules, I understand, we all have to justify our expenditure.

If the package passes the Senate it will hit private enterprise and several hundreds of thousands of people who work very hard indeed, to say nothing of the stab in the ribs suffered by the restaurant and catering industries. The two so-called great perks enjoyed by public servants, namely, their superannuation schemes and their travel allowances, have survived untouched.

I could go on, but it simply means that the people affected by the changes actually pay a lot of taxes. They also tend to be the members of the group in society who are ambitious employees, entrepreneurs and business people who are the achievers, the people who endeavour on their own behalf to create wealth and do more than most to generate the economy and keep it moving.

The savagery of the new package is quite remarkable, most notably on entertainment and company cars. It will be a crucial blow to the car-manufacturing industry and the catering industry. In a State such as Queensland, no doubt it will have a devastating impact.

Many figures have been bandied round about the loss of jobs in Queensland. It can be argued that 2 000 or 8 000 jobs will be affected, but the fact remains that many people will lose their jobs because of the latest tax package brought down by Treasurer Keating.

I realise that framing a Budget is not easy in difficult economic times. It is disappointing to realise that no outstanding new initiative is available for the private sector. The SGIO is to get a new name. Most Government revenue has been indexed and increased by 6.7 per cent, but no initiative has been taken to reduce any instrumentality, statutory authority or Government department. No small-government impetus has been taken in this Budget. It is simply another big-government Budget. There appears to be no great incentive for the private sector, with the exception of the initiatives in the small business area through increased funding for the Small Business Development Corporation which, of course, is welcome. I welcome this opportunity to speak on the Budget and hope that this year some of the comments made by honourable members may bear fruit in years to come.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (9.49 p.m.), in reply: I am pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the Budget debate, which has just concluded. Firstly, I thank those honourable members who spoke so constructively during the debate.

That comment, however, would not be relevant for honourable members on the opposite side of the Chamber. The tone of the debate from honourable members opposite was set by their leader in his nebulous and negative attitude to what was an excellent Budget in the prevailing circumstances. His speech degenerated from that point on.

It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to give a long discourse on what he misguidedly saw as wrong. Did we hear positive and constructive alternatives? Sadly, but as usual, his speech was deathly silent in this context. It was as silent as his grand financial plan, which seems to have sunk to the bottom of the sea under universal public rejection.

I do not propose to direct comments to the individual members who have spoken; rather, I propose to answer some of the comments emanating from the Leader of the Opposition, which seem to be representative of the total lack of knowledge of honourable members opposite.

Over a period, the Leader of the Opposition has tried to say that the Queensland Budget was not balanced and that we were running at a huge deficit. He went to great lengths to prove how bad all of this was.

Having failed miserably in this direction, last Tuesday, in the Chamber, he changed course, virtually in mid-stream. Now, suddenly, he complains that we have a massive surplus. How the Budget can be in surplus and deficit at the same time really defies logic.

What I assume he means is that the Budget must be balanced, and this is precisely what this Government has been doing, and is precisely why the State's finances are in such a healthy position. Balanced Budgets are a fundamental philosophy of this Government, and it will maintain this position.

The facts are as stated repeatedly in explanation to the Opposition—

The Consolidated Revenue Fund is balanced.

The Loan Fund is balanced.

The Trust Funds are in substantial balance.

The deficit referred to by the Australian Bureau of Statistics represents funding of capital works programs which have a long life and which are rightly paid for either by the users, such as ports and railways, with no charge on the tax-payer, or by subsequent generations of tax-payers for schools, hospital buildings, and so forth. The latter of these two, that is, the charge on subsequent tax-payers, is really the true public debt of the State, the servicing of which costs only 5 per cent of total revenues each year. That is a wonderful gearing position indeed.

The strength of the Queensland Government's financial position is recognised in the world financial markets in Tokyo, Wall Street, London and Europe, where Queensland continues to raise funds on the best possible terms and conditions.

In the Chamber earlier today, the Leader of the Opposition attempted to make great play of a so-called \$60m surplus being socked away last year. The fact of the matter is that these funds were required to meet program commitments, particularly the \$600m program.

The projects under the program are major works, which have considerable expenditure time frames. They cannot be stopped and started at whim. It is absolutely essential that funds be available at all times to ensure that the momentum of the program is maintained. The bulk of the funds was required to meet commitments early in the current year. It was very prudent of the Government to provide for them, and to be criticised for doing so displays a complete lack of financial and Budget management skills.

It is also about time that Opposition members woke up to the fact that the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program is real. They should open their eyes and see what is going on round them.

Opposition members are no doubt upset about the fact that, having gone out on a limb last year with extravagant claims that the special program was a fraud, they have had to eat humble pie, because the figures this year clearly show that additional capital works expenditure is taking place over and above the normal level of expenditures.

Let me go back for just one moment to the so-called surplus that has been mentioned. The impression has been given that the funds made available from the recurrent budget for capital works have been magically discovered by Houdini in the form of the Leader of the Opposition. He said—

“But now the Opposition has let the cat out of the bag and the true situation is known by members.”

I quote the following passage from the Premier and Treasurer's Budget speech last year, that is, 12 months ago—

“Funding for the additional Special Major Capital Works Program overall will be provided from several sources, including borrowings, with Consolidated Revenue Fund providing maximum funds possible to minimise debt servicing costs. \$90 million has been provided from Consolidated Revenue this year.”

I quote also this passage from the 1983-84 Budget speech—that is two years ago—

“The Government has been able to provide an amount of \$68.7 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Special Projects Fund for the wage pause program and for supplementation of the normal capital works program.”

I could go on quoting relevant excerpts from the various Budget speeches in recent years. I think I have sufficiently demonstrated that, far from discovering something new, the Leader of the Opposition has been asleep for many years.

Rather than being secretive about its capacity to release funds for urgent capital works by good management and firm Budget control, the Government is very proud of its achievements and has proclaimed it from the roof-tops.

It would also be true to say that the thousands and thousands of Queenslanders who have benefited from the new schools, public buildings and other facilities that these funds have provided are very grateful to the Government for its sound management policies.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr GUNN: People from the honourable member's electorate are grateful for those facilities.

Thankful also are the many Queenslanders who have been given employment opportunities by the capital works generated by these funds. For the Opposition to claim that these are somehow wasted funds is incredible.

I also take the Leader of the Opposition to task for his comments on the summary information table provided in the State Capital Works Programs document. Firstly, he claimed that although the Queensland Electricity Commission is included as a department in the table, it is not so treated by the Co-ordinator-General. He ought to have been aware of the new departmental status of the commission within the public accounts this year. There is no inconsistency with the Co-ordinator-General's report.

Secondly, he referred to the difference between the Commonwealth specific purpose grants shown in Commonwealth Budget documents and those shown in the table. The difference between the figure of \$485.2m said to be included in Commonwealth Budget papers as specific purpose grants for capital purposes and the State figure of \$433.7m is easily explained by the fact that grants for local authorities for, say, roadworks, which are included in the Commonwealth figure, are not included in the State figure.

These are samples of the simple errors or misunderstandings that no responsible Leader of the Opposition should make, let alone base his speech on. All I ask of the Leader of the Opposition is that he check his facts before making wild statements.

Rather than try to denigrate the Government's efforts to provide for essential capital works and social infrastructure, Opposition members should act with Queensland's best interests at heart and put pressure on their comrades in Canberra to give Queensland a fair go. I cannot believe that honourable members opposite, who supposedly consider themselves Queenslanders, can cuddle up to Canberra and say what a good deal Queensland is getting from Canberra relative to other States. It is hypocrisy at its worst.

It is absolutely incredible that the Opposition should support the blatant discrimination being foisted on Queensland. Thankfully, the Federal Labor Government's ill-considered and unworkable taxation reform proposals will see that Government out of office in a very short space of time.

Before going on, I take to task some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the discrimination against Queensland in the Medicare arrangements. He said—

“To assert, as the Government tries to do, that the Medicare arrangements discriminate against Queensland's free hospital system is patently false.”

In anyone's language, a State that receives \$29 per capita towards its hospital system, when the next lowest payment per capita is \$63 and the highest is \$81 per capita, is being discriminated against in the worst possible way.

To claim that the Grants Commission has adequately compensated Queensland for the discrimination is patently absurd and displays the Opposition's complete lack of knowledge of the commission and its workings.

I put it to the Leader of the Opposition that there is absolutely no justification for Queensland tax-payers, who pay the same levy as their counterparts in the other States, to be so inequitably treated by his friends in Canberra.

I must also point out that, in trying to criticise the Government's spending on public health services, the Leader of the Opposition cannot even get the Grants Commission figures correct. He quotes Queensland's expenditure on health services as \$289 per head of population. Table A-55, on page 57 of the commission's 1985 report, shows Queensland's expenditure as \$287.86 per capita, with New South Wales and Victoria spending \$282.93 per capita and \$285.11 per capita respectively. Clearly, contrary to the assertion made, Queensland is not the lowest. It is another example of the inaccuracy of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition.

Once again, the Opposition has trotted out the hoary old arguments about increases in Government charges. It should take a look around its comrades in Government in other States who also have adopted the user-pays principle by reviewing charges regularly to ensure that users of Government services pay the full cost of the service. Honourable members opposite should take a careful note of the State Budgets that will be delivered tomorrow. If the user does not pay, the service must be subsidised by the general taxpayer. It is this Government's philosophy to minimise the tax burden on the people of Queensland, and it remains committed to Queensland being a low-tax State.

The simple fact that the Opposition seems to find such difficulty in swallowing is that Queensland does not have a petrol tax, a tobacco tax or a financial institutions duty that the Labor States seem so fond of—and it will not have them while this Government is in power.

The Opposition has not been able to find a single crack in the Government's Budget, and I do not propose to take up the time of the Committee further by refuting the baseless allegations that have been made. However, before concluding, I want to refer to one or two points made by the honourable member for Nundah which are worthy of comment. In particular, I was pleased with his comment that all States must balance their Budgets. As a former Treasurer, he is no doubt acutely aware of the necessity for a balanced-Budget philosophy. It has not been, nor will it ever be, the philosophy of this Government to dip into trust fund moneys to pay for recurrent services. Everybody knows which States do that. Trust fund moneys are exactly that—moneys held in trust, and they will remain that way.

I am also sure that the honourable member for Nundah, as a former Treasurer, will recognise the importance of stamp duty and pay-roll tax revenues to the State, given the raw deal the States get from income tax revenues generated by the States. I can assure the honourable member that the Government is committed to pay-roll tax relief, particularly for small business, and this Budget has demonstrated this fact.

I also take this opportunity to confirm the Government's commitment to the sugar industry. The Budget has provided \$20m for immediate assistance. The Government will play its part but it will not be bullied by a Federal Government which is seeking to use the sugar industry as a political football. The position is clear. The precedents with the steel and automobile industries have been set where, quite rightly, the Commonwealth met the full cost of the rescue measures. The Commonwealth must stop trying to screw Queensland for political motives and get down to the real business of providing Commonwealth-funded assistance to people who desperately need it and who provide so much revenue to Commonwealth coffers.

As I have already indicated, given the circumstances that confronted the Government, the Budget is an excellent one. The Budget has as its objectives—

a balanced Budget;

maintenance of our commitment to the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program and the \$700m rail electrification program;

maintenance of the normal Capital Works Program;

no new taxes and reform in the pay-roll tax area;

maintenance of essential services and enhancements in key areas; and

implementation of the Employment Task Force recommendations.

Nothing that the Opposition has said during the debate in any way diminishes the Government's belief that these objectives will be achieved. The Budget for 1985-86 is to be commended for its achievements.

Item (Contingencies—His Excellency the Governor) agreed to.

Progress reported.

MINING (FOSSICKING) BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 18 September (see p. 1027) on Mr I. J. Gibbs's motion—

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

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (10.5 p.m.): I have some brief comments to make on this legislation. The Bill is interesting. It is one piece of legislation that is long overdue in this State, and the Opposition supports it. Opposition members have seen the need for it for a long time and they are happy that it has come before the House. We have some argument about the content of the Bill, which has been very carefully, thoroughly and fully analysed by the Opposition spokesman on Mines and Energy (Mr Vaughan). As usual, he has done an extremely good job in summing up the good points and the bad points of the Bill. He is a very competent man.

The Bill is a belated effort to bring some degree of rationalisation to an important aspect of mining. Our collective minds go back to the problems on the central Queensland gem-fields and the fact that, at Anakie, anarchy almost took over. Of course, the Government took no action. It is fairly typical of the Queensland Government to wait until a problem is exacerbated before it takes any action, and then it is generally bandaid-type legislation.

Mr Neal: Who gave you this brief?

Mr SCOTT: I will resign from my job the day that I have to go to someone for a brief. I do not stand up in this Chamber and ask the number of Dorothy Dix questions that the honourable member for Balonne asks. He should be totally ashamed that he crawls along looking for a ministerial position by asking a large number of Dorothy Dix questions. I know that he says so little in the House that to get his name before his electors he has to resort to that sort of thing. He should be thoroughly ashamed of himself.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCOTT: Mr Speaker, I have anticipated your kind words of advice. Despite attempts to divert me, I have to make pithy comments about the Bill. However, I would like to know why the Government has to allow matters to get into a dreadful state before action is taken.

The Bill refers to areas that will be set aside. I ask the Minister to advise the House of the way in which the areas will be delineated on the maps. The Government is not

famous for wanting to survey these areas and to set them out clearly. One of the major problems arising from the Bill is the determination of exactly how these areas will be shown to would-be fossickers or to old hands at the game.

Mapping is a most important aspect of mining. I have had brought to my attention many instances of miners and people who wish to take out claims or leases and who have made a submission to the Mines Department stating that their area of interest is defined in such a way. The Mines Department takes note of that information and proceeds frequently to tell them, "You are not there; you are somewhere else." It is a vexed question as to who is right and who is wrong and how one goes about finding out that information. One of the most contentious matters that can be encountered by a miner is the setting out of an area in which he would like to mine and its definition to the acceptance of the Mines Department. It will be interesting to learn how those areas are set out.

The Bill states that certain leases and claims are excluded and, conversely, that no authorities to prospect will be allowed over those areas. I regard that as a very good state of affairs. A problematic part of mining in far-north Queensland is the setting out of areas to which small miners may have access. In Queensland, large areas are set aside in the form of an authority to prospect to the exclusion of the small miner. Concerned persons come to me and say, "Why isn't it possible for us to have access to mining where we can make a living?" Although that is something that should be dear to the heart of the Government, it is not concerned about small people. It runs away from the problem. Unfortunately, the Mines Department frequently runs away from the problem. In one way or another, the problem is now being tackled. It remains to be seen how good the tackling effort is.

The problems of mapping and access to mines is most important. That in itself raises the question of roads to the areas referred to. I am certainly happy to stress the problems faced by small miners. Opposition members tend to speak in favour of small miners, whose problems include not only mapping of areas but also access to those areas.

The Mines Department sets aside certain moneys which are to be spent on improving access to particular mining leases. That work is carried out in consultation with the shires concerned. At this point I indicate that, these days, shires receive a good deal of money by way of rates from mining leases and mining claims. In fact, from a financial point of view, small miners—people holding claims and leases—pay substantial amounts of money not only to the Government in terms of lease fees but also to shires by way of rates. The small miners feel that they get very little back for the money that they pay out. Of course, the shires see it in a different light. As far as the shires are concerned, relatively few of their rate-payers are miners and they consider that they should not use too much of the hard-earned rate-payers' dollar to provide access to mines.

I am not drifting away from the legislation, because the same remarks will apply to these fossicking areas. I represent the Mount Surprise and Forsayth areas—two major centres for small mining and fossicking. The road to O'Brien Creek outside Mount Surprise and the road to Agate Creek in the Forsayth area often become quite rough. Those roads are used by a large number of people, not only bona fide and legitimate miners but also tourists who go there just to see what is happening. Many of the tourists are people who, in their own way, would like to become fossickers and possibly small miners. It is quite often a holiday goal. On other occasions, it is a retirement goal. These people are attracted by the idea of mining and the idea of fossicking, so they visit areas in which they want to engage in small mining.

My colleague the honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) will have something to say about this subject because he takes a great interest in the small miners in his electorate. I will stick with the specific cases that I have mentioned of O'Brien Creek and the Forsayth area, not because they are particularly special but because they do highlight the problem of access to fossicking areas and the simple fact that local authorities

will need more money to improve the roads to mining places. I simply do not believe that this Government will be prepared to make that provision.

I hope that the Minister will take my comments on board. I notice that he is nodding his head, not shaking his head. I am fairly certain that he is concerned about his portfolio. One does wonder about the competence of Ministers, but I am sure that the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs), when he takes his mind away from the big coal-miners and the other big miners in this State, is concerned about this matter and, in the few spare minutes that he has available to him, is able to apply himself to the problems of small miners.

A very pertinent point is the very low number of departmental staff. Again, it is pleasing to see departmental officers sitting in the lobby. I know that those officers are taking note of my comments. I believe that I express the sentiments of other ordinary back-bench members of Parliament when I say that I get a pretty good deal whenever I ring the Mines Department. It is one of the Government departments with which I have many dealings, and it is possible to speak to senior officers to obtain information about what is going on or to settle minor troublesome points without having to go to the Minister. Officers of the Mines Department are very co-operative. It always gives me great pleasure to be able to ring an officer in a department, set out the problem, get some background information and do the right thing and write to the Minister. Of course, the department prepares the reply. The groundwork can be laid, the dimensions of the problem discussed and, when the matter goes before the Minister, it is generally fairly well resolved.

It is a fact that Mines Department offices in far-north Queensland are inadequately staffed. I often have cause to ring local officers to put forward a complaint about pollution in a creek, an argument over a boundary or something like that. Pollution is a serious matter that I have to draw to their attention. Of course, the problem then is whether or not the department has enough staff and enough money to go and inspect the problem area. I must say that on most occasions they do, but many instances occur when the task is unable to be carried out because of the relatively few inspectors who are employed.

I have commented on the authorities to prospect and the fact that they cover very large areas of the State. Because authorities to prospect have been taken up over very large areas, people who want to take up mining are simply blocked out. In a minor way, the provisions of the Bill contribute to finding a way round that problem, but I feel that the proof of the pudding will be in the eating, and honourable members will have to wait and see how its provisions work out in practice. In terms of considering small-mining matters, the Government's record is not very good.

Without delving into the clauses, I turn my attention now to some of the items in the Bill. For example, it contains a definition of "hand mining", which is, "mining using only picks, shovels, hammers, gads, sieves, windlasses and other like tools which are used manually." Unless I have missed something, no mention has been made of explosives and small hydraulic devices that could be regarded as being close to machinery but would be a long way from being a pick, a shovel, a gad or a sieve, all of which relate mostly to the old days. There is no doubt that some fossickers like to use those pieces of equipment to get into the way of fossicking. It is rather interesting that in the various mining festivals that are held in north Queensland, a hand-drilling contest is still conducted in which a group of men line up with hammers and gads, and they are timed to see who can drill the deepest hole in the specified time. It is very seldom these days that holes are drilled in rock without pneumatic assistance, but there is no reference in the Bill to even the smallest of compressors or the smallest of hammers, whether they be operated as some form of electric hammer or percussion instrument. I foresee all kinds of problems arising.

Although some of the provisions of the Bill come close to sorting out the problem of definition, I note that by proclamation the Governor in Council may proclaim with respect to one or more than one designated area the type of machinery or mechanical

device that will be used. On the one hand, the Bill provides that the fossicking areas will be largely restricted to hand mining, small miners, and people who do not wish to use machinery; on the other hand, the Bill provides that people will not be able to use machinery. The end result is that the determination is left to the Governor in Council by way of proclamation. It must be said that in the State of Queensland a great deal of suspicion surrounds proclamations of such a nature.

Conversely, in the provisions of the Bill there exists a prohibition on the use of certain types of machinery. I foresee a great deal of conflict in the resolution of these matters. The track record of the Government in solving such problems is not good. As I have said, the number of staff available to go out into the field to settle problems is simply inadequate to properly handle the matters, and I do not know how people will get on. I feel that the Bill will simply be a piece of paper that is waved round and that much will be made of it; but in practical terms, I think that its provisions will not amount to very much.

Because it is important, I repeat that the electorate of Cook encompasses many mining areas besides the ones I referred to in the Etheridge shire. One could travel the length of the road from Cairns to Normanton, and see that all of the creeks along the way are being fossicked today by the use of metal-detectors, sieves and all of the things referred to in the Bill. As well, closer to the Cooktown area, a vast mining field is located in the Rossville/Helenvale area, and mining activity is increasing further up the Peninsula in the areas around the Archer River and the Wenlock River. I pose a question to the Minister: Can I presume that there will be no end to the areas that will be defined; that the Minister will conduct a continuing program to examine suitable areas in the future? I hope that, in considering that proposition, the Minister will bear in mind that the areas need not be very large. The areas defined by the Bill could be small areas.

The problems associated with camping and the provision of accommodation in the designated areas have been well canvassed by members of the Opposition. I know that my colleague the member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) will have something further to say on that subject.

I repeat that we on this side of the House support the legislation. We are largely happy with the contents of the Bill, but we will adopt a wait-and-see attitude.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (10.20 p.m.): It was with some glee that Opposition members first received this Bill but, having gone through it, we have found a number of matters that we hope the Minister can clarify in his reply. It is obvious that the departmental officers researched the Bill fairly well, because they have covered everything, with the exception of a couple of matters about which I would like some clarification from the Minister because, if the provisions are carried out in the manner set out in the Bill, the third world war might well start in my electorate.

Alluvial gold has been found in the Jordan Creek area, which is a historical mining area. At one stage there were in the vicinity of 26 hotels in the area, although they were more or less taverns and not hotels as we know them today. Many acres of rain forest were cleared. As I said, people are chasing alluvial gold in that area at present, as well as near Douglas Creek and a number of other creeks. People also fossick in the area for gemstones, particularly red and green garnets. The local gem club, through its journals, has aroused the interest of people from throughout Australia. People come from overseas, specifically Canada and the United States, to fossick in the area. The development of the area as a gem-field could prove a real boon for tourism. The gem club is kept going by two or three people who have vehicles capable of travelling to the area.

I want to question this statement by the Minister in his second-reading speech—

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

Later in his speech the Minister said—

“ . . . the legislation does provide the warden with the authority to permit heavy machinery in the areas where it is normally prohibited, to carry out certain works such as restoration, dam-building and roadworks.”

I should imagine that, in some areas, particularly in the rain forests, there would be no need for dams because there are permanent streams.

My main area of concern is the Minister's description of designated areas. He said—

“These designated areas can only comprise land which is—

unoccupied Crown land

occupied Crown land (other than occupied pursuant to any Act relating to mining or the Miners' Homestead Leases Act) which the land-holder has agreed can become or be included in a designated area; or

reserve land other than any State forest, timber reserve, national park or environmental park.”

I mention two specific areas on Palmerston Creek and on the north side of the North Johnstone River. Although they are alluvial gold areas, they have never been claimed or, if they have been, the claims have been forfeited. Some families in the area are interested in fossicking, and they do fossick in the area occasionally. I understand that an application has been made to declare a very large part of that area as a national park.

Mr Comben: Would you agree with that?

Mr EATON: Within reason, but I like to keep a balance in all things. I do not believe in going overboard. I do not want to kill all the humans to save all the trees, or vice versa.

There is room in that area to cater for all the needs of not only the tourists but also the miners and the schoolchildren. Many young people in north Queensland actively participate in visits to those gem-fields, one would have to call them, to collect red garnets. Relics of the early mining days, such as chutes containing quicksilver, still remain. Children love to look at them. Many years ago, when they were much younger, I took my own children there. Many people in the north take their families into those areas. But I can see potential conflict in the area because it is a timber reserve adjacent to a national park. There is roughly a two-mile strip up the Palmerston Highway that is a declared national park. The rest of the area comprises State forests that are harvested for their timbers. They are adjacent to Downey Creek, another controversial area. To my knowledge, no minerals have been found in the Downey Creek area.

I have outlined the problems I visualise arising in the future. If I have correctly interpreted the Minister's statement on page 7 of his speech, entry to the area will be prohibited unless action is taken by Order in Council or proclamation to allow people to continue using the area. Over the years, people have been getting access to this area by four-wheel-drive vehicles. They have been leaving them at the roadside. Because of the prohibition placed on State forests, they will require a permit. A road block was constructed and a sign was erected saying that entry was prohibited. That caused quite a furore. The Minister may have received letters from me about it. He referred me to the Minister in charge of State forests. People know the problems that can arise. I hope that they will not be as badly affected as I fear they will be. This is the only place where good-quality red garnets are found in such quantity. Zircon and sapphire chips are also found in this area. Sapphires are also found in my electorate in the Lava Plains area.

Mr Elliott: Wouldn't that be in competition with Mount Garnet?

Mr EATON: No, it is well away from Mount Garnet. It is about 140 miles from the first area I described.

Mr Hamill: The member for Cunningham would still be upset about the lost treasure—the Millmerran coal that was not used for the new power station.

Mr EATON: That would be so.

I should like the Minister to clear up the points I have raised. I have mentioned Jordan Creek, Douglas Creek, the Palmerston area, the sapphires, garnets, zircons and alluvial gold.

I have a question to ask the Minister about the two months allowed for a fossicking permit. Many people take long-service leave specifically to go fossicking. Some of them would have to come back to town to get their permits extended. A permit could be issued for up to six months. The Minister said that school holidays lasted only a fortnight, but during the Christmas holidays people are more inclined to go to the rain forest areas that are not as hot as the drier back block country. I ask the Minister to consider whether it would be more advantageous to have fossickers' permits issued for a longer period.

I compliment the Minister on the general idea of the fossicking permit. It will allow families to get out to enjoy the country. This country developed as a result of the efforts of the earlier fossickers. It was only after the fossickers found gold and precious gems that the big people moved in. The old-time fossickers helped develop Australia. Their fossicking was responsible for much of the progress in Australia today.

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (10.28 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I was interested to hear the honourable member for Nudgee claim to have initiated the setting apart of areas for tourists and fossickers on the central Queensland gem-fields. As I pointed out in my second-reading speech, the tourist potential of these fields was brought to prominence in 1968 by the late John Herbert, the then Minister for Labour and Tourism.

The honourable member referred to my predecessor's answers to questions on notice on 17 and 30 October 1979, relating to the gem-fields. In clarification of those answers I inform the House that, on addressing the unique nature of the gem-fields, the Government, pursuant to the provisions of the Mining Act, took progressive steps consistent with the level and types of activities on the gem-fields to restrict within proclaimed areas the methods of mining, the types of tenure available and the number of tenures that could be held. However, as my predecessor indicated, the actual restriction of areas for tourist fossicking only was not implemented following a concerted Australia-wide campaign by the small miners association of the central Queensland gem-fields, which indicated public opposition to such a proposal. More recent public opinion, including that of lapidary clubs and tourist operators, indicated a reversal of attitude to this particular concept and, accordingly, following numerous meetings with interested individuals, groups and organisations, this legislation was formulated.

Someone who added to the confusion and the opposition by the miners was none other than the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Keith Wright). He played his part in setting this legislation back a long way. He went into the area and upset my good friend who is now the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), and caused a lot of trouble. In fact, because of his interference in an electorate that was not his, the legislation was delayed.

In answer to the question of the honourable member for Nudgee as to the position of mining claims in designated areas, as distinct from fossicking areas, the legislation does not prohibit the marking out, application for, and registration of, mining claims. However, the proclamation covering the designated area can indicate the method of mining and the types of equipment or machinery that can be used. Accordingly, any restrictions imposed by the proclamation would apply to any mining claim, which may be registered.

The honourable member is also seeking credit for bringing to notice the necessity for small prospectors to have access to areas under authorities to prospect. I might enlighten the honourable member by saying that a reading of the Mining Act as a whole

leads to the clear conclusion that the holder of a miner's right is entitled under the Act to occupy Crown land, which is subject to an authority to prospect for hand-mining purposes, and the holder of the authority to prospect is not entitled to prevent the exercise of such entitlement. However, should the holder of the miner's right wish to have a mining lease granted to him or a claim registered, he would require the consent of the holder of the authority to prospect.

With regard to the honourable member's comment that there is no indication in the legislation that a fossicker's licence entitles the holder to hand mine only—this is intentional. Clause 7 provides that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation, declare the methods by which prospecting or operations for mining purposes may or may not be carried on within a designated area, and hence in any fossicking area within it. In the majority of cases, the proclamation will allow only hand mining, which the honourable member has pointed out is defined in this legislation.

In special circumstances, however, it may be necessary to provide that, within certain designated areas, equipment may be used by fossickers which would not strictly constitute hand mining. An example of this that immediately comes to mind is the use for alluvial gold fossicking of small motorised suction dredges. Accordingly, the legislation has been designed to allow for such flexibility. That answers some of the points that the honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) raised about designated areas.

As regards the appointment of persons engaged full time to act on behalf of the warden—I point out that the department has in fact a full-time field officer stationed at Emerald to assist the warden in regulating fossicking and mining on the central Queensland gem-fields.

As regards the payment of royalty by fossickers—it must be appreciated that royalty on gemstones is paid only on the gross proceeds derived from their sale or disposal, after deducting the sum of \$10,000 in any one year. With gold, the exemption figure is higher again at \$30,000. Therefore, it will be seen that it is not the intention of the Government to make holiday-makers and tourists pay royalty unless the unusual circumstance arose in which a huge profit was made from fossicking operations.

As regards the suggestion by the honourable member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) that the fossicker's licence would be suitable for framing following its expiry—I advise that in designing that licence, this very aspect has been addressed, and I am sure that it will be highly prized for such a purpose.

With regard to the licence cost—it is envisaged that it would initially be in the vicinity of \$4 or \$5. The fee is considered reasonable for the entitlements bestowed.

The honourable member's comments regarding the responsibilities of mining wardens have been noted. As this is new legislation, its implementation will be monitored closely. It must be borne in mind that a mining warden is also, in fact, the stipendiary magistrate for the mining district concerned and, as such, is well versed in legal interpretation and implementation of statutory provisions.

With regard to the honourable member's comments as to a lack of appeal provisions in this legislation—I point out that this legislation is in addition to and not in derogation of the Mining Act. Appeals would lie against the decisions of a warden's court in relation to offences in the normal manner prescribed in the Justices Act. As regards clauses 20 and 23, which particularly exclude appeal—it must be recognised that such prohibition cannot affect avenues available under natural justice, such as appeal to the Supreme Court.

In this regard, it is relevant that a licence has a maximum term of two months, and to prescribe appeal provisions relative to such decisions could only lead to wardens, whose work-loads and responsibilities are already heavy, being involved in time-consuming appeals. Again, as previously stated, any lack of specific appeal provisions in these circumstances would not remove normal avenues for natural justice. However, as I have previously stated, this is new legislation that will be monitored closely, and complaints

as to discriminatory actions by any official, or matters coming to notice that reflect on the suitability of officers for such responsibilities, will, I assure the honourable member, be responded to appropriately.

The honourable member raised the point of advising and educating prospective fossickers. Plans are well advanced on the preparation of a complete advisory kit that will be the subject of promotion prior to the declaration of designated and fossicking areas. The kit, which will include detailed maps, will be available for purchase with the fossicking licence, and it is envisaged that the total cost of both will not exceed \$12. However, should a fossicker not wish to purchase the kit, the relevant information on his entitlements and responsibilities will be printed on the back of his licence.

I refer to the statement by the honourable member for Ipswich that he is interested in the revenue to be generated by the implementation of this legislation. Let me assure him that it is not envisaged that the fees to be charged will offset the cost of monitoring the areas set apart. The effect of the legislation is primarily to promote tourist potential in a mining environment, and any benefit to the State will be indirect.

Obviously, because of his tender years, the honourable member is unaware of the centralist policies practised by previous Labor Governments in Queensland or he would not have inflicted on the House his ill-founded oration on decentralisation. What must be understood is that this legislation will encourage, even if implemented in only a small way, the establishment of businesses to service the needs of fossickers in remote areas of Queensland.

The honourable member also raised the necessity for impartiality by wardens in the administration of this legislation. I refer him to my advice to the honourable member for Lockyer regarding this matter and the avenues available for appeal against the decisions of the warden.

I thank the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha for his support of this legislation and of the role to be played by respective wardens. I am sure that it is not misplaced.

The honourable member for Mount Isa was good enough to regale the House with a summary of well-known mining activities in the Mount Isa district, particularly those relating to small ore producers, which, however, was irrelevant to the legislation under debate. Even though it means digressing from the contents of the Bill, I point out that the pegging out of claims is still a simple matter and the Department of Mines provides free assay of prospectors' samples.

The honourable member raised the alleged concern of the Chamber of Mines as to charges levied against the mining industry. Again, although this matter does not directly relate to the legislation being debated, it is disappointing that it has received such undue publicity. In fact, the chamber and the Government have held long and fruitful discussions on relevant fees and charges and I am pleased to advise the honourable member that, as a result, the Government has agreed not to increase mining lease or mining claim rentals this financial year.

As regards royalty—there appears to be conflict in the ranks of the Opposition. Firstly, the honourable member for Nudgee insinuated that not enough royalty is collected, whereas the honourable member for Mount Isa considered the Department of Mines to be pedantic in requiring the submission of royalty returns.

As indicated, fossickers will not be required to lodge royalty returns if no royalty is payable. The honourable member has raised the matter of camping on designated areas where they are close to caravan parks owned by a local authority. The honourable member's attention is drawn to clause 28, which provides that camping may be prohibited on any land within a designated area by Order in Council. This was provided to cover not only caravan parks that are owned by local authorities and exist in close proximity to designated areas but also privately owned caravan parks. I can assure honourable members that this aspect will be carefully assessed in each proposed designated area and discussions will be held with all interested parties.

As I have previously indicated, detailed discussions and public meetings have already been held in respect of the central Queensland gem-fields. The honourable member has raised the matter of the quantum of the fee for the licence. I have adequately covered this aspect earlier in my reply. However, I am pleased to note that the honourable member did in fact whole-heartedly support the Bill.

This evening, the honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) claimed that this legislation is overdue. I can assure him that successive Ministers—I instance Mr Camm—have done an enormous amount of work. Although I realise that the legislation covers different types of mining, I must give credit to those who spent some pretty rough and tough times out on the gem-fields. I believe that the time is now ripe for the legislation. The legislation is now acceptable on the gem-fields, but only after much very, very hard work was done by officers of the Mines Department, the Director-General (Mr Woods), the Chief Executive Officer (Mr Ken Gluch), my private secretary and me. Many people have done a tremendous job up in the field by talking to miners. In the end result, the property-owners and the grazies showed a great willingness to co-operate. A great deal of co-operation was received from the Lands Department and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. When he was the Minister for Tourism, the member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) did much by way of negotiation to bring this matter through to its conclusion. The legislation has not come forward without much hard work and patience. I believe the timing is right. Most people are happy with the legislation. It has been a very, very big job.

Earlier in my speech I covered the provisions for mapping. That is all in hand. I have approved the samples of what will be produced. The Cartographic Branch of the Mines Department is doing an excellent job. I am quite sure that all members of the House, irrespective of their political stance, will be very pleased with the amount of homework that has been put into this legislation and the results of that work.

The member for Cook also spoke about tourism, roads and entries. It is true that local authorities do receive some revenue from mining tenures. I have already dealt with the matter of machinery used in mining. The legislation covers the whole of Queensland. It provides the means for both large and small tourist promotions on the gem-fields. The member for Cook also referred to problems in the gem-fields and asked how areas are to be delineated. They are to be surveyed and signed. Maps will be available. Where necessary, boundaries around occupied and private land will be fenced. A great deal of work will be done and money spent on all those aspects. I have covered that matter fairly well in my reply.

The honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) said that, as time goes by, many areas could be covered by the Bill. If we go about that matter in a methodical manner and if the areas can be identified not too quickly, a great deal will be achieved in various areas. The Bill will remove uncertainty from the minds of those persons who want to do some fossicking. They will be able to go to an area shown on the maps. They will be safe in those areas and know that, as long as they comply with the rules, their activities cannot be questioned.

Mr Eaton: I agree with you when you say you have tried to cover the whole State, but you have an exceptional area, which includes State forests, with large timber reserves. We have already had one clash with the Government. We will have another one unless you can clarify it for me.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Tonight I cannot clarify it any further. We must be willing to examine any situation that may arise and whether something should or should not take place. I think that the honourable member mentioned Jordan Creek, Palmerston and other areas. They will be very important. He also referred to children at school. I would be very pleased to talk to the honourable member about the matter at any time. Let us get down the track with the legislation and put it in place. About the middle of next year we should have some idea as to how it is working, the direction in which we should be heading and whether amendments ought to be made to the Act.

The honourable member referred to machinery. I have already referred to that in my reply. The honourable member also referred to designated areas and the redistribution of State forests and timber reserves. That matter will need to be examined later.

Reference has been made to the two-month limit of a fossicker's licence. If a longer term is required, a person should obtain a miner's right, which is valid for one year. The reason for the legislation cannot be overlooked. The Government does not want to extend the legislation into areas that are adequately covered by the Mining Act. It does not want the tourist-type operation to be abused and for it to be regarded as mining. That is beyond the intention of the legislation.

The honourable member referred to gem clubs. Gem-collecting is a hobby that almost becomes a sport. Once a person has collected gemstones, he becomes involved in a great hobby. A wonderful family atmosphere is created in the gem clubs, particularly in the Beenleigh group, which is a very strong group of people. I know that they are looking forward to this legislation.

I think that I have already covered the queries expressed by the honourable member for Mourilyan about designated areas to which I referred in my second-reading speech. Some of those matters will need to be addressed later. The Government will take on board all the honourable member's comments because they were constructive and practical. I know that, as far as that side of life is concerned, the honourable member is a down-to-earth person. I know that the honourable member understands the bush and mining as a whole. In his electorate, as well as in the electorate of Hinchinbrook, which is represented by Mr Row, a great deal of mining, including tin-mining, takes place. As time goes by, that mining will become very important.

I hope that I have answered most of the queries raised by honourable members. I thank all honourable members for their constructive debate on the Bill.

Motion (Mr I. J. Gibbs) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. I. J. Gibbs (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Declaration of designated area—

Mr VAUGHAN (10.51 p.m.): I seek clarification of the provisions contained in clause 5, which states—

“Declaration of designated area. (1) The Governor in Council may by Order in Council declare any area within a mining district to be a designated area.

(2) Notwithstanding the declaration of a designated area pursuant to subsection (1), a designated area shall comprise all Crown land and reserve land situated within the designated area other than any land—

(a) that is occupied Crown land, not being land occupied pursuant to any Act . . . where the holder of that land has not given his consent—”

and I emphasise these words—

“in writing to the inclusion of that land in the designated area;”

Over the page the clause further states—

“(3) Where, immediately prior to the making of an Order in Council declaring a designated area, any occupied Crown land was or was part of a designated area, for the purpose of subsection (1),—”

and I emphasise this—

“the holder of that land shall be taken to have given his consent to the inclusion of that land in the designated area.”

Subclause (2)(a) refers to “where the holder of that land has not given his consent” and over the page subclause (3) says, “the holder of that land shall be taken to have given his consent”. I ask the Minister to clarify the meaning of those two subclauses. As I have said, subclause (2) (a) refers to “occupied Crown land . . . where the holder of that land has not given his consent” and subclause (3) refers to “the holder of that land shall be taken to have given his consent”

I believe that that should be clarified for people who may have cause to read the legislation at some future time and need to know where they stand.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: In answer to the honourable member’s query about clause 5—Declaration of designated area, I will read the comments that I have relating to that. It is often difficult to frame simple, clear legislation that people can readily understand. Of course, all the things that are to be issued in a kit are spelt out very clearly.

Subclause (1) provides for the Governor in Council by Order in Council to declare designated areas. Subclause (2) indicates that a designated area includes all Crown land and reserve land except—

“(a) that is occupied Crown land, not being land occupied pursuant to any Act relating to mining or to the *Miners’ Homestead Leases Act 1913-1982*, where the holder of that land has not given his consent in writing to the inclusion of that land in the designated area;”.

In other words, if the land-holder is not agreeable to the establishment of an area for fossicking and so on on his land, it cannot be included in the designated area. However, land occupied pursuant to mining legislation or the *Miners’ Homestead Leases Act* is included in a designated area to enable the restrictions and controls applying to that designated area to be also applicable to that land.

I have also some notes relating to that on clause 24, which will be gone into later. Perhaps I could refer to those notes. They state—

- “(b) Any State Forest or Timber Reserve;
- (c) any National Park or Environmental Park; or
- (d) any land specifically excluded by Order in Council.

Subclause (3) provides that where a Designated Area is declared and it includes occupied Crown land that was, immediately prior to such declaration, already in a former Designated Area, it is not necessary to again obtain the landholder’s consent.”

That explains in part that the land-holder’s consent is not necessary. It all depends on how that stood at the time of the Bill.

The notes continue—

“This allows for the amendment of the boundaries of well established Designated Areas without the threat of the area having to be abandoned because further agreement to the use of the area previously within a designated area cannot be reached.”

That is the note I have about that particular matter, and some other aspects are included in clause 24.

Mr VAUGHAN: I seek clarification of clause 5 (2), which states—

“ . . . a designated area shall comprise all Crown land and reserve land situated within the designated area other than any land—

- (a) that is occupied Crown land . . . where the holder of that land has not given his consent . . . ”

That means that land over which a land-holder has not given consent will not be included in the designated area.

On the next page, the Bill provides in (3)—

“Where, immediately prior to the making of an Order in Council declaring a designated area, any occupied Crown land was or was part of a designated area, for the purpose of subsection (1), the holder of that land shall be taken to have given his consent. . .”

I ask the Minister to clarify the position because, on the one hand, the Bill provides that where the land is occupied Crown land and the land-holder has not given his consent it shall not be included in the designated area; and, on the other hand, on the next page in subclause (3), the Bill provides that the holder of the land shall be taken to have given his consent. Either consent has been given or it has not been given. What is the position?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: For the benefit of the honourable member for Nudgee, I will again read subclause (3).

Mr Vaughan: Do not read it. I know what it says. I want you to say what the position is.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I will read it again because, in my book, the matter is explained quite clearly in the Bill. If the honourable member does not understand it, he is dense. Subclause (3) provides that, where a designated area is declared and includes occupied Crown land that was, immediately prior to the making of such declaration, already designated—

Mr Vaughan: Do not keep reading that garbage. Get some advice.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: If the honourable member for Nudgee listened carefully, he would realise that it has all been explained quite well in the Bill.

I have been advised that, in accordance with page 6 of the Bill, consent is not needed for redesignation of a previously designated area. That is what the Bill states, and that is the advice that I have received from my departmental officers. Because the provisions of the Bill state that advice in many more words, I will read it again. I ask the honourable member for Nudgee to listen and try to take in what is being said.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member for Murrumba has just come into the Chamber, having left the bar, I see. Perhaps he ought to be quiet or go back to the bar where he would be less of a nuisance.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member for Port Curtis has been at the bar, too, and he is trying to make a great deal of noise. Perhaps both honourable members should go back into the bar and, without causing further disruption to the proceedings, leave the Opposition spokesman to get on with the business.

Mr Kruger: Why don't you grow up?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I know that the honourable member is drinking water now, but that would only thin out what he has consumed on his way to the Chamber. Someone might be able to get a very good authority to prospect, perhaps.

I will attempt to highlight the simplicity of subclause (3) by saying that consent is not needed for redesignation of a previously designated area. That is a short description of subclause (3), which I previously read out. Its content is very simple and plain.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—Effect of declaration of designated area upon authorities to prospect and mining leases—

Mr PRICE (10.59 p.m.): Although the Minister did expand upon the original definition of “designated area” given on page 3, I think that the definition is still restrictive because it limits the areas over which new mining leases can be applied for. The greater good of the State would be served if that designated area were still allowed to be taken into a mining lease in circumstances in which a particular mineral or fine is discovered in the surrounds of the designated area. I do not think that the definition is broad enough to cover that sort of an application.

Clause 3 (a) states—

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the *Mining Act 1968-1983*, on and from the declaration of a designated area taking effect, any authority to prospect, whether granted before or after the passing of this Act, to the extent that it relates to land within the designated area, shall have no force or effect.”

That seems unfair to me. If a prospector, or a mining company for that matter, loses an authority to prospect to work in that designated area, does he or it then apply for a tourist licence or a fossicker’s licence to allow him or it into the designated area to continue to work?

I see them as being restrictive one way or the other. Firstly, the definition is not broad enough to cover the concept of the greater good of the State and, secondly, it seems unfair if an authority to prospect is lost by the declaration of a designated area. What does the prospector or the mining company do to gain permission to enter that designated area?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Before referring to my notes on clause 11, I must say that the debate seems to be moving away from what is covered by the Bill. The Bill will not cover many areas in this State. It will cover only areas that are picked out, not vast areas. It is not as if it will cover the whole of the Mount Isa area. There might not be any fossicking areas within 500 or 1 000 miles of Mount Isa, or anywhere in the Mount Isa electorate.

They will be unique areas fairly close to the coast. The gem-fields round Sapphire are a typical example. The Bill has been basically designed with that area in mind, although it will apply throughout the State. For instance, there are some gemstone areas in the electorate of Mourilyan. So members have to adopt the correct frame of mind and not think that the Bill will affect any large area of the State, because it will not. The member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) referred to small areas, and it is likely that only small areas, which are unique and are of historical interest, will be designated. Perhaps, following the passage of this Bill, the odd new area will be discovered.

Subclause (1) prohibits the application for and granting of mining leases within a designated area on and from the declaration of such designated area unless the application was made prior to the declaration, in which case it can be determined on its merits in the usual manner or, alternatively, the Order in Council indicates that mining leases are available in such designated area or part thereof.

Subclause (2) provides that the existing mining leases, or those granted pursuant to the provisions of subclause (1) hereof, can be renewed, transferred, amalgamated or surrendered, notwithstanding that they become part of a designated areas.

Subclause (3) provides that any authority to prospect, granted either before or after the passing of this legislation, has no force and effect in respect of any designated area. It also provides that the Crown will not be civilly liable in this regard. This provision is necessary to prohibit large-scale exploration in designated areas and also puts beyond doubt the fact that a person does not require the consent of the holder of an authority to prospect before carrying out prospecting or collecting mineral within a designated area.

The honourable member said that the provision for wiping authorities to prospect is unfair. In practice, the department will not declare designated areas for fossickers if they are more suitable for large-scale exploration under authorities to prospect, or even large mining leases. That has to be related to the factors that exist at the time or the department will basically not be interfering with an area such as those that would concern the honourable member for Mount Isa in his electorate. That is the advice I give the honourable member from the written notes concerning clause 11, and the advice relative to it from the officers.

Mr PRICE: I was disappointed to hear the Minister say that this "designated area" may not apply in my electorate. Certainly, on the Cloncurry River or the Leichhardt River, there are historical areas for mining gold. They are extremely attractive to campers and tourists.

The Minister spelt out inherent difficulties and said that he would consider each designated area on its merits. A region adjacent to Cloncurry is famous for its straw gold, which is perhaps the world's most ancient type of gold. It is believed that it would be a wonderful tourist attraction, but unique problems are involved. It is because of that that I am concerned about the legislation.

I should like the Minister to retract his statement that possibly Mount Isa will not be considered for a designated area. Opal regions are to be found to the south of Mount Isa. They are very popular with fossickers and lapidary clubs. Last year, Mount Isa hosted the Australian convention of lapidary clubs. The members had better than a field day—almost a national holiday—when they got into the Mount Isa mineral area, which is thought of so highly. The Minister read subclause 3; but I thought that I had raised a small anomaly which indicated that the designated area did not really cover the restriction that seems to be inherent.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The proof of the pudding will be in the eating. The effect of this legislation relative to the Mining Act has been gone into thoroughly. I hope I did not give the impression that nothing would go to the honourable member's electorate.

I repeat that an area will not be declared for fossickers if it is more suitable for large-scale operations under authorities to prospect or large mining leases. It is not intended that the Bill should upset or destroy the chances of finding another Mount Isa. That would be a disaster. The Government will be happy to consider any areas that can be set aside without interfering with the mainstream of mining. The whole concept is exciting.

I am well aware of the opals found to the south of Mount Isa. They are found in some areas in the electorate of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, and also in some areas in the electorate of the Minister for Primary Industries. I was in the area south of Mount Isa some years ago. When I was there, I wished that I could get some sort of licence that would enable me to dig in safety, without upsetting anybody who had the rights to an area. This legislation will take care of situations such as that. It applies to the whole of Queensland. It blocks no-one out, but it should not interfere with the normal mainstream of mining, which is so important, especially in the Mount Isa district.

Mr VAUGHAN: In my response to the Minister's introduction of the Bill, I asked for clarification on the conditions of mining claims in designated areas. The title of clause 11 is, "Effect of declaration of designated area upon authorities to prospect and mining leases." The clause reads, in part—

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Mining Act 1968-1983 and subject to subsection (2), on and from the declaration of a designated area taking effect, the provisions of that Act with respect to—

- (a) the application for mining leases;
- (b) the granting and issuing of mining leases,

do not apply with respect to land within the designated area other than land that is specified in the Order in Council. ”

I ask particularly for clarification of the position of mining claims.

Clause 14 (2) states—

“ no person shall be entitled to mark out or apply for registration of a mining claim over land within a fossicking area.”

There are fossicking areas inside designated areas. I wanted to know the position concerning a mining claim in a designated area.

When the Minister responded, I think he said that it was OK to have a mining claim in a designated area. What about an existing mining claim in a designated area, which also happens to be a fossicking area? What is the position of a person who obtains a fossicker's licence, wanders round a gem-field and comes across a mining claim? I know that the Minister responded to that question, but I ask him to clarify the position.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I will repeat some of the points that I made when I replied to the debate. We did talk to lapidary clubs and tourist operators, who indicated a reversal of their earlier attitude.

When replying to the second-reading debate, I said—

“In answer to the question of the honourable member for Nudgee as to the position of mining claims in designated areas, as distinct from fossicking areas, the legislation does not prohibit the marking out, application for, and registration of, mining claims. However, the proclamation setting apart the designated area can indicate the method of mining and the types of equipment or machinery that can be used.”

In other words, there is flexibility in the system. That should cover the matters that are worrying the honourable member.

Mr PRICE: I have one further point. In nominating a designated area in a region, will a local authority have any say in where the designated area is? In declaring a designated area, will there be room for objection from local authorities in particular and mining in general?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I think that we have the power to declare a designated area without asking a local authority. In framing this legislation, we have worked very closely with the councils in the areas in which we have been active. My view is that we should work with the councils. I hope that, to some degree, the councils will take the initiative and put forward certain areas that they would like included under the legislation. In fact, if a council did not welcome the setting aside of a designated area in its region, we would not want to go there. This proposal involves tourists, the public and councils. I would think that, if we were not welcomed by a council, we would not go into its area. We will listen to councils, to people engaged in the tourist industry or to anybody else who wants to put up a proposal. Councils will play a very important role in this matter.

Mr Price: And mining companies?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Anyone in the community. It would be good if the mining companies were to promote mining a little more and bring it to the fore.

Mr Price: What if they wanted to object?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I am quite sure that we would listen to anyone. I have said that we would not declare designated areas for fossickers if an area was more suitable for large-scale exploration under an authority to prospect or even under larger mining leases.

My people in the Mines Department have that sort of information at their fingertips. They would know well in advance whether our intrusion into an area might interfere

with the mainstream of mining. I assure honourable members that the Bill is not aimed at doing that.

Mr VAUGHAN: I seek clarification for the record. A person cannot apply for a mining lease in a designated area, and a mining lease will not be granted. However, a person can lodge an application for a mining claim or mark out a mining claim in a designated area. In other words, there is no restriction on mining claims in designated areas but there are restrictions regarding mining leases in designated areas. Is that correct?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Perhaps I will have to read it for the third time.

Mr Vaughan: Just give us a simple answer. Don't read it out; just give us the answer off the top of your head.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I will read it out because it is important that it be accurate, and I should not give the answer off the top of my head. The Mining Act is quite complicated, which makes it difficult for the honourable member to understand.

In answer to the question of the honourable member for Nudgee as to the position of mining claims in designated areas, as distinct from fossicking areas—the legislation does not prohibit the marking out, application for, and registration of, mining claims. However, the proclamation setting apart the designated area can indicate the method of mining and the types of equipment or machinery that can be used. In other words, it is restricted. Accordingly, any restrictions imposed by the proclamation would apply to any mining claim which may be registered. I think that that covers it.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—Fossicking in designated area—

Mr PRICE (11.18 p.m.): I am concerned about the consent of the lessee or applicant for the lease as outlined in subclause (1) (a) (iii), which reads—

“the subject of a miners' homestead perpetual lease (or an application therefor), a miners' homestead lease, a mining lease (or an application therefor), a mining claim (or an application for registration therefor) or an area marked out pursuant to the *Mining Act 1968-1983* by the holder of a miner's right,

with the consent of the lessee or applicant for the lease, the holder or applicant for registration of the claim or the person who marked out the area, as the case may be, may enter and be upon that land;”

It is my belief that, should it be necessary to get rid of a fossicker who gets consent to go onto a miner's homestead perpetual lease, a miner's homestead lease or a mining lease because he plays up on the lease or for some other reason, it is just not easy enough to get rid of him. My own point of view is that, in regions such as mine, a warden would virtually have to live on the designated area. It may be envisaged that the mining warden in Mount Isa will be used to police the designated area, and although it may be easy enough for tourists or campers to get to that area, it may be difficult to get the mining warden out there to police the area and to keep a check on the individuals fossicking on the lease. If that is the case, great difficulties will be experienced in getting rid of a person who is on a lease. I know that there is recourse to legislation, but that takes so long. I also realise that the licence expires after two months, and that the lessee could wait out the time. However, if the fossicker is a big enough trouble-maker, and some of these guys can be when they get into these regions, there is not a quick way in which to get him off the lease.

If a mining company which has a designated area within an authority to prospect or a lease grants permission to a fossicker to go onto the lease, which may be a miner's homestead perpetual lease, and if it starts to receive complaints about the fossicker, the process by which the company can get to that person seems far too slow. It must be considered that the mining company itself may be based kilometres from the lease.

The legislation does not seem to be tight enough. Consent can be given, but it cannot be cancelled.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: My information is that consent can be withdrawn at any time. The granting is optional. The warden can authorise persons to assist him in controlling operations in designated areas.

On the question of being able to gain access to very remote areas—perhaps my officers should consider whether those areas should be allowed to become designated areas. It might be that many of the areas in the Mount Isa electorate would not be suitable for this type of operation. The thrust of the legislation is to help the tourist industry and those associated with gem-fields.

The two-month duration of a fossicker's licence is a very short time. That is why I do not wish to respond to those Opposition members who have criticised me for making the duration of the licence only two months. In fact, the very reason for that has been raised by the honourable member for Mount Isa. I do not think there will be any problems from that point of view. My department will take on board the comments by the member for Mount Isa.

I believe that the legislation covers all possibilities. The wardens can direct others to help in this work. Of course, certain areas will be policed by officers of the Mines Department, who will be doing the bulk of this work.

Mr PRICE: I hope that the Minister has not taken me the wrong way. I do not want to erect barriers that will be used by the Minister to stop the designation of areas in my electorate. I want to find some way for designated areas to be declared in my area. Perhaps consideration should be given not only to giving mining wardens responsibility for these designated areas but also to appointing officers of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, or even officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, as honorary wardens under the umbrella of the legislation. The legislation could delegate powers to those people. I assure the Minister that my electorate wants designated areas. The region finds a great attraction in the designation of some alluvial gold areas. Those areas are in another mineral-field, that which is in the Boulia district, in the electorate of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson), but it is part of my region. I do not want the Minister to preclude the declaration of designated areas from my electorate. I want to find a way round that problem that I can foresee.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I take the honourable member's comments on board. If his fears ever become reality, the giving of some authority to the available forces in any area would be fair enough. However, the legislation contains some authority and responsibility that really only fit in with the duties of a warden. I certainly take on board the suggestion that those who are available in an area should be considered if it is necessary to do so. I would be happy to do that.

Mr VAUGHAN: Clause 24 falls within Part IV of the Bill, which deals with the fossicker's licence. Clause 24 deals with the holder of a fossicker's licence being entitled to enter land for the purpose of searching for and collecting gemstones and gold. I am concerned that the clause does not add the words "by hand mining"

I have been through the Bill and I cannot find any reference to hand mining other than in the definition, which reads—

“ ‘Hand mining’ means mining using only picks, shovels, hammers, gads, sieves, windlasses and other like tools which are used manually.”

If a tourist on the gem-fields is issued with a fossicker's licence, I presume that, on that fossicker's licence, there will be a stipulation that only hand-mining methods as defined will be used. If a person is to be issued with a fossicker's licence, the legislation should spell out clearly that fossicking should be by hand-mining methods only.

Clause 24 states—

“... the holder of a fossicker’s licence ... for the purpose of searching for and collecting gemstones and gold.”

The Bill should spell out “by hand-mining methods”

I would be surprised if the Minister can show me anywhere in the legislation, other than in the definition, a reference to hand mining. Although I have read the Bill carefully, I cannot find any reference, other than in the definition, to hand mining. If I have missed it, fair enough. If a person is issued with a fossicker’s licence that restricts him to hand-mining methods only, that should be spelt out.

Anyone who has been to the gem-fields would know that not too many people, even tourists, strictly abide by the definition of “hand mining”. They have all sorts of gadgets and small petrol engines, which are used to process the soil and extract the gems. All means other than strict hand-mining methods are used. If penalties are to be imposed on persons who breach the provisions of this legislation, and if the warden or anybody under the jurisdiction of the warden, has the authority to police the provisions of this legislation, the people who are issued with fossicker’s licences should be told, in no uncertain terms, that, when they go out with the fossicker’s licence in their hot little hands, they will be restricted to using hand-mining methods as defined. I will be listening very intently to the Minister’s reply. If hand mining is referred to in the legislation other than in the definition, I ask the Minister to let me know where it is.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: It would save a great deal of time if the honourable member had listened to my reply. Although I spelt it out then, I will spell it out again. “Hand mining” will be spelt out in the proclamation.

Mr Vaughan: Where is it in the Bill?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Would the honourable member like to listen for a while? He is getting worse than the honourable member who entered the Chamber some time ago. “Hand mining” will be spelt out in the proclamation. It is not rigid because limited machinery might be allowed in certain circumstances. The wording of the Bill is deliberate. I referred to flexibility being required because all areas are totally different. Because of rock in some areas, small machinery might be allowed.

Mr Vaughan: A fossicker?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member has evidently not been to Mount Isa. My friend from Mount Isa would not agree with the honourable member for Nudgee, who is used to digging in his back yard with a four-inch spade. Never in his life has he dug a stone pit. He does not understand how a fossicker goes about his business.

Mr Vaughan: They go about this business without this legislation.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member should listen for one minute and not get excited or he will probably suffer a heart attack. I do not want to lose the honourable member because he is a very good Opposition spokesman. I would hate to have any other fellow in his place. He should take care of himself.

The Bill needs to be flexible. It might be necessary to use a machine to dig a dam for water. Many places in the Mount Isa district do not have water. Therefore, to that extent, the Bill needs to be flexible.

Mr Vaughan: A fossicker wanting to build a dam?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: We might want to build a dam for him. The Bill needs to be broad. That is why it has been spelt out in the Bill in that way and why it was spelt out in my second-reading speech. It is a pity that the honourable member did not listen to it.

Mr VAUGHAN: I simply require clarification of one final matter. Am I to understand that the Minister will allow a tourist who goes out onto the gem-fields to use other than hand-mining methods to fossick? The Minister will issue fossickers' licences to tourists. My interpretation of what the Minister has just said is that the Minister would even allow a person with a fossicker's licence to use a bulldozer to dig a dam while he is out on the gem-fields fossicking.

The Minister mentioned Mount Isa. People who have been to Mount Isa or any other area of this State to prospect for gold or any other mineral have been prospecting under the provisions of the Mining Act with miners' rights and adopting the methods set out in the Act. The Minister specified in his second-reading speech that the Bill was aimed at promoting tourism. What the Minister just said implies that he is quite happy to allow those fossickers to use not hand-mining methods but machinery methods and even to engage a bulldozer to dig a dam while they are out on the gem-fields fossicking for the two months of their particular licence.

I particularly ask the Minister to answer this question: Can he tell me why, as the Bill contains a definition of hand mining, no reference is made to hand mining anywhere else in the Bill? I do not believe that reference is made to hand mining anywhere in this Bill other than in the definition. If that is the case, why is there a definition in the Bill defining a particular type of mining, namely, hand mining, when it is not referred to anywhere else in the Bill?

Mr Yewdale: You've got your note; answer it.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Another smarty has just come in from the bar. I wish he would stay out there.

Mr Prest: We are not all fortunate and able to book it up to the public, like you.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: No.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member for Port Curtis should go back out to the bar and get into some more grog. He is half-full now.

Mr PREST: I rise to a point of order. I have not left the Chamber today. I am not a drunk, as the Minister is. If I do drink, I pay for it myself. I do not book it up to the public.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest, with respect, that the debate be addressed to the Bill. There is too much reference to extraneous matter.

An Opposition Member: Look over there. The Minister started it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! My ruling applies to both sides of the Chamber.

Mr Yewdale interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Rockhampton North——

Mr Yewdale: I take offence at what he is saying.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am on my feet. I am saying that I do not want anyone continuing to prosecute an argument about the bar. I have heard enough about the bar. I ask that the debate return to the subject-matter of the Bill.

Mr Yewdale: It started with the Minister. Talk to him.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: With due respect, Mr Row, it started with a couple of Opposition members who recently entered the Chamber and who cannot keep their mouths closed.

If those members had been making less noise and if the Opposition spokesman had listened to my reply, he would not be wasting the time of the Chamber.

I will return to page 3 and page 5 of my reply and I will read it out again. This is like Sunday school. In answer to the question of the honourable member for Nudgee as to the position of mining claims in designated areas, as distinct from fossicking areas—the legislation does not prohibit the marking out, application for, and registration of, mining claims. However, the proclamation setting apart—

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: Does the honourable member for Nudgee want to listen? If he does not want to listen, I will sit down and be quiet. I do not want to waste my time on the honourable member for Nudgee if he does not want to listen.

Mr Vaughan: Go ahead.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I will start again on page 3. In answer to the question of the honourable member for Nudgee, as to the position of mining claims in designated areas, as distinct from fossicking areas—the legislation does not prohibit the marking out, application for, and registration of, mining claims. However, the proclamation setting apart the designated area can indicate the method of mining and the types of equipment or machinery that can be used. That is on page 3. I will give the honourable member for Nudgee a copy and he can read it tonight in bed.

Page 5 states that, in the majority of cases, the proclamation will allow only hand mining, which, as the honourable member has pointed out, is defined in the legislation.

In special circumstances, however, it may be necessary to provide that, within certain designated areas, equipment may be used by fossickers which would not strictly constitute hand mining.

An example that immediately comes to mind is the use of such equipment in the extraction of alluvial gold. Fossicking by means of small, motorised suction dredges has been designated under the legislation to allow for such flexibility. The honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) referred to the use of such equipment in his electorate. I point out that all of the information required by members of the Opposition is contained in the Bill and was summed up and spelt out by me quite clearly, but Opposition members did not listen.

Clause 24, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 47, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, by leave, read a third time.

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

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 59) on Mr I. J. Gibbs's motion—

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

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (11.38 p.m.): As the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) indicated, this is a simple Bill in that it merely reduces the optional retiring age for workers in the coal-mining industry from 58 to 57 years. As has been pointed out, optional retirement at 58 years of age for employees with 30 years' service in the

industry was introduced in 1981. In 1983, the qualifying period was reduced to 25 years. The aim, of course, is eventually to reduce the optional retiring age to 55 years.

The mining unions and the coal-owners have agreed to the amendment, which is recommended by the Miners Pension Tribunal, and the actuarial solvency of the fund will be retained.

For the record—according to the latest Coal Board statistical report issued on 16 August, as at 29 June this year, the total number of persons employed in the coal-mining industry in Queensland was 10 393. Although it will be a long time before most of them will be able to avail themselves of the early retirement provisions, many will be able to do so.

The recently announced closure of the Bulimba B and Tennyson A power stations and half of the Collinsville power station will certainly mean early retirement for workers employed at the mines which currently supply coal to those power stations unless they can be absorbed into other mines throughout the State. Unfortunately, early retirement is not an attractive proposition to many mine-workers owing to their having to wait until they are 65 years of age to receive the age pension unless they are returned servicemen.

A person who retired after 25 years' service would currently receive \$68,700, which is not a princely sum by today's standards. However, the amendment is a simple one, and the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (11.40 p.m.): I agree with the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) when he says that the Bill is very straightforward. The idea, of course, is to lower the optional retirement age in the mining industry from 58 to 57 years and to retain 25 years of service in the industry as a qualification for the exercise of that option. However, I wish to address some comments to the miners' pension scheme, certain aspects of which are of great concern to a number of my constituents.

As honourable members would be aware, the miners' pension scheme is a tripartite scheme involving contributions from the mine-workers themselves, the coal-owners and the State Government. A little bit of the history of the scheme is pertinent to the comments that I wish to make.

Originally, the miners' pension scheme was conducted as a contributory pension fund, with the pension being payable to retirees from the industry. However, in November 1970, the form of payment of the pension scheme was altered from the miners' weekly pension to a lump sum based upon the number of months of service of people who had qualified in the industry. From 1977, the lump-sum benefit rate has been automatically adjusted from 1 July to a rate that has been determined from time to time by the actuary as a figure that is actuarially feasible having regard to the state of the fund.

It is instructive to look at the increases that have been obtained under the lump-sum benefits over the past 10 or 12 years. In 1970, when the lump-sum payments were introduced, the rate of payment was \$25 a month of service. In 1973, it was increased to \$27. There were no increases then until 1975, when the rate was increased to \$35. It took a very large jump indeed in 1977 to \$85 a month. By 1983, it had increased to over \$200 a month of service. No doubt such increases will continue.

In terms of the fund under which those pensions are being paid out, it is my understanding that the contributions that are made by the mine-workers themselves constitute about 19 per cent of the income of the fund in a year. The coal-owners contribute about 56 per cent. The State Government's contribution is very paltry indeed; it is only about 1 per cent of the income. Interestingly, the income actually derived from the existing fund now constitutes almost 24 per cent of the annual income of the fund, that is, the fund from which the pension benefits are paid out.

I point out that a commutation package has been offered to those who retired under the weekly-pension benefit. It caused considerable concern among members of the Retired

Mine Workers Association. It would appear that the association certainly had not considered the effect of such a commutation; but what it has meant, of course, is that weekly pensioners who sought to opt for a commutation pay-out based, presumably, upon their expected longevity are now in a situation in which they have been considerably advantaged with respect to a number of pensioners who retired under the lump-sum payment scheme as introduced in 1970.

As I presume the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) would be aware, this whole issue has been the subject of some correspondence from the Retired Mine Workers Association and, indeed, from the Queensland Colliery Employees Union. In fact, on 24 May 1984, the Queensland Colliery Employees Union sought reconsideration of the lump-sum benefits that had been paid out from the fund to those who had retired between 1970 and 1976. They were the people who retired after many, many years of service on rates of lump sum based on \$25 a month in 1970, \$27 a month in 1973, and \$35 a month in 1975. One does not have to be a great mathematician to work out that the actual lump sums payable, even to a person working in the industry for 30 years, are quite tiny by comparison to the sort of lump-sum payments to which people have recently become accustomed. The approach that was made by the Retired Mine Workers Association and the miners union was rebuffed by the actuary.

It is interesting and instructive to look at the correspondence that came from the Acting State Actuary at the time. I will quote from a letter dated 13 June 1984 sent by the actuary to the Registrar of the Coal Mine Workers Pensions Tribunal. It refers to the earlier correspondence I have mentioned. I refer particularly to paragraphs 1, 2 and 8.

Paragraph 1 is in these terms—

“I think it will be generally agreed that the retirement benefits paid by the Fund at a particular time should be governed by the actuarial position of the Fund at that time (by ‘actuarial position’ I mean ‘Is the Fund able to afford to pay the present benefits and is it possible to increase benefits?’).”

In paragraph 2, the Acting State Actuary wrote—

“The valuation as at 30.6.1971 showed a surplus of \$26,232, after the introduction of lump sum retirement benefits. There was obviously no scope for an improvement in benefits at that time.”

Those are the words of the Acting State Actuary, yet the Government has seen fit to encourage the pension scheme administrators to seek commutation on the part of the weekly pensioners. If the weekly benefit of the pensioners were being judged by the state of the fund as at 1971, when the lump-sum scheme was introduced, the fund simply would not have had enough money. After all, only slightly more than \$26,000 was in the fund to pay the commutation of the weekly pensions that has taken place. That is why the request made by the retired mine-workers for a fairer deal for those who retired under the paltry benefits paid between 1970 and 1976 sits uneasily.

Paragraph 8 of the letter from the Acting State Actuary reads—

“For the reason mentioned in 1. and because members who retired in 1970-76 did not have contributions made by themselves or on behalf of themselves, up to retirement, which warranted any increase to the entitlements they received, I can see no justification for any subsequent increase in benefits.”

That paragraph does not sit at all well with what the Government has sponsored for weekly pensioners. The Government has been very eager for miners on weekly pensions to commute their benefits to a lump-sum pay-out despite the fact that the fund, at the time, would not have stood those pay-outs. For those who retired between 1970 and 1976 and sought redress concerning the paltry benefits received, the actuary said that the fund at the time would not justify that sort of pay-out, and further that the actuarial position at the time those people retired ought to be the consideration.

It is hypocrisy to provide a benefit on the one hand for a certain group and to apply totally different criteria on the other hand to deny a benefit to another group.

The miners who retired between 1970 and 1976 served for many years in what can only be described as a very dangerous industry. They worked very hard and contributed greatly to the industry, which has served the State so well. It is hypocrisy for them to be denied decent retirement benefits. The \$25 a month was not a large sum for the years of service of those who retired between 1970 and 1973. It would not involve a heavy burden on the fund to provide some redress for the pensioners who are trying to eke out an existence on a very paltry pension payment. I shall be very interested to hear the Minister's comments on what I have proposed.

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (11.49 p.m.), in reply: I thank the two Opposition speakers for their summing-up and their support of the Bill, although I should say that the Opposition spokesman (Mr Vaughan) took advantage of the situation to insinuate that there would be retrenchments in association with the closure of Tennyson and Bulimba.

Mr Vaughan: It is true.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: As I see it, it is totally untrue.

The honourable member for Ipswich spoke about lump-sum payments in recent years and other matters. I point out to him that the workers contribute 16 per cent and the owners contribute 49 per cent.

He referred also to the commutation package on pensions, which was not really commutation. At the time, there was correspondence on the matter. The tribunal convinced the Retired Mine Workers Association that it was getting a fair deal.

When the honourable member talks about an actuarial evaluation, he is referring to lump sums, not pensions. Therefore, what he is saying is not valid. There is no valid argument for increasing pay-outs to people who have already drawn their entitlement. That is history, and we really cannot go back on it.

I thank the two Opposition speakers for basically supporting the Bill.

Motion (Mr I. J. Gibbs) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. I. J. Gibbs (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 2.; Meaning of terms—

Mr HAMILL (11.52 p.m.): I wish to pursue a question that the Minister seems to have dismissed so easily. Clause 2 refers to the retirement age for those people engaged in the mining industry. Opposition members are pleased that the retirement age has been reduced to 57 years. At the time when those people I have been discussing retired, the retirement age was 60 years.

What the Government has overseen is a retrospective change in the terms under which a pension entitlement could be drawn by people who retired prior to 1970. If it was good enough for the Government to do that then, why has the Minister come into the Chamber tonight and said that those people who retired between 1970 and 1976 should remain in a disadvantaged state? The Government can look after those people who retired prior to 1970 and give them cash benefits on the basis of a pay-out according to their expected life span.

I understand that not all weekly pensioners opted for the lump-sum pay-out that was offered. Some retired miners are still drawing the weekly pension. If the idea was to try to lessen the burden upon the fund, it has not succeeded.

It is not sufficient to totally dismiss the claim, as the Minister has done, and say that it is all past tense and ought to be forgotten. These people are present tense. They are elderly people who do not have great means. Even a small consideration to improve their lot would be gratefully accepted by them. They are not wealthy people and a few extra comforts in their retirement would be appreciated by them.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member for Ipswich appears to be under the misapprehension that the Government runs the scheme. The Government administers the Act; that is all. The scheme is administered by a tribunal comprising representatives of the unions and the coal-owners, and the Director-General of Mines is the chairman. The decision is made by that tribunal, not by the Government. Nothing comes to me, save recommendations that legislation be introduced into this Chamber, because the Mines Department administers the Act. The honourable member should do his homework and get his facts right. As I say, the Government does not run the scheme; it is run by representatives of the industry and the union.

Mr HAMILL: I shall pursue one point that the Minister made about the operation of the fund. I understand that the decision that was made to offer lump-sum benefits to people who retired from the industry almost 15 years ago or longer did not actually receive the sanction of one of the parties that contribute to the fund, and that is the trade union body. Who made the decision to offer those pensions? Was it some sort of a brainstorm idea from the department, the actuary or the other contributors to the fund?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The actuary has a responsibility, and he accepts that responsibility. He does what is actuarially sound. The actuary is an officer who works for the Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Fund, which he administers according to what the tribunal sets down. I make it clear that the Government does not make the decision, and the honourable member knows that.

Mr Hamill: Who made the decision?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The tribunal.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, by leave, read a third time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
“That the House do now adjourn.”

Road Toll

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.58 p.m.): Tonight I speak about the carnage on Queensland roads. Queensland has the worst road toll in Australia, and the unbelievable attitude of the Government, which has failed to address the problem, has shocked most Queenslanders. Not one positive step is being considered by the Government. Indeed, neither the Premier nor any one of his Ministers has been heard to defend the

Government's attitude. On the contrary, the Government adopts its stand, which is that nothing can be done. However, plenty of things can be done to reduce the road toll.

Since 1975, the road toll throughout Australia has fallen by approximately 16 per cent. However, in the last few years, the national road toll has risen at an unhealthy rate. In Queensland, that increase has been unbelievable. The Minister who is responsible for fire services and who is presently responsible for transport could be called the Minister for death or the angel of death because of a number of fatal fires that have occurred recently and because of the road toll, which he cannot cope with. Of course, that is not his fault, but the Government should take positive steps to reduce the toll.

It appears that the Government is balking at the cost of those measures. A good example is its failure to employ more police officers, to have them more visible and, therefore, to be more effective. On Sunday last, I travelled to the Gold Coast and back. In the morning, the only police I saw were on the north-bound side of the highway. About five or six officers were booking motorists who had fallen into a radar trap. Most of the traffic was travelling south. When I returned an hour or so later, I passed five separate accidents involving about 14 cars on the south-bound road. There was not one policeman in sight and, because the traffic had slowed to a crawl, motorists were totally frustrated. That situation made a farce of the supposed effective policing of the State's roads.

Because there are no checks, roadworthiness inspections are not taken seriously. To remove unworthy vehicles from the road, more is needed than a roadworthiness inspection at the time that a motor vehicle is sold.

Licensing in Queensland is a joke, because the Government will not take that seriously, either. The Government will not ensure that the holders of drivers' licences are in fact properly capable of driving. The fact of life is that licence-testing is not effective.

Wednesday, 25 September 1985

Whether the Government likes it or not, random breath-testing has proven effective in some States where it has been properly introduced. In those States, it has brought about a 20 per cent reduction in the road toll. Surely the lives that would be saved by random breath-testing are worthy of consideration by this Government. However, it dismisses the concept out of hand. Perhaps that is because of the cost, or perhaps it is because there are not sufficient police in this State. The Premier said recently that if random breath-testing was introduced, everybody would be inconvenienced. If the police conduct random breath-testing in a proper and orderly manner, that is not the case. The drivers who are pulled up at random for testing are the only ones who are inconvenienced.

Mr Davis: It has been a success in Victoria.

Mr D'ARCY: That is right.

For years, the Opposition has known that the ambulance services have needed paramedics or properly trained medical attendants. The stabilisation of the condition of a victim at the scene of an accident is all-important. The stabilisation of the condition of even heart-attack victims is proving successful in some States, to such an extent that the lack of appropriate training in Queensland is a disgrace. Such a positive step as the introduction of properly trained ambulance officers could be combined with the introduction of random breath-testing.

One thing about random breath-testing in Queensland really shocks me. In this State, it is legal to drink alcohol but not to drive while under its influence. Although it is illegal to use drugs in Queensland and blood tests have revealed the presence of drugs in drivers, not one person has been convicted for driving under the influence of marijuana, heroin or other drugs.

Time expired.

Entry into Australia of Representatives of International Terrorist Organisations

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (12.3 a.m.): I take this opportunity to express the strongest possible concern at reports that the Commonwealth Government is continuing to permit the entry into Australia of representatives of international terrorist organisations. I submit to the House that such action must represent a threat to national security.

Firstly, Canberra permitted into the country the leader of the Namibian terrorist group SWAPO, Andimba Toiva, and has followed that up with a decision to permit the entry of a representative of the African National Congress. Both these organisations are dedicated to the violent—I emphasise the word “violent”—overthrow of the South African Government, and both are strongly supported by the Soviet bloc.

The communist links to both groups have been confirmed by a November 1982 report of a subcommittee of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on Security and Terrorism. In part, that report states that the original purposes of both the ANC and SWAPO have been subverted and that the Soviets and their allies have achieved alarmingly effective control over them.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, I repeat that that was a report from a United States Senate committee. The honourable member does not seem to like some of the phoney and dangerous friends of the Labor Party.

Questions need to be asked as to why the Federal Government seems so ready to embrace such organisations. The Labor Party appears to have some very curious and dangerous friends.

Mr McPhie: Mr Hayden supported the leader of the terrorists.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the comment from my friend the member for Toowoomba North.

The reported policy of the Commonwealth Government is a sinister and dangerous one, which must not only represent a threat of some magnitude to this country's own domestic security but also horrify all thinking Australians. The strongest possible condemnation of this outrageous and unacceptable decision by the Federal Government is warranted. No activist for a terrorist organisation that advocates violence, death and destruction should have a place in furthering his objectives in Australia, let alone be aided and abetted by the present Federal Government.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I have some information for the Opposition Whip. I certainly do not support the present apartheid policies of the South African Government.

An estimated 2 million or so foreign blacks work in South Africa, only 350 000 of them legally. Of the latter, 104 000 come from one country alone, Lesotho, to work in South African gold mines. In 1983, the total value of that part of their wages that foreign workers sent home totalled an estimated 678 million South African rand. Such remittances accounted for 51 per cent of Lesotho's gross national product and 12 per cent of Mozambique's.

There is similar heavy dependence on South Africa for transport services. In 1983 there was a daily——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, I point out that I am not talking about South Africa; I am talking about the other African countries that depend on the South African economy.

For the benefit of the honourable member who is displaying his ignorance so profusely, I also point out that, in 1983, there was a daily average of almost 6 000 South African rail freight cars working across the border, and almost 1 000 foreign cars within South Africa. According to one estimate, in October 1983, Zaire received 57 per cent of its imports, and sent 45 per cent of its exports, through South Africa. Zambia's figures were 70 per cent and 40 per cent respectively, compared with Malawi's 60 per cent and 50 per cent and Zimbabwe's 68 per cent and 65 per cent.

I suggest to honourable members opposite that the policies that their Federal Government is pursuing will only hurt the blacks in southern Africa. Honourable members opposite seem to support Malcolm Fraser. His claim to fame and what he has done in Zimbabwe have contributed to the creation of a one-party Marxist State. He should hang his head in shame.

Small Business; Electricity Boards

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (12.8 a.m.): I refer to the plight of small-business people in this State, so many of whom are going bankrupt. Lately, honourable members have heard from the Opposition about the mugs who are sticking up for those people who have evaded tax in this country for so long.

I read to the House this statement, which was reported on Tuesday, 17 September, by a former tax-man—

“Capital gains tax is a ‘tax for posterity,’ according to a Gladstone-bred man who is quite well-briefed on matters of taxation.

Mr O'Reilly said the tax was not going to ‘bite’ for quite a while.

‘The lack of a capital gains tax in Australia has considerably weakened the income tax system because so much of the so-called legal tax avoidance has been based on converting income into what in technical and legal terms is capital,’ Mr O'Reilly said.

Mr O'Reilly said that he did not know the details of the Government's scheme in relation to capital gains but said it ought to protect a person's income and lead to a reduction in income tax.

In relation to a tax on fringe benefits. Mr O'Reilly said: ‘What you are paid, in kind, ought to be just as good a subject for taxation as cash or income.’

Criticism of this tax included comments that some restaurants would be forced to close down.”

That is in the small business sector.

The article continues—

“Mr O'Reilly said he did not know full proposals for such taxes but said there could be ‘some effects at the margin for a short while.’

‘As always, people tend to kill the goose that layed the golden egg,’ he said.

‘I don't think any government was worried about the incidence of fringe benefits when they were not so visibly taking the place of increases in income or salaries,’ Mr O'Reilly said.

But in recent years they had become disproportionate to salaries. He said it was not surprising that the Government felt constrained to take some action.

He described the current trend among some groups and individuals, including the Cattle Council of Australia, the National Party and the former Federal Treasury head, John Stone, to support a uniform tax rate as a ‘pipedream.’

Mr O'Reilly said that details of this proposal were not known to him but he gave the following example of its unfairness.

'If you have a standard rate of tax at 25 per cent and a person earns \$100 in income, he pays \$25 tax.

'If another person also earns \$100 in income and has a rebate of \$20 he is taxed on only \$80 and pays only \$20 tax.'

'It doesn't mean that everybody is going to pay the same proportion of income tax because it can be played around with so easily with rebates, deductions and so on,' he said."

That statement came from a man who was the Commissioner of Taxation from 1976 until last year. It relates very closely to those members of the National Party who are on the land and claim all those benefits, such as rebates, through taxation.

I am concerned about statements by the mugs on the other side of the Chamber that small businesses, such as restaurants, will feel the pinch because of the fringe benefits that will be taxed from now on. What is being done for small business in relation to the electricity boards throughout this State that are asking small business in industries, such as accommodation and catering, for huge deposits as guarantees on electricity that is to be supplied in the future? The electricity boards have been asking not only for one deposit but also for outlandish deposits to cover more than one period of electricity supply.

Nothing is heard from the Government about taking action regarding the electricity boards. Those boards are the judge and jury on whether a business is to operate financially or is going to fail. The electricity boards are taking no risks. Those boards are asking small-business people to provide deposits. Honourable members know that small businesses cannot afford to have such deposits lying there and not earning an income.

The electricity boards are so great that they are now to give the usual savings bank rate for deposits held by them. It is not only the electricity boards throughout the State that require such deposits. Telecom Australia also asks for double and sometimes two and a-half times more than the usual telephone bill would be for a quarter from small businesses. Telecom wants its money in advance. The small-business people of this State have to wait 30 to 60 days to get their money from the people to whom they give credit, but they are not granted the same liberty as the Capricornia Electricity Board.

Time expired.

Federal Education Funding

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (12.13 a.m.): I wish to highlight a difference of opinion and attitude that exists among certain members of the Federal Government. I refer in particular to the Grants Commission regarding school assistance. It is quite interesting to note that, when the Federal Minister for Education and Youth Affairs (Susan Ryan) was in Opposition, she pointed out that there was certainly insufficient money spent on education and that education was being disadvantaged.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: More money was needed, as the honourable member for Brisbane Central is pointing out.

It is interesting also to note Susan Ryan's change in attitude. Recently she pointed out that it is not the amount of money spent on education that really counts, but the quality of the education itself. Perhaps that is a valid point. However, when honourable members realise what Susan Ryan had in mind when she made that statement, they will begin to become aware of its repercussions. For example, the allocation of funding under the grants program or the booklet containing guide-lines spells out fairly clearly just what is expected when applications are made for assistance to various schools. The Federal Minister for Education should be satisfied with the arrangements for the identification and recognition of the Commonwealth capital funding for Government schools and for schools generally.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: I am not sure whether the honourable member for Brisbane Central is listening to the debate. He should sit down and keep quiet.

I do not argue that the Federal Education Department or the Federal Minister for Education should not know what is going on and know in advance the details of applications. I do not argue against the provision in advance of details of proposed building projects to be assisted with Commonwealth funds. However, the Federal Government requires notice two years prior to a building program being commenced before an application can be approved.

The forward commitment arrangements also enable advance approval to be given for the construction of facilities required two or more years in advance of the receipt of the grant. Many schools cannot really plan two years in advance when they will want a building. The schools want to carry out construction when development is taking place.

That is precisely what is happening at present to many of the smaller and larger schools, particularly in the non-Government sector. Capital grants for non-Government schools, for example, are subject to a priority assessment. The Government has stated that its priorities for the allocation of capital grants are to assist non-Government schools and authorities to provide new places in developing areas in accordance with the overall planning of education facilities, and to ensure that the basic facilities are provided in existing non-Government schools that serve poor communities.

That brings me to the other aspect, that is, that the assessment not only is made two years in advance but also is based on the Government's determination of what constitutes a poor community. The effect of such an assessment is that any community that is prepared to work for itself and any p. and c. committee that is prepared to raise some of its own funds would be determined not to be a poor community or a school serving a poor community, and that school would miss out on the funding that should be available under normal circumstances for the development of school facilities.

I ask all honourable members to listen to the criteria for assessment of priorities, which I will now quote, as follows—

“In assessing priorities for capital assistance, account will be taken of the government's objective of achieving improved schooling services and outcomes, especially for students in poorer circumstances.”

Again, the assessment is based on the Government's determination of “poorer circumstances”

Mr Davis: What you are saying is terrible.

Mr STEPHAN: I agree with the honourable member for Brisbane Central that the situation is not very good because, again, the people who are prepared and willing to do something for themselves will be disadvantaged, and no incentive can be derived under those circumstances. The assessment of priorities goes on, as follows—

“Applications for capital assistance for all program elements will be considered on the basis of relative educational and financial need. In determining the educational need for a project, Planning and Finance Committees will take account of the level of existing or proposed facilities of the applicant school relative to established standards. In determining financial need in respect of a particular project, the Committees will examine the capacity of a school and its supporting community to undertake the project from its own resources, including loan funds and building levies, or to borrow the funds with or without a Commonwealth loan guarantee. Even where the Committee has determined a high educational priority for a project, a grant or loan guarantee will not normally be made unless a school can demonstrate that it cannot reasonably meet the full cost of the project from its own resources.”

Time expired.

Australian Small Business Association Convention, Hamilton Hotel, Brisbane

Mr YEWDALE (Rockhampton North) (12.18 a.m.): The subject-matter I wish to discuss refers to the convention conducted in June this year at the Hamilton Hotel by the Australian Small Business Association. The guest speakers were Mr David Russell, a barrister, who spoke for the National Party, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) and Mr Peter Boyle, the National president of the Australian Small Business Association. At that particular convention, several speakers addressed the gathering and several questions and answers went back and forth. Upon a perusal of the list of speakers, I come down fairly quickly to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. On that occasion, Mr Russell indicated that Mr Lester would address the gathering. Mr Lester said—

“David has been a shining light for the Government, his work during the past months has been invaluable. Mr Wier is known to you all as a truck driver for a newspaper company forced out of a job over union intimidation tactics and in the building industry, electrical and plumbing we have a similar problem.”

Some of the questions that were asked were very interesting, and one was—

“When is the government to change the policy of State Government workers being union members?”

The reply was—

“We have already moved that any person wishing to resign from a union can do so immediately without the previous 3 months notice. We will also remove the preference provisions for union membership from State Awards. A significant number of businesses do not want union membership abolished, so the government cannot act yet. But we will outlaw preferences except where certain specific situations occur e.g. in Mt. Isa and the A.W.U.

Under current legislation 5% of a group can apply secretly for a secret ballot.”

A further question was asked—

“When will the government clean up it's own back-yard like not collecting union dues.”

The reply was as follows—

“The State is already not doing this e.g. in the Police force and in the Railways. Strangely since this happened, policemen are not so apathetic they objected strongly when their executive made a donation to the E.T.U. recently.

We'll give the unions a bit more treatment as we go down the track.”

A further question was asked of Mr Peter Boyle—

“What of issue of employers unwilling to take on employee because of possible redundancy payments in the future?”

The reply was—

“Redundancy payments ought not to be in future legislation. We consider them to be an inhibitor of employment, and expansion of business and employment.”

There was a further question, as follows—

“What of a Voluntary Employment Contract Policy?”

The reply was as follows—

“Inroads are being made in Victoria. Is there anyone who does not know what the Voluntary Employment Contract Policy means?

The newly proposed youth training scheme is related to this policy. Voluntary Employment Contracts are A.S.B.A. policy.

It's implementation will legalize the right of individual mutual contracts outside Union Awards. You will be totally outside the control of the Unions. Whatever is determined will apply to your employees, e.g. 336 days work whatever pay etc.

Take the example of a metal work business with a small group of workers. A.S.B.A. group all raised money and dispersed his machinery and operation through 3 other factories. His business continued but the jobs and unionists were split up. Governments must legalize Voluntary Employment Contracts for this action to succeed."

A further question reads—

"We need to consider appropriate legislation for Government to assist small business. What legislation do you suggest?"

The notes continue—

- "Responses:
1. Abolition of Pay Roll Tax
 2. Make it an offence for a business to pay or collect union dues
 3. Voluntary hours contract—no set formula for hours worked—no overtime if start is an hour earlier. Work hours to be any time of day you determine an employee to work e.g. tourism industry—weekends, day, night etc. Not to be bound by rules or unions or awards."

The notes continue—

"Union Dues

Firms who don't collect should be exempt from pay roll tax as incentive.

Rockhampton Member:

Recommended employees be advised by advertisements in local papers of their rights for a secret ballot if 5% request it.

54% of Australia's population is unionized—not because they want to be but because they have to be."

Peter Boyle then said—

"Ned Kelly attitude still left in this country. Government would rather not put martyrs in jail. Friday is deadline for action. Presentation of facts to the media, if not presented correctly, could motivate against the Government. Nothing can be done for the little man, the small shopkeeper, milk bar proprietor, he's a lost cause and has been for a long time, but there are 40,000 of us who can be heard and can sell the association.

If an issue has to be picked and there isn't one—create an issue the challenge is yours."

That is only a brief outline of the activities of David Russell, Vince Lester, Peter Boyle, and the members of the Australian Small Business Association. I will take the opportunity later to elaborate further on what transpired at that meeting.

Sugar Industry

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (12.23 a.m.): I want to make some remarks about the problems facing the sugar industry.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Well, the Government would not allow this subject to be debated, and the situation has now been reached at which two Governments are talking to each another through the media while the cane-growers languish.

Mr Stephan: The Ministers are talking tomorrow, aren't they?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Thank goodness. At last the Ministers are talking. I hope that the two Governments will talk to each another because the sugar industry is becoming very concerned about its problems.

It does not seem to be understood by the Queensland Government, so it has to be restated that the Queensland Government owns the sugar. For some reason or another, it does not understand that the terms of control of this industry are quite unique in Australia in that a State Government owns a commodity. That is so, and has been so for many years. All the sugar from New South Wales and the sugar invert in Queensland is owned by the Queensland Government. Under the Sugar Acquisition Act, it has the power to, and does commandeer all the sugar produced in Australia. It also has the power to market that sugar, and to use as its agent the Queensland Sugar Board, for which considerable funds are provided from the finances of the State.

The Sugar Acquisition Act, together with the sugar agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the Queensland Government, which runs until 30 June 1989, gives all the power required to the Queensland Government to look after the interests of the sugar industry in the marketing of sugar, including the control, management, operation and maintenance of bulk-sugar terminals, the ownership of bulk-sugar terminals, which are leased from Queensland port authorities, and the use of CSR Limited and the Millaquin Sugar Company Pty Ltd as the bodies to distribute sugar for the Australian and overseas markets.

The Sugar Board, the Government agency, pays the millers. The year before last it paid the millers about \$800m for the sugar that was acquired.

The Queensland Government provides loan money from the Queensland Government Development Authority loans to look after these arrangements. In the year before last, it amounted to \$26.5m. Of course, the Government looks after the payment of loans from the International Sugar Organisation and from debentures raised overseas, and for the financing of port developments relative to bulk terminals. The sugar industry is rather unusual in that many people do not understand that the product is owned by the Government.

The commitment that the two Governments have made over the past years through the sugar agreement, which is now extended to 30 June 1989, places obligations on both Governments to handle problems associated with the industry.

The industry is facing a problem for which neither Government can be blamed—the very low sugar price round the world caused by the surplus that exists. These serious problems could last longer than some of the problems of the past. It is about time that the posturing ceased. Mr Hawke is not the least among those who have been posturing. It is all very well for him to start blaming the Queensland Government. It would be just as well for the Queensland Government to stop its posturing. The Hawke Government should also start to knuckle down and do something positive. It is time that both Government leaders and both Governments started to listen to sugar industry leaders.

The Savage report came up with 34 recommendations, quite a number of which are not popular. The cane-growers were prepared to go through them and come up with those with which they could agree or those which they could qualify. They have been prepared to place, before both Governments, their views on the subject.

Time expired.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.29 a.m. (Wednesday).